Plenary Agenda
Office of the Chancellor, Dumke Auditorium

Thursday, January 18, 2007 – 10:00 am – 5:00 pm
Reception at the Chancellor's Home, 6:00 pm – 7:30 pm

Friday, January 19, 2007 – 8:00 am – noon

1. Call to order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of agenda
4. Approval of minutes
5. Announcements
6. Presentations/Introductions
7. Reports:
   7.1. Chair
   7.2. Standing committees
   7.3. Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee
   7.4. Other committees and committee liaisons
   7.5. Chancellor Reed (Time certain 3:30 pm, Thursday)
   7.6. Roberta Achtenberg (Time certain 4:00 pm, Thursday)
   7.7. Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
   7.8. John Travis, President, CFA
   7.9. Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee
   7.10. David Backues, CSSA Liaison
8. Committee Recommendations:
   8.1 Resource Needs for High Quality Independent Ed.D. Programs in the CSU AS-2773-06/FGA/AA (Rev) Second Reading
   8.2 A Student Fee Policy That Supports Educational Outcomes AS-2774-06/AA (Rev) Second Reading
8.3 Principles to Guide The Application Of The TCSU Numbering System For California State University (CSU) Systemwide Articulation

8.4 Response to SB 1543 (ALARCON) High School Curriculum; High School Coursework Requirements

8.5 Support of the a-g Curriculum as California’s Primary High School Graduation Course Requirements

8.6 Library Resource Needs For All Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

8.7 Recognition of Faculty Service in Governance

Adjournment
Resource Needs For High-Quality, Independent Ed.D. Programs In The California State University (CSU)

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reaffirm and restate our concern for adequate support for the independent Ed.D. Programs in the CSU (see AS-2716-05/TEKR/AA and AS-2532-01/FGA/TEKR); and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to support the funding of resources and services specific to the independent EdD programs;

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campuses to use the authorized Ed.D. fee revenue to augment the funding of resources and services specific to the independent Ed.D. Programs in order to offer high quality doctoral education; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That, given the particular importance of information resources to graduate programs, the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to provide the funding of interlibrary resources and services specific to the independent Ed.D. Programs as a systemwide provision in the CSU; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campuses to augment the funding of required library resources and services specific to the independent Ed.D. programs in order to offer quality doctoral education.

RATIONALE: Doctoral programs by their very nature require additional resources, including adequate library and information resources and supporting clerical and other staff. Senate Bill 724 (Scott) stipulates that the CSU shall provide any startup funding from within existing
budgets. Thus, the additional funding needed for the independent doctorate must come from the CSU system budget and campus budgets. Given the new fees structure for graduate work, these resources should provide the funding needed for the new independent doctoral programs. Further, both Cornerstones and the new study by the Academic Provosts argue for the importance of graduate study to the CSU and particularly for high quality programs. High quality programs will need adequate funding.

Since doctoral programs require intensive research, availability of adequate information resources and supporting services are essential for successful and credible programs. The CSU Council of Library Directors has expressed library support needs for the independent doctorate program (see memo dated 8/31/06). Program planning ought to address the principle of equal access to resources and services for all Ed.D. program participants regardless of location. Certain resources may be shared electronically with systemwide procurement but those costs are significant. Since not all research materials would qualify, local collections still need attention and access to other specialized materials carries a document delivery cost at the local level. Further, instruction and assistance for dissertation research has a significant staffing implication.

Faculty Participation in the Development of Applied Doctoral Degree Programs

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) acknowledge the efforts of both the Chancellor and the California State University community to secure authorization from the California Legislature to develop independent applied doctoral degree programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU applaud the CSU’s leadership in recognizing the need to alleviate the significant shortage of highly qualified and effective educational leaders in California and its contributions to the successful passage of SB 724 which would authorize the CSU to offer independent applied doctoral degrees in education; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU reaffirm the principles related to both the development and the quality of applied doctoral degree programs ensuring that such programs meet the highest national standards as articulated in AS-2532-01/FGA/TEKR, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU strongly support the involvement of both our Community College and K-12 colleagues in the development of applied doctoral degree programs in education within the CSU; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU establish an *ad hoc* committee, comprised of members of the Academic Senate (including representation from both its Teacher Education and K-12 Relations Committee and its Academic Affairs Committee), that will draft and propose to the Academic Senate CSU, principles and guidelines to be applied during the development and implementation of applied doctoral degree programs in education, to ensure both the participation of, and contributions from senators with expertise in professional education, educator preparation, and knowledge of national professional and accreditation standards of quality in applied doctoral degree programs, during this process.

