



Academic Senate CSU

*November 9, 2006
Thursday, 8:30 a.m.-3:00*

*Dumke Auditorium, CSU Headquarters
401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA*

Agenda November 9, 2006

1. Call to order 8:30 a.m.
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. Other committees and committee liaisons
 - 7.4. Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer
 - 7.5. John Travis, President, CFA
 - 7.6. Craig Smith, Faculty Trustee
 - 7.7. David Backues, CSSA Liaison
8. Committee Recommendations:
 - 8.1 Laboratory Science Requirement for Freshman Admission AS-2769-06/AA/TEKR
Second Reading
 - 8.2 Fulfilling the Principles of Cornerstones in the New Strategic Plan AS-2771-06/AA
First Reading/Waiver
 - 8.3 Advocating for Additional Funding for CSU Budget Challenges and Unmet Needs AS-2772-06/FGA
First Reading
 - 8.4 Resource Needs for High Quality Independent Ed.D. Programs in the CSU AS-2773-06/FGA
First Reading
 - 8.5 A Student Fee Policy That Supports Educational Outcomes AS-2774-06/AA
First Reading

- | | | |
|------|---|--|
| 8.6 | Library Resource Needs for Quality, Independent EdD Degree Programs in the California State University (CSU) | <u>AS-2775-06/AA</u>
First Reading |
| 8.7 | Principles to Guide the Application of the T-CSU Numbering System for California State University (CSU) Systemwide Articulation | <u>AS-2776-06/AA</u>
First Reading |
| 8.8 | Response to SB 1543 (Alarcon): High School Curriculum; High School Coursework Requirements | <u>AS-2777-06/AA/TEKR</u>
First Reading |
| 8.9 | Support of the A-G Curriculum as California's Primary High School Graduation Course Requirements | <u>AS-2778-06/AA/TEKR</u>
First Reading |
| 8.10 | Library Resource Needs For All Undergraduate and Graduate Programs | <u>AS-2779-06/FGA</u>
First Reading |

9. Adjournment

Laboratory Science Requirement For Freshman Admission

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recommend that the CSU admission criteria for the two high school laboratory science courses be revised by removing the requirement that one of the courses be from the life sciences.

RATIONALE: This resolution supports the recommendation of the Admissions Advisory Council of the CSU. Current CSU policy requires one unit of laboratory science be from among the life sciences. The University of California (UC) policy does not specify a life science for its two unit laboratory science courses. The discrepancy in policy has resulted in some students being UC admissible, but not CSU admissible. This resolution addresses that anomaly, and would make every UC admissible student also CSU admissible.

SECOND READING – November 8-9, 2006

Fulfilling the Principles of Cornerstones in the New Strategic Plan

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the Beyond Cornerstones Steering Committee to give high priority to the following Principles of the original Cornerstones, which have not yet been implemented or achieved, so that adequate support for faculty, graduate programs, and infrastructure will be addressed:

Principle 4 - The California State University will reinvest in its faculty to maintain its primary mission as a teaching-centered comprehensive university. Faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity are essential components of that mission.

Principle 6 - Graduate education and continuing education are essential components of the mission of the California State University.

Principle 8 - The responsibility for enhancing educational excellence, access, diversity, and financial stability shall be shared by the State, the California State University system, the campuses, our faculty and staff, alumni/ae and students.

RATIONALE: The original Cornerstones has been championed by the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor's Office as a far-sighted plan for the CSU for the twenty-first century. While many of the Principles of Cornerstones have been or are being implemented, several have not. In the Chancellor's Office's "Evaluation of Achievements under Cornerstones," Principles 4, 6 and 8 were singled out as not yet having been "well addressed." These three provide for adequate support, including infrastructure, for the performance of faculty duties, for funding graduate

programs, and in particular the independent EdD programs, at a sufficient level, and reducing the “salary gaps for all categories of employees for whom such gaps exists.” The Academic Senate CSU strongly believes that these Principles should be given high priority in any successor strategic plan of Cornerstones.

Advocating for Additional Funding for CSU Budget Challenges and Unmet Needs

- 1. RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) strongly affirm its concern for the continuing Budget Challenges and unmet needs for the California State University (CSU) which appear again in the proposed 2007-2008 CSU Budget; and be it further
- 2. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU strongly urge the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees, to continue to aggressively advocate with the Department of Finance, the Legislature and the Governor's Office for additional funding to cover these unmet needs; and be it further
- 3. RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU pledges to work closely with the Chancellor and the CSU family in this advocacy effort.

