At its meeting of March 19, 2007, the Academic Senate passed the following Sense of the Senate Resolution presented by Senator Peter for the University Library Board.

Sense of the Senate Resolution
Library Resources to support the independent Ed.D.

Resolved, That SJSU should not implement an independent doctoral program until the terms of policy S03-1 have been met: “that all requests for new programs and permanent courses will be required to include an analysis of library resource needs which has been collaboratively prepared by the requesting department faculty and the library faculty”; be it further

Resolved, That a portion of the authorized Ed.D. fee revenue, as per Executive Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard’s February 12, 2007 memo, be used to augment funding for the additional library resources that the Ed.D. will require; be it further

Resolved, That the Dean of the University Library and other appropriate librarians be included in the planning process for the independent Ed.D. program; be it further

Resolved, That SJSU should respect the intent of Senate Bill 724, which states that the Ed.D. should be implemented “without diminishing the quality of program support offered to...undergraduate programs,” to which we would add existing graduate programs as well.

Rationale: San Jose State University is scheduled to implement an Ed.D. program in 2009, and the creation of this program will have significant resource implications for the Library. The Library is already under substantial financial strain to support our existing degree programs, and the University Library Board and the Academic Senate wish to make it clear that the Library cannot adequately support a new doctoral program without significant new resources. While the system has indicated it will make some resources available centrally, these will not be sufficient.

SJSU has operated a joint Ed.D. in conjunction with the University of California. Prior to 2005 the California Master Plan for Higher Education prohibited the CSU from granting doctoral degrees, but this restriction was lifted for the Ed.D. when the Governor signed Senate Bill 724, signed on September 22, 2005. The CSU subsequently decided to withdraw from the joint doctoral programs and create its own.
The system’s decision to “go it alone” has raised troubling questions regarding resources, since the Legislature appropriated no new funds to support stand-alone doctoral programs. These concerns have previously been expressed by the CSU Council of Library Directors in an August 31, 2006 memo (attached) as well as in a unanimously adopted resolution of the ASCSU on November 9 2006 (attached)

In response to AS-2773-06, Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard responded for the CSU: “We certainly agree that Ed.D. programs in the CSU need support, and that such needed support must not come at the expense of existing programs. It is clear from campus Ed.D. implementation plans that they plan to use the authorized Ed.D. fee revenue to augment the funding for these programs, including for both direct instruction and resources and services specific to those programs.” The Library Board and the Academic Senate wish to make clear that the provision of library resources for the Ed.D. must be fully funded from the Ed.D. fee revenues and any available system support—or else the Ed.D. will in fact come at the expense of existing programs.

Workload Impact: Passage of this resolution will not by itself produce an appreciable workload impact. However, the degree of consultation and collaboration called for between the College of Education and the University Library will of course demand substantial workload.

Fiscal Impact: Passage of this resolution will not by itself produce any significant fiscal impact. However, adherence to the principles contained herein would mean utilizing a new source of revenues (Ed.D. fee revenue) in part to supplement the Library budget. Whether this would be sufficient or not has not to our knowledge been studied.

Approved: March 12, 2007

Present: Chung, Peter, Veregge, Harris, Ford, Bakke, Paul, Fleming, Feind, Walton, McGriff

Vote: 11-0-0