**RATIONALE:** California State Senate bill 724 (SB 724) has been passed by both the Assembly and the Senate and awaits gubernatorial approval to become law. The provisions of this bill authorize the CSU both to develop applied doctoral degree programs and to offer applied doctoral degrees in education. The primary motivation for the promulgation of law in this area was recognition by both the State Legislature and the educational community that there exists a chronic unmet need for adequate numbers of highly qualified leaders in
California’s K-12 schools and California Community Colleges. Through the efforts of the Chancellor of the CSU, and the broader CSU community, and members of the California Legislature, a remedy to address this unmet need has been crafted. If enacted and properly implemented, SB 724 will provide a vehicle through which highly qualified educational leadership personnel will be prepared. The successful implementation of provisions contained within SB 724 demands that members of the CSU faculty with specific expertise in the advanced preparation of professional educators and related professional standards, provide guidance and expertise during the development of principles and procedures for program design, development, approval and implementation.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY – September 16, 2005
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) request the cooperation of the Chancellor and Board of Trustees to develop jointly a legislative proposal for the CSU to offer independent Ed.D. degrees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That any Academic Senate CSU support for development and implementation of Ed.D. programs be contingent upon first securing funding for existing graduate programs based on the definition of a graduate full-time equivalent student (FTES) being 12 units and supplemental funding for the Ed.D. programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU affirm that Ed.D. programs offered by the CSU must be developed and approved by faculty through regular governance processes (including the campus academic senates) on the individual campuses that will offer Ed.D. degrees and that any proposed program must meet the appropriate standards for such applied doctoral programs.

RATIONALE: The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) (2000 Report) and California legislators (SB 713, introduced) have cited a need for educating school administrators and Community College teachers and administrators at the level of the doctorate of education. As the system of public higher education with a highly qualified faculty that educates and certifies most of California’s schoolteachers, the California State University (CSU), with its 23 campuses across the State, is well positioned to provide access to Ed.D. programs of high quality and at reasonable cost to students. The structure and content of such programs will be determined and approved by CSU faculty. The degree programs must have sufficient flexibility to ensure the scholarly development of a broad range of educational leaders in different areas of emphasis including, but not limited to curriculum specialists, community college faculty, educational administrators at all levels, allied health educators, and student services specialists.

The Academic Senate CSU has earlier (in its resolution of 1985) determined that creation of such programs would be contingent upon the securing of funding at a level consistent with high quality. Because existing post-baccalaureate programs in the CSU are underfunded at present, proceeding with planning for any Ed.D. programs must await increased funding of all CSU graduate programs at the level of national norms (e.g., 12 weighted teaching units (WTUs) per FTE/S instead of the present 15 WTUs). The Board of Trustees of the CSU in 1985 declared independent applied doctorates in the
field of education, when authorized by the State, as within the mission of the CSU; this element of the CSU mission is to be reiterated in pending Master Plan reports and legislation, which could include specific authorization to provide the Ed.D. degree and/or other independent applied doctorates.

APPROVED – May 10-11, 2001
August 31, 2006

TO: Dr. Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor & Chief Academic Officer

FROM: Barbara Butler, Chair, CSU Council of Library Directors

RE: Library Support Needs for the Independent Doctorate Program

The CSU Council of Library Directors would like to bring to your attention our concern regarding the need for library resources and services to support the CSU independent Doctor of Education degree. Senate Bill NO 724 stipulates that the CSU shall provide any startup funding from within existing budgets for academic programs support. Since doctoral programs by their nature require intensive research, availability of adequate information resources and supporting services are essential for a successful and credible program.

Planning is underway in the seven campus libraries for institutions expected to implement the independent doctorate in AY 2006-2007. Our calculations show that existing budgets are inadequate to provide a basic core. The attached document provides a summary of costs, conservatively projected, for one cohort at start-up, as a sample only.

