TO: State College Presidents  
State College Librarians

From: C. Mansel Keene  
Assistant Chancellor  
Faculty and Staff Affairs

Subject: Status of Librarians

In the last several months considerable concern has been expressed by many librarians and others about the status of librarians. In addition, a professional society of librarians has indicated its intent to impose sanctions on the California State Colleges if certain benefits and privileges are not granted. Recently, FSA 69-30 (attached) was issued to detail the history of the attempts of the Board of Trustees to obtain sabbatical leaves for librarians. Of greater importance are the events relating to the overall status of librarians in the California State Colleges. The statement which follows provides an account of these events.

One of the first major projects of Faculty and Staff Affairs, after the adoption of the new personnel rules by the Board of Trustees in January 1962, was a special study of librarians in the California State Colleges. Nine campuses were visited in the course of this study and 60 library employees (56 professional and 4 clerks) were interviewed as well as 11 deans and presidents. A comprehensive review was also made of information on librarian salaries, compensation plans, status, etc., in other academic institutions as well as in public libraries, industry and government.

The findings and recommendations resulting from this study were discussed with representatives of the State Personnel Board (which had previously had classification and salary setting authority for these positions), the University of California and the State Department of Finance.

At the July 1962 meeting of the Board of Trustees the recommendations were put into effect. Salary ranges were increased from 2½% to 22%, depending in large measure on outside rates and internal alignment.
In order to make maximum use of the some $136,000 provided for the readjustment of librarians' salaries, particularly at the higher levels where the salary lag was greatest, emphasis was placed on the changes in salary ranges rather than on the immediate increase in salaries. Thus, the salary range for College Librarians was increased by 22\%\%\%, while the salary of each of the College Librarians was increased by at least 2\%\%, as all were placed at the first step of the new range, despite their previous salary step.

This means of making maximum use of the extra funds available for 1962-63 and allowing for further step increases in ensuing years convinced some that librarians had been given more than their "due." Some college administrators even expressed the opinion that the librarians had been accorded special treatment in contrast with other campus personnel.

The immediate response of some librarians to the results of the librarian study was rather favorable. A College Librarian wrote in July 1962, "The action of the Board of Trustees in adopting the resolution pertaining to librarians . . . is most gratifying. We felt our services would be more adequately recognized under our new governance, and this recognition has now taken place in a forthright and effective manner. We are most indebted to the energy and friendly interest . . . shown." Twenty-two librarians in a letter dated August 1, 1962: "express(ed) (their) appreciation for . . . (the) realistic approach to long standing problems in library position classification and salary rates." They went on to state: ". . . This is probably the most important step in the improvement of library personnel morale in the last twenty years. We . . . are very happy to express our satisfaction with this very important step in the improvement of the State College Libraries . . ."
to be promoted to specialist or supervisory jobs at the next higher level (Librarian III). Possession of two masters' degrees automatically qualified an individual for the Librarian II level.

3. More flexibility at the Librarian III level to permit especially capable individuals to be promoted to this level on the basis of performance of difficult and specialized non-supervisory work in addition to the prior exclusive use of the level for supervisory positions.

4. Greater recognition of the worth of full supervisory and management responsibilities by making the Librarian IV level more readily available for use, and by the addition of a new level of Librarian V to be responsive to the management of the libraries as they increased in size and scope.

5. The establishment of two new classes of sub-professional positions (Library Assistant I and II) for clerical employees, specialists in particular subject areas without graduate work in library science, library interns, etc. With the availability of these two classes, promising clerical employees were provided career progression opportunities where they could assume as much non-professional work as possible. This also allowed professional librarians more time for professional work and, hence, more opportunities to progress to higher level librarian positions.

Lead time required to incorporate such changes into the college budgets coupled with rather strict position controls in Sacramento prevented the early realization of all of the potential advantages which could have resulted from the librarian study recommendations. However, in the ensuing years there has been a relaxation of the position controls and a consequent overall upgrading of librarian positions. Continuing shortages of available funds for reclassification purposes still pose problems.

The agenda item on which the Board of Trustees' July 1962 action was taken contained the following paragraph:

With the use of the academic salary rates and the identification of librarian positions in the "closely related" academic area, it is contemplated that at
such time as salaries for academic class and rank positions come up for review, a review will also be made of salaries of positions in the "closely related" category to determine if all or part of the positions in that group warrant salary adjustment.

