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Memorandum

To: Reg Gooden, Chair
Academic Senate

From: Lloyd H. Lamouria

Subject: Substitute Pay

Date: 3 December 1984
File No.: 
Copies: Harvey Greenwald

On 30 November 1984, the Budget Committee of the Academic Senate unanimously approved for forwarding to the Senate the attached two items:


Your Committee requests that this item of Pay for Substitute Teachers be approved by the Senate Executive Committee for inclusion on the next Senate agenda.
Memorandum

To: Ann Reynolds, Chancellor

From: Academic Senate
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Subject: Substitute Pay

The Budget Committee of the Academic Senate at California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo has completed a survey of the impact of insufficient funding for substitute pay on the cancellation of classes. Due to illness, injury, or professional meetings, a faculty member may be unable to meet his/her class obligations. Because it is not always possible to obtain volunteers to cover classes, a number of classes have been cancelled. The survey indicated that the availability of sufficient money allocated for substitute pay would have had an impact on the reduction of cancelled classes. Furthermore, the Unit Three Contract Agreement in Article 20.19 calls for the compensation of faculty who cover the classes of colleagues.

Clearly, the goal of the California State University is to provide quality education. The failure to provide adequate funding for substitute pay jeopardizes this goal. The Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo requests that funding be budgeted for the purpose of hiring substitute faculty and for compensating faculty who cover the classes of colleagues.
RESOLUTION ON SUBSTITUTE PAY

Whereas, There are a number of classes which are cancelled each year, and

Whereas, Sufficient money allocated for substitute pay would have an impact on the reduction of cancelled classes, and

Whereas, The Unit Three Contract Agreement calls for the payment of substitute faculty in Article 20.19, therefore be it

Resolved: That the following memorandum be sent to the Chancellor:
Reg Gooden, Chair, Academic Senate
Members, Academic Senate Executive Committee

Sam Lutrin

From: Sam Lutrin

Subject: Request that specific steps be taken to ensure that members of Professional Consultative Services are not omitted from Academic Senate-generated documents

As per your request, I am writing to clarify a concern I have raised about several documents which have come before the Academic Senate Executive Committee this fall.

Before going into specifics, I think it will be helpful to review some basic "givens:"

1. For at least 10 years, membership in the Academic Senate has included selected Librarians and Student Affairs Officers. At one point in time, the Senate Chair was a student affairs officer.

2. In Fall of 1981, the faculty adopted the document entitled, "Constitution of the Faculty" which included among those holding a "voting membership of the General Faculty..." "personnel in Professional Consultative Services."

3. By-laws of the Academic Senate dated 3-30-84, Section B. Definitions, defines Full-time Academic Employees as follows, "Faculty members holding rank...personnel in professional consultative services and...shall be considered full-time academic employees...."

In summary, both in "theory" as outlined in key documents AND in practise, student affairs officers and librarians have been accorded the right to be represented in and by the Academic Senate as well as the right to represent faculty on University-wide committees when they have been deemed to be best qualified.

When documents are brought before the Senate which exclude (usually through oversight) either of these two constituents, they violate both the spirit and the letter of the "law voted into effect by the faculty. Examples of documents which I believe do this include the "Resolution on the Timetable for Retention, Tenure and Promotion," the "Resolution of Professional Growth and Development (including the document, "Role and Definition of Professional Growth and Development)," and the "Leave with Pay Guidelines" as proposed earlier by the Senate's Constitution and By-laws Committee.

I believe that it is the responsibility of both the Executive Committee and PCS representatives at all levels to ensure that this does not occur. In line with this, I am sending a copy of this memo to all PCS reps and I ask that the Executive Committee direct the Senate office to send copies to each committee chair.