Program planning should address the principle of equal access to resources and services for all EdD program participants regardless of location. We realize that the capacity level will vary among campuses and this factor should be closely scrutinized to ensure that program quality is not uneven. Certain resources may be shared electronically with system-wide procurement but those costs are significant. Since not all research materials would qualify, local collections still need attention and access to other specialized materials carries a document delivery cost at the local level. Further, instruction and assistance for dissertation research has a significant staffing implication.

We want the CSU libraries to be a successful partner in this endeavor. Your consideration of our concerns is most appreciated and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss them further with you and/or other Chancellor’s Office staff.

Attachment: Projected Cost of Library Support for Independent EdD Programs
Senate Bill No. 724

CHAPTER 269

An act to add Article 4.5 (commencing with Section 66040) to Chapter 2 of Part 40 of the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.

[Approved by Governor September 22, 2005. Filed with Secretary of State September 22, 2005.]

Legislative Counsel’s Digest


Existing law, known as the Donahoe Higher Education Act, sets forth, among other things, the missions and functions of California’s public and independent segments of higher education, and their respective institutions of higher education. Provisions of the act do not apply to the University of California unless the regents of the university act, by resolution, to make them applicable.

Among other things, the act provides that the University of California has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the California State University to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields. With respect to doctoral degrees, the act limits the California State University to awarding these degrees jointly with the University of California, as described above, or jointly with independent institutions of higher education, provided that the proposed doctoral program is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

This bill would instead authorize the California State University to award the Doctor of Education degree, and prescribe standards for the awarding of that degree. The bill would require the California State University, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office to jointly conduct, in accordance with prescribed criteria, a statewide evaluation of the doctoral programs implemented under the bill and to report the results of the evaluation, in writing, to the Legislature and the Governor on or before January 1, 2011.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Article 4.5 (commencing with Section 66040) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 40 of the Education Code, to read:
66040. The Legislature finds and declares both of the following:
(a) Since its adoption in 1960, the Master Plan for Higher Education has served the state exceedingly well, allowing California to create the largest and most distinguished higher education system in the nation. A key component of the Master Plan is the differentiation of mission and function, whereby doctoral and identified professional programs are limited to the University of California, with the provision that the California State University can provide doctoral education in joint doctoral degree programs with the University of California and independent California colleges and universities. This differentiation of function has allowed California to provide universal access to postsecondary education while preserving quality.
(b) Because of the urgent need for well-prepared administrators to lead public school and community college reform efforts, the State of California is hereby making an exception to the differentiation of function in graduate education that assigns sole authority among the California public higher education segments to the University of California for awarding doctoral degrees independently. This exception to the Master Plan for Higher Education recognizes the urgency of meeting critical public school and community college leadership needs and the distinctive strengths and respective missions of the California State University and the University of California.

66040.3. (a) Pursuant to Section 66040, and notwithstanding Section 66010.4, in order to meet specific educational leadership needs in the California public schools and community colleges, the California State University is authorized to award the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree as defined in this section. The authority to award degrees granted by this article is limited to the discipline of education. The Doctor of Education degree offered by the California State University shall be distinguished from doctoral degree programs at the University of California.
(b) The Doctor of Education degree offered by the California State University shall be focused on preparing administrative leaders for California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges and on the knowledge and skills needed by administrators to be effective leaders in California public schools and community colleges. The Doctor of Education degree offered by the California State University shall be offered through partnerships through which the California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges shall participate substantively in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, and program assessment and evaluation. This degree shall enable professionals to earn the degree while working full time.
(c) Nothing in this article shall be construed to limit or preclude the California Postsecondary Education Commission from exercising its authority under Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 66900) to review,
evaluate, and make recommendations relating to, any and all programs established under this article.

66040.5. With regard to funding the degree programs authorized in Section 66040.3, the California State University shall follow all of the following requirements:

(a) Funding on a per full-time equivalent student (FTES) basis for each new student in these degree programs shall be funded from within the California State University’s enrollment growth levels as agreed to in the annual Budget Act. Enrollments in these programs shall not alter the California State University’s ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, and shall not come at the expense of enrollment growth in university undergraduate programs. Funding provided from the state for each FTES shall be at the agreed-upon marginal cost calculation that the California State University receives.

(b) Each student in the programs authorized by this article shall be charged fees no higher than the rate charged for students in state-supported doctoral degree programs in education at the University of California, including joint Ed.D. programs of the California State University and the University of California.