Actually, the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Trustees have followed a consistent practice of seeking the same percentage salary increase for librarians as for the faculty. Numerous special memora-
randa have been developed over the past seven years for the Director of Finance or members of his staff, the Legislative Analyst, and for the use of the Trustees' Director of Governmental Affairs in Sacra-
mento in order to justify the use of the new structure and to attempt to achieve the same salary increases and fringe benefits for librarians as for the teaching faculty. An example of the consistent types of problems which have prompted the use of an inordinate amount of staff time to protect the relationship established between librarian and faculty salaries are the following excerpts from an August 19, 1963 memorandum from the Director of Governmental Affairs after a conference with a representative of the Department of Finance:

"He confirmed the fact that there are no funds for the class of librarian.

"He stated that this decision was based upon the fact that the report prepared by the State Personnel Department (sic) did not reflect substantiating data in support of such an increase for State librarians.

    ***

"He did not want to commit Finance with respect to what would happen if the Trustees included in their certifi-
cation to Finance, funds for librarian classes . . . ."

This type of problem has probably helped to intensify the efforts of some librarians in the California State Colleges to merge the librarians with the instructional faculty; such efforts are based on the assumption that the librarians could not be singled out for differential treatment if they were merged with instructional faculty for salary and benefits purposes. For example, a proposal was made in November 1965 by a state college librarian to change Section 42700 (1) of Title 5 of the Administrative Code to place "all librarians, laboratory school teachers, and a few others [In the category of those employed and compensated as class and rank]. This would in-
volve a shift of about 450 persons . . . from a small miscellaneous exposed category into a large, amorphous, and protected group. The
advantages to the 450 persons is that their personnel rights and benefits are related to the larger group and, therefore, are not so easily singled out for discrimination. In bringing this group under the standards and qualifications for retention, promotion, and tenure, the larger group gains control of the quality of the personnel and services provided by the small group of closely related employees." However, this did not prove to be an effective means of achieving "protective coloration."

For example, the experience is set forth in FSA 69-30 on sabbaticals, indicating such leaves were restricted beginning in 1966-67 to "those persons occupying a class and rank position . . . [who have] taught at least one quarter time on the average for each year of eligibility considered for the granting of a sabbatical leave."

In addition, there has been a consistent attempt for some time, endorsed last year by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, to establish one salary increase fund so as to provide maximum flexibility to the Board of Trustees in granting salary increases. The February 14, 1969 letter to the Director of Finance from the Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs, stated in part:

"Pursuant to the resolution approved by Board of Trustees and recommended by the CCHE, we request that a single salary budget increase appropriation be made to the California State Colleges. This will permit some flexibility in the actual allocation of funds."

Yet the Governor's Budget contained specific separate dollar limits for instructional faculty and for librarians as well as a third amount for non-instructional classes.

In spite of continuing difficulties, the same percentage salary increase for librarians was achieved and granted by the Trustees as that for the faculty from 1962-63 through 1967-68. However, for 1968-69 only 5.85% was obtained for librarians despite great efforts to obtain a salary increase equal to that granted the faculty--7.5%.

There was acknowledgement of the extent of the effort made at the Coordinating Council meeting on December 2 and 3, 1968, when a librarian observer who was present wrote a report to "Campus Representatives, College Librarians, CLA Officers." It contains the following summary statement as well as much greater detail as to what took place during the meeting: "Although the salary package is unsatisfactory, we can take some comfort in two things: (1) the principle of parity seems to be accepted by CCHE, and (2) the Chancellor and his staff, especially Milton Dobkin, did wage a vigorous campaign in our behalf."
Despite these difficulties in trying to maintain even the established salary relationship between librarians and teaching faculty, many of the librarians continue to press for faculty status, salaries, and a nine-month work year. Even in these efforts there appear to be inconsistencies in the positions taken by the librarians in their consideration of some of the internal factors. For example, early in 1967 in a very forward looking article in a national publication it is stated that "the consequences of giving librarians the same academic benefits for the same academic work, equivalent academic qualifications, and equal academic obligations . . . upon the budget would not be great, but an increase in salaries to those managerial librarians who would be on twelve-month contracts would be necessary. The increased output of creative and well-qualified librarians would offset the increased cost." Yet by the fall of 1968 the author joined with three of his colleagues to observe: "The number of librarian positions should be augmented by 2/11 of the total number of positions that are shifted to the academic year schedule to provide the same level of service now available."