RATIONALE: In September 2001, the ASCSU developed, adopted and distributed a report entitled: "The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California." The report describes the serious detrimental impact of funding cuts in the 1990's on the teaching mission, library collections and library staffing, the physical and technological infrastructure, the clerical-secretarial staff, and the faculty. It describes a crisis in faculty hiring and in physical infrastructure.

In seeking to address the serious deficits and needs in the CSU, the report makes the following recommendations.

- Reduce the current student-faculty ratios.
- Remedy infrastructure insufficiencies and bring state-of-the art technology to more CSU classrooms.
- Augment CSU library collections and restore library staffing.
- Establish incentives to attract new faculty members of the highest quality, including improved benefits, housing subsidies, and moving expenses.
- Hire additional tenure-track faculty and reduce the current proportion of lecturers by hiring tenure-track faculty.
- Increase the number of secretarial/clerical staff and technical staff who provide services to students and faculty.
- In recognition that research, scholarship, and creative activity are required for effective teaching, increase support for all CSU faculty to engage in these activities.
- Adjust CSU faculty salaries to achieve parity with comparison institutions to remain competitive with other academic institutions.
- Improve the current CSU physical plant to provide adequate facilities for existing programs and for growth.

The CSU Academic Senate developed and distributed other reports addressing some of these same crucial and unmet needs. These are:

Response to ACR 73 (Strom-Martin): A Plan to Increase the Percentage of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the CSU – July 2002

<http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Agenda/agendasept06.pdf>

Report of the Faculty Flow Committee – March 2003

<http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/FacultyFlowCmtReport.pdf>

CSU Faculty Flow Survey Report – January 2003

<http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/FacultyFlowSurveyReport.pdf>

Findings and Recommendations of the Advisory Committee for the CSU and Comparable

Faculty Workload Studies – January 2003

http://www.calstate.edu/acadres/docs/FINAL_Findings_Rec.pdf

Faculty Compensation and the Crisis in Recruiting and Retaining Faculty of High Quality – May 5, 2005

http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Reports/statement_on_faculty_salariesfinal.pdf

Since the distribution of the 21st Century report, the CSU has again experienced serious reductions in funding because of the fiscal crisis of the state. These funding reductions caused further serious detrimental impacts on the CSU.

As CSU moves forward to undertake a strategic plan addressing Access and Excellence, it is even more urgent to highlight to the state and others the continuing budget challenges and unmet needs of the CSU. To **not** address these now and **forcefully** is to set high barriers to the ability of the CSU to move forward to serve the pressing needs of the citizens of California for access to a high quality education that has become a necessity for the health of California's economy.

Resource Needs for High Quality Independent Ed.D. Programs in the 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; 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 Ed.D. programs; and be it further
3. RESOLVED That the Academic Senate CSU urge the campuses to use the authorized 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.

RATIONALE: Doctoral programs by their very nature require additional resources needs including adequate library and information resources and supporting clerical and other staff. Senate Bill 724 (Scott) stipulates that CSU shall provide any startup funding from within existing budgets and thus the additional funding needed for the independent doctorate must come from the CSU system budget and campus budgets. Given the new fee 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 important of graduate study to the CSU and particularly for high quality programs. High quality programs need adequate funding.

#5 Agenda Item

AS-2774-06/AA
November 9, 2006

A Student Fee Policy That Supports Educational Outcomes

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) request that the Chancellor's Office undertake a study of CSU Student Fee Policy to determine if changes in this policy would result in a better allocation of state resources as well as serve to facilitate graduation efforts.

RATIONALE Current CSU Student Fee Policy may result in students enrolling in more courses than they need to complete, students registering through the Extended University rather than the main campus, students taking no courses rather than one course, students making course load decisions based more upon economic incentives rather than educational considerations, and ultimately, longer average times to degree completion and lower academic achievement. Student fee policies should align economic incentives with educational outcomes.