(c) The California State University shall provide any startup funding needed for the programs authorized by this article from within existing budgets for academic programs support, without diminishing the quality of program support offered to California State University undergraduate programs. Funding of these programs shall not result in reduced undergraduate enrollments at the California State University.

66040.7. The California State University, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst’s Office shall jointly conduct a statewide evaluation of the new programs implemented under this article. The results of the evaluation shall be reported, in writing, to the Legislature and Governor on or before January 1, 2011. The evaluation required by this section shall consider all of the following:

(a) The number of new doctoral programs in education implemented, including information identifying the number of new programs, applicants, admissions, enrollments, degree recipients, time-to-degree, attrition, and public school and community college program partners.

(b) The extent to which the programs established under this article are fulfilling identified state needs for training in educational leadership, including statewide supply and demand data that considers capacity at the University of California and in California’s independent colleges and universities.

(c) Information on the place of employment of students and the subsequent job placement of graduates.

(d) Any available evidence on the effects that the graduates of the programs are having on elementary and secondary school and community college reform efforts and on student achievement.

(e) Program costs and the fund sources that were used to finance these programs, including a calculation of cost per degree awarded.
(f) The costs of the programs to students, the amount of financial aid offered, and student debt levels of graduates of the programs.

(g) The extent to which the programs established under this article are in compliance with the requirements of this article.
A Student Fee Policy That Supports Educational Outcomes

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) requests that the Chancellor’s Office, in conjunction with the Academic Senate CSU, undertake a study of CSU Student Fee Policy to determine what changes in this policy would result in a better allocation of state resources as well as serve to facilitate graduation efforts and student success.

RATIONALE: Current CSU Student Fee Policy results in some students making course load decisions based more upon economic incentives rather than educational considerations, such as enrolling in more courses than they intend to complete or registering through the Extended University rather than the main campus. These choices, based on economic incentives, may result in longer average times to degree completion and lower academic achievement. Fee policies should align economic incentives with educational outcomes.

Principles To Guide The Application Of The TCSU Numbering System For California State University (CSU) Systemwide Articulation

1. RESOLVED: That individual community college courses receiving a Transfer CSU (TCSU) number for a Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) should be articulated at all CSU campuses offering a comparable course; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the same principles apply to comparable course sequences; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That “comparability” implies equivalent prerequisites, required course coverage, contact hours and laboratory activities; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the faculty of the appropriate CSU campus discipline have primary responsibility for determining TCSU comparability with campus courses; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the LDTP Steering Committee will facilitate the resolution of questions regarding this policy and comparability. If questions remain, the issue will be referred to the established LDTP discipline course review team, which will have ultimate decision-making authority.

RATIONALE: Discipline faculty from across the CSU have invested significant time and effort developing course descriptors for courses included in LDTPs. Discipline faculty from across the system will invest significant time reviewing community college course submission for the purpose of certifying their congruence with said descriptors. The purposes of the LDTP project and the associated TCSU numbering system, by which certification can be communicated are to facilitate the major preparation and smooth transition to the CSU by transfer students. Disallowing major credit for comparable courses taken at community colleges would pose an unreasonable hardship for transfer students.
It is also unlikely that community colleges will submit sufficient courses for review if approval of courses does not imply articulation outside of LDTP transfer. If courses are modified to meet the guidelines set forth by the CSU discipline faculty, community colleges many have to redo and renegotiate dozens of campus-to-campus articulation agreements with individual CSU campuses, not to mention UC and private institutions.

SB 1415 (Brulte) states “the California Community Colleges and California State University shall adopt, and the University of California and private postsecondary institutions may adopt, a common course numbering system for the 20 highest-demand majors in the respective segments.” It is widely understood that the TCSU numbering system will replace the CAN system, in which we no longer participate, for the CSU to meet the intent of this bill.

Response To SB 1543 (Alarcon): High School Curriculum; High School Coursework Requirements

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the Chancellor’s Office, in conjunction with the Academic Senate CSU, to move quickly in establishing a systemwide faculty task force to address issues raised by SB 1543 (Alarcon) related to Career Technical Education (CTE), including the preparation of model curriculum standards to guide the approval of CTE courses as a-g general elective courses for purposes of admission to the CSU.