A new factor came into the picture when on May 22, 1967 the Assembly Ways and Means Committee adopted the following:

"The Coordinating Council for Higher Education is requested to include as part of its annual study of faculty salaries and welfare benefits in the University of California and California State Colleges, made pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 of the 1965 Regular Session of the Legislature, similar information and recommendations concerning salaries and welfare benefits for all academic administrators, other administrative and related classes, and all other academic-related classes which are not otherwise included under the designation of 'faculty'."

As an outgrowth of this directive, the staff of the Coordinating Council proposed that librarian salaries be funded at .77 of faculty salaries since this was the median of the relationships in the 18 comparison institutions. In contrast, the average of the relationship in the State Colleges at that time was .81. The CCHE staff further recommended that librarians not be included in surveys of instructional faculty for salary and benefits purposes.¹ As noted

¹Again, the CCHE staff has recently recommended the use of AAUP statistics for purposes of calculating needed increases in faculty salaries. By definition these statistics do not include librarians: "... administrative officers, librarians, athletic coaches, teachers in laboratory schools, etc., whose functions are not primarily academic instruction, should not be included in the tabulated numbers or compensations even if they hold a title of academic rank. . . ."
above, the Council in its action favored the same increase for librarians as faculty which would not have been the case had the staff recommendation been accepted. However, the actual salary appropriations allowed for only a 5.85% increase for librarians vs. 7.5% for faculty.

One of the fundamental difficulties has been the relatively better salaries paid to State College librarians than those paid librarians in the 18 comparison institutions.

As the attached chart demonstrates, the average salary paid State College librarians in 1968-69 was $10,115, while that in the comparison institutions was $9,857, yet the average salary for State College faculty--$12,814--showed a lag behind the $13,027 average in the comparison institutions. (As will be discussed below, those comparison institutions which consider librarians academic are indicated with an "A" on the attached chart. This comparison does not reveal a parallel salary status to that of the faculty in the same institutions.)

In January 1968 a member of the Coordinating Council staff wrote, in reply to some questions raised by an individual about the CCHE librarian salary survey, in part as follows:

"When one considered the prestige of the various institutions, the research activities, the size of libraries, the number of doctorates granted, their ranking in salary surveys, etc., I believe these eighteen institutions comprise an outstanding group of institutions of higher education.

* * * *

"It may be important for you to know that the average salary paid professional librarians by the State College group of comparison institutions is higher than that paid by the University of California and by the University's comparison institutions: Cornell, Harvard, Illinois, Michigan, Stanford, SUNY-Buffalo, Wisconsin and Yale."

The average salaries paid for each level of librarian in the University of California and the State Colleges were as follows in the fall of 1968-69:
Average salaries and salaries by level of librarian are a function of the distribution of individuals by their salary levels. As can be noted from the following table there has been a gradual shift upward in the distribution by levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>U.C.</th>
<th>State Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$14,168</td>
<td>$14,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>12,313</td>
<td>12,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>10,635</td>
<td>11,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>8,830</td>
<td>9,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>7,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$9,864</td>
<td>$10,115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting occurrence, presumably related to the changing distribution of the levels of professional librarians and apparently in line with the management changes that have been made in the libraries is the use of library assistants. As of September 1968, the state colleges employed library assistants as follows:

| Library Assistant I | 80   | $6,490 |
| Library Assistant II| 68   | 7,616  |
| I and II combined   | 148  | $7,007 |

To the extent that these sub-professional positions are used effectively, it will provide opportunity for better use of the professional positions and further shifts upward in the distribution of levels of professional librarians.

As mentioned above, the distribution of professional librarians at the higher levels has been more conservative than is justified by
the work to be done in the libraries. This results from the rather stringent controls placed on reclassification in the period following the implementation of the 1962 study, coupled with inadequate reclassification funds and some reluctance on the part of some colleges to use the higher levels. As an example, the 1962 study opened the Librarian III level for use for non-supervisory positions. More recently non-supervisory Librarian IV positions, although potentially rarer, have been established. Thus, in effect, despite the presence of the requirement for supervision in a major portion of Librarian IV positions and in some Librarian III positions, a librarian under the current system has a four-level range based on his professional competence. This provision is not unlike what the librarians desire although it does not accord faculty pay levels nor nine-month assignments, neither of which have common acceptance in prevailing practices in comparative institutions.

As the study of Madan, Hetler, and Strong reported in 1968 indicates:

"It is unfortunate, but nonetheless true, that the conditions of librarians have not changed significantly over the past decade. Even though 63.4 per cent of librarians polled reported that they had (faculty) status, findings indicate that they did not. The yardstick by which the committee measured the librarians' faculty status might be considered by some to be too rigid."