#6 Agenda Item

AS-2775-06/AA
November 9, 2006

Library Resource Needs For Quality, Independent EdD Degree Programs In The California State University (CSU)

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) restate its concerns about the adequacy of resources provided to support quality, independent EdD degree programs in the CSU (see AS-2716-05/TEKR/AA and AS-2532-01/FGA/TEKR); and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor to provide the funding of interlibrary resources and services specific to the independent EdD degree programs as a systemwide provision in the CSU; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the campuses to augment the funding of required library resources and services specific to the independent EdD degree programs in order to offer quality doctoral education.

RATIONALE: The CSU Council of Library Directors has expressed library support needs for the independent doctorate program (see memo dated 8/31/06). Senate Bill 724 (Scott) stipulates that the CSU shall provide any startup funding from within existing budgets for academic program support. Since doctoral programs require intensive research, availability of adequate information resources and supporting services are essential for successful and credible programs.

Program planning ought to address the principle of equal access to resources and services for all EdD program participants regardless of location. Certain resources may be shared electronically with systemwide procurement but those costs are significant. Since not all research materials

#6 Agenda Item

AS-2775-06/AA

November 9, 2006

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.

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2716-05/TEKR/AA
September 16, 2005

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 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

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-2532-01/FGA/TEKR
March 15-16, 2001

Consideration of the Ed.D. in the California State University System

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



University Library

Jean and Charles Schulz Information Center

1801 E. Cotati Avenue, Rohnert Park, CA 94928 Tel: 707-664-2397 Fax: 707-664-2090

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

SB 724, Scott. Public postsecondary education: California State University: Doctor of Education degrees.

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:

Article 4.5. Doctoral Programs in Education

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.

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

1. RESOLVED: That individual community college courses receiving a Transfer-CSU (T-CSU) number for a Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) be deemed to 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 appropriate campus discipline faculties have primary responsibility for determining comparability; and be it further
5. RESOLVED: the LDTP Steering Committee will resolve that CSU campus exception to this policy and questions regarding comparability. Any decision by the LDTP Steering Committee can be appealed 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 T-CSU 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 may have to redo and renegotiate dozens of campus-to-campus articulation agreements with individual CSU campuses, not to mention University of California (UC) and private institutions.

SB 1415 (Brulte) states “the 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 T-CSU 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 to move quickly in establishing a systemwide task force to adequately address SB 1543 (Alarcon) related to Career Technical Education (CTE) courses.

RATIONALE: According to the materials provided with SB 1543 (Alarcon), educators have created a false division between career technical courses and college preparatory programs. Vocational education courses are often squeezed out to make room for courses that are required to meet university admission requirements. Yet, a 2005 report from the California Department of Education (CDE) indicates the number of A-G approved career technical education (CTE) courses has more than doubled since 2003. There are currently more than 4,000 CTE courses that meet the A-G admission requirements, including courses in agriculture, business, health careers, arts, industrial and technology education, and home economics.

SB 1543 requires the inclusion of CTE courses that meet current standards into A-G admission requirements. The CSU is supporting this bill after having worked with Senator Alarcon. The bill would have the effect of directing us to work more closely with high school CTE faculty to align their courses with our A-G admission requirements. Current law requires the CSU to establish model academic standards for high school courses that satisfy university admission requirements. The CSU Board of Trustees has established common high school coursework requirements for undergraduate admissions. Students who take courses that meet these minimum

requirements and who meet other specified criteria are eligible to apply and be considered for admission.

The CDE defines CTE as a program of study that integrates core academic knowledge with technical and occupational knowledge to provide students with a pathway to postsecondary education and careers. SB 1543 directs the CSU, by July 1, 2008, to either adopt model standards for high school CTE courses or recognize CTE courses that meet standards approved by the CSU Board of Trustees. In addition, this bill requests the CSU Board of Trustees, when they adopt model uniform standards for CTE courses, to make those standards publicly available.

SB 1543 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. SB 1543 specifies that these provisions shall not apply to any CTE courses approved as satisfying the admissions requirement for the CSU as of January 1, 2007.

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

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 high school graduation course requirements; and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU recognizes the importance of the A-G curriculum in helping to align high school standards with both college and work expectations; and be it further
3. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU appreciates that the A-G curriculum creates a school culture of high expectations where academic challenges lead to student success; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU acknowledges that the A-G curriculum is an optimal preparation for all paths in life, even that leading to the workforce straight out of high school.

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 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 blue-collar 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.