RATIONALE: SB 1543 (Alarcon) provides that if the CSU has not adopted, by July 1, 2008, model uniform academic standards for CTE courses that will satisfy the completion of a general education course requirement for the purpose of admission, the CSU Board of Trustees shall recognize the completion of all high school CTE courses that meet the model curriculum standards established in current law, as satisfying the completion of a general education requirement for the purpose of admission.

Senate Bill No. 1543

CHAPTER 669

An act to add Section 66205.9 to the Education Code, relating to the high school curriculum.

[Approved by Governor September 29, 2006. Filed with Secretary of State September 29, 2006.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

SB 1543, Alarcon. High school curriculum: high school coursework requirements.

Existing law, the Donahoe Higher Education Act, sets forth, among other things, the missions and functions of California’s public and independent segments of higher education, and their respective institutions of higher education. Existing law establishes the University of California, under the administration of the Regents of the University of California, and the California State University, under the administration of the Trustees of the California State University, as 2 of the public segments of postsecondary education in this state. Provisions of the Donahoe Higher Education Act apply to the University of California only to the extent that the regents act, by resolution, to make those provisions applicable.

A provision of the act requires the California State University, and requests the University of California, to establish model academic standards for high school courses for pupils who wish to attend those institutions.

Existing law requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to coordinate the development, on a cyclical basis, of model curriculum standards for a high school career technical course of study. Existing law also requires the superintendent to develop a career technical curriculum framework based on prescribed criteria.

This bill would add to the Donahoe Higher Education Act a provision providing that if, by July 1, 2008, either the University of California or the California State University has not adopted, in accordance with the criteria in existing law, model uniform academic standards for career technical education that will satisfy the completion of a general elective course requirement for the purposes of admission to their respective universities, the regents are requested to, and the trustees are required to, recognize the completion of all high school career technical education courses that meet the model curriculum standards developed by the superintendent as satisfying the completion of a general elective course requirement for the purposes of admission to their respective universities. The bill would request the regents, and would require the trustees, to make publicly
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available, upon their adoption, any model curriculum standards for career technical education courses.

The bill would not apply to any career technical education courses that, as of January 1, 2007, are approved as satisfying the admissions requirements of the University of California or the California State University.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 66205.9 is added to the Education Code, to read: 66205.9. (a) If, by July 1, 2008, the University of California has not adopted model uniform academic standards for career technical education courses, pursuant to Section 66205.5, that will satisfy the completion of a general elective course requirement for the purposes of admission to that university, the Regents of the University of California are requested to recognize the completion of all high school career technical education courses that meet the model curriculum standards established pursuant to Sections 51226 and 51226.1 as satisfying the completion of a general elective course requirement for the purposes of admission to that university.

(b) If the Regents of the University of California adopt standards for career technical education courses pursuant to Section 66205.5, the University of California is requested to make those standards publicly available upon their adoption.

(c) If, by July 1, 2008, the California State University has not adopted model uniform academic standards for career technical education courses, pursuant to Section 66205.5, that will satisfy the completion of a general elective course requirement for the purposes of admission to that university, the Trustees of the California State University shall recognize the completion of all high school career technical education courses that meet the model curriculum standards established pursuant to Sections 51226 and 51226.1 as satisfying the completion of a general elective course requirement for the purposes of admission to that university.

(d) If the Trustees of the California State University adopt standards for career technical education courses pursuant to Section 66205.5, the California State University shall make those standards publicly available upon their adoption.

(e) This section shall not apply to any career technical education courses that, as of January 1, 2007, are approved as satisfying the admissions requirements of the University of California or the California State University.
Support Of The a-g Curriculum As California’s Primary High School Graduation Course Requirements

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) is in support of the a-g curriculum as California’s primary pathway to high school graduation; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognizes the importance of the a-g curriculum in preparing high school students for both college and employment; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU believes that the a-g curriculum contributes to a school culture of high expectations for student learning and achievement where academic challenges lead to student success; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU send copies of this resolution to California State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell, CSU Board of Trustees, Chancellor, campus president and provosts, and campus senate chairs.