Twenty-four of 26 institutions, which the Madan, Hetler and Strong study finds grant full-faculty status to librarians, are identified. Faculty salaries in all but one of these institutions according to figures in the AAUP salary report are on the average less than those paid faculty in the California State Colleges. This probably means, judging from experience with the 18 State College comparison institutions, that their librarians have salaries which not only average less than their own faculty salaries but also less than librarian salaries in the California State Colleges.

In 1967, the Academic Senate, California State Colleges, responded to many appearances of the librarians before the Senate's Faculty Affairs Committee, by passing a resolution which urged the establishment of librarian classifications equivalent to faculty classifications for pay purposes but without ascription of rank and class. The resolution also indicated that the standards for recruitment and promotion be equivalent to those applied to professors, that leave and other benefits be equivalent to those granted to faculty and that librarians be appointed on an academic year basis.
Following this resolution a Librarian Personnel Committee was established with representatives of the Academic Senate, College Librarians, professional librarians, Academic Vice Presidents and staff of the Chancellor's Office. The first meeting was intended to be an exploratory session. Representatives of the State College Division of the California Library Association offered a proposal which stated their demands and a salary conversion plan. This plan, which was primarily a pay conversion plan, did not address some fundamental problems which underlie any proposal for changes in status of librarians.

There has been a long delay until a second meeting could be scheduled, due in large part because of the efforts required to prevent a loss in the existing salary relationship between librarians and teaching faculty, to reestablish sabbatical leave entitlement for librarians, and to ensure the including of librarians in the academic salary group.

Solution of these problems is requisite to any further change in the personnel and compensation plan for librarians. For example, faculty status will not mean equivalency with 12-month faculty salaries, or academic year appointments (such equivalency, incidentally, is not customary in the 18 comparison institutions nor in the University of California and its comparison institutions), unless there is agreement by the Coordinating Council, Department of Finance and the Legislature.

Finally, rules in Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, and reaffirmed by a special Trustee resolution, provide that professional librarians are in the academic category, as academic-related employees, and thereby are entitled to all the rights and benefits of academic employees. This means that librarians have the same tenure provisions as teaching faculty and receive the same sick leave and retirement benefits as teaching faculty. Provisions for vacations for librarians are the same as those for 12-month faculty and academic administrators. Under these provisions the librarians receive 21 days vacation a year, plus all the legal holidays observed by the state. Librarians are entitled to sabbatical leaves insofar as the Trustees are concerned. Also, as granted by local faculties, librarians are represented on faculty senates and councils, and librarians are represented on the Statewide Academic Senate.

While we are still attempting to improve the salary and status of librarians, this is not an easy task since the data from comparison institutions do not support what we see as our salary needs, equal relationships with faculty salaries, or the requests of the librarians.
It should be clearly understood that we recognize that nationally the salaries for qualified academic librarians, as a group, are not competitive with salaries of other professions demanding similar qualifications. We also recognize the competitive impact of better salaries and working conditions offered to librarians by some community colleges in California. It is, however, most difficult to persuade those who provide fiscal resources that the California State Colleges should lead the major universities of the nation in the improvement of the status of professional librarians. However, efforts will continue to be made to achieve our mutual goal of providing a means to attract and retain highly qualified librarians, and to provide state college librarians with opportunity for professional and academic development.

CMK:km
Attachments

cc: Vice Presidents and/or Deans of Academic Affairs
Vice Presidents and/or Deans of Administration
College Business Managers
College Personnel Officers
Chancellor's Staff

COMPARISON BETWEEN CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES AND 18 OTHER INSTITUTIONS

|       | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | Comp. Inst. Avg. | CSC Avg. |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------------|----------|
| Professor (9 mo.) | 16,000 | 15,800 | 17,300 | 17,400 | 17,500 | 17,600 | 17,300 | 17,400 | 17,500 | 17,600 | 17,300 | 17,400 | 17,500 | 17,600 | 17,300 | 17,400 | 17,500 | 20,300 | 18,200 | 19,100 | 18,000 | 18,900 | 19,800 | 20,700 | 21,600 | 17,700 | 17,000 |
| Faculty (9 mo.)    | 11,900 | 12,100 | 12,300 | 12,500 | 12,700 | 12,900 | 13,100 | 13,300 | 13,500 | 13,700 | 13,900 | 14,100 | 14,300 | 14,500 | 14,700 | 14,900 | 15,100 | 15,300 | 15,500 | 15,700 | 15,900 | 16,100 | 16,300 | 16,500 | 16,700 | 17,100 | 17,400 | 17,700 | 18,000 |
| Librarian (12 mo.) | 9,500  | 9,500  | 10,000 | 10,500 | 11,000 | 11,500 | 12,000 | 12,500 | 13,000 | 13,500 | 14,000 | 14,500 | 15,000 | 15,500 | 16,000 | 16,500 | 17,000 | 17,500 | 18,000 | 18,500 | 19,000 | 19,500 | 20,000 | 20,500 | 21,000 | 21,500 | 22,000 | 22,500 | 23,000 |
THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90036