RATIONALE: In too many of our schools, low income students students of color and low-performing students are placed in low-rigor courses with low-level assignments. Research (Matt Gandal, 2006) shows that students of all skill levels actually do better when they’re enrolled in rigorous classes, because students are less bored and more engaged in the classes. Schools and districts that require all students to take the a-g curriculum expect, demand, and foster high academic and post-secondary achievement in each of their students.
Employers want the same skills colleges do. Recent research by the American Diploma Project Network found that employers increasingly want the same high-level skills that college-bound students need. Employers cited the importance of strong reading and comprehension ability, so employees can understand informational and technical texts. Even jobs that in the past didn’t require college-level skill sets have tougher entrance requirements today.

Most good jobs in California and across the nation require education beyond high school. It is estimated that, “over the next decade 83% of the jobs in the 30 fastest growing occupations in the U.S. will require a college education or training. Eight of the top 10 fastest growing jobs require an Associate’s degree or higher.” Consequently, a rigorous a-g curriculum ought to be the primary pathway to graduation, and should be available to all students.

Library Resource Needs For All Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reaffirm its ongoing concern from our *21st Century Report* of five years ago about lagging budgets for library resources in support of all programs and disciplines; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and campus presidents to seek enhanced funding to restore and improve newer electronic and traditional print collections; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor and campus presidents to seek enhanced funding to restore and improve appropriate student-librarian ratios and to address the state and national challenge of improving information competency; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU acknowledge the CSU's recent inclusion of library resource needs within short or long-term annual budget categories and urge a higher priority for these needs; and be it further

5. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU send copies of this resolution to the Chancellor, campus presidents and provosts, the Council of Library Directors, and to campus faculty senates.

RATIONALE: The Academic Senate CSU *21st Century Report* from 2001 outlined various unmet core and support needs at that time and from many years prior as well as the deleterious effects on CSU educational quality in the future of not restoring and augmenting the pertinent resource budgets. Library funding shortfalls received due attention as a component of this report, and the situation has generally deteriorated in the five or more years since. CSU libraries and
librarians have experienced greater difficulties in giving quality support to faculty and students
from undergraduate and graduate programs across all departments and disciplines. Higher
inflation rates for print and online research materials have damaged purchasing power along with
static or otherwise insufficient collection funding. From 1972 until 2004, CSU Statistical
Abstracts show a 39.5% decline in systemwide and campus expenditures for libraries when
adjusted for inflation. In 2002 the NCES Academic Library Survey listed total CSU library
expenditures per FTES at an average of $356, or 42% below the $619 figure for a group of 14
CPEC libraries. Again during the 1972-2004 period, overall CSU library staffing decreased 53%.
As of 2002 the NCES Academic Library Survey reports that our librarian/professional staff per
1000 FTES stood at 1.36 or 57% lower than at CPEC libraries. Since the 1970's and since our
2001 21st Century Report, the CSU overall has certainly experienced enrollment growth in
numbers and percentages that we might represent as almost the 180-degree opposite of the
library support declines outlined herein. While publication formats may have evolved
considerably over these decades, the need for traditional materials has not disappeared in many
disciplines even as efficient-but-expensive newer modes have grown popular in other subject
areas. Furthermore, in many ways the rich proliferation of research sources old and new has
greatly magnified the dire social need for librarians and colleagues to better manage our
information resources and more effectively teach their best critical use.

Recognition of Faculty Service in Governance

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University (CSU) urge campus academic senates to review their promotion, retention, and tenure policy documents to ensure that they encourage faculty at appropriate stages of their academic careers to engage actively and productively as contributors to academic governance; and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU urge campus academic senates to consider establishing campus award programs, if they do not already exist, to recognize exceptional faculty contributors to academic governance; and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU forward this resolution to campus senates, presidents and provosts.

RATIONALE: As the demographics of faculty in the CSU change there is concern that the work of academic governance is being undertaken by fewer and fewer faculty members. This concern was explicitly noted in a report submitted to the Academic Senate CSU in 2001 (Shared Governance Reconsidered: Improving Decision-Making in the CSU). The importance of service was reinforced in “Faculty Service in the California State University (CSU): An Integral Component in the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion of Faculty” December 19, 2002

This resolution urges campuses to apply their own standards to the balance among teaching, research and creative activity, and service (including governance) in reviewing their promotion, retention, and tenure policies so as to encourage and recognize appropriately faculty participation
in academic governance. It also urges the campuses to consider the creation of awards, if such do not already exist, to highlight exceptional faculty contributors to academic governance.