April 1, 1969

FSA 69-30

To: State College Presidents
    State College Librarians

From: C. Hazel Keene
    Assistant Chancellor
    Faculty and Staff Affairs

Subject: Sabbatical Leaves (Librarians)

Recently enough questions have been raised concerning the eligibility of librarians for sabbatical leaves that it may be useful to detail the history of this subject.

When the personnel rules were adopted by the Board of Trustees in January 1962, among the important policy changes made were the following: (1) librarians were designated as academic employees (in the closely related category)--this was reaffirmed by action of the Board of Trustees on December 7, 1962; (2) librarians (as well as executive and academic administrative personnel) were designated as eligible for sabbatical leaves; and (3) the limitation of those able to take sabbatical leave in any of the eligible categories in any one year was set at 5% of those in each category--Assistant Professors and above in the faculty category. (Previously, only 5% of those faculty members with sufficient service to take sabbaticals could take them in any one year--this meant that an individual faculty member with six years qualifying service might have to wait 20 additional years to take a sabbatical--only 84 or 1.9% of the regular full-time faculty were able to take them in 1961-62. Also, previously, those taking difference in pay leaves were paid the difference between each individual's salary and that of his replacement--under the new rules the amount of difference in pay was set as the difference between the individual's salary and that of a "hypothetical" replacement at the first step of the salary range for Instructor.)
All of these changes plus an increase in the funds appropriated for the purpose resulted in an immediate increase in those taking sabbatical leaves—131 or 2.7% of the full-time regular faculty (although some librarians and academic-administrators were included in those taking leaves both in 1962-63 and 1963-64).

Unfortunately, because of the desire to hold the total support budget to $105 million in 1963-64 only the same number of sabbatical leaves, 131, were available in 1963-64 or 2.5% of the regular full-time faculty. We were unable to get an augmentation increase included in the budget submitted to the Governor. (A memorandum dated August 3, 1962 from the then Chief of Budget Planning in the Chancellor's Office to the then Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs includes the following:

"Mansel Keene said that [increased] funds for this purpose [sabbatical leaves] should be included in the budget. Six colleges asked for $276,483 to implement this law change. If all colleges asked for funds, we would have an [augmentation] item totaling $500,000. In our earlier discussions . . . we did not see how this could be included in a high-priority category, so it is not programmed in the $105,000,000 budget.

However, $200,000 in program augmentation for sabbatical leaves was included in the Governor's budget for 1964-65. The following comments concerning the changes in the personnel rules which became effective in July, 1962, were included in the Governor's Budget, 1964-65:

"The new rules essentially provide for two changes, (1) the base upon which the eligible group is determined has been expanded to the total number of faculty at any given college, and (2) the group eligible for the sabbatical leave program has been expanded to include executive, administrative and librarian classes.

"This budget provides for the first of the two changes adopted by the Trustees of the California State Colleges, that of expanding the sabbatical leave program for the faculty. There are now approximately 6,000 faculty members in the college system, 5 percent of this total, or 300 individuals, would be entitled to participate in the new sabbatical leave program next year if they have sufficient tenure.

"The funds provided in this budget will allow implementation of approximately 50 percent of the program expansion for the teaching faculty."
The Legislative Analyst in commenting on the sabbatical leave augmentation item for 1964-65 supported it, but in his comments which covered more than one page of his report (pages 275-276) are the following observations:

"The total amount requested for 1964-65, including both augmentation and workload funds, will provide for about 50 percent of the estimated maximum cost of the new program. We believe that the amount requested for faculty is fully justified. The granting of sabbatical leaves to faculty members for every seventh year of service is well established for public, as well as private, colleges and universities across the country.

* * *

"We do not believe, however, that it is either necessary or appropriate at this time to extend sabbatical leave privileges to librarians and administrative personnel. If this were to be done, it would be difficult to justify not extending similar privileges to librarians and administrative personnel throughout the state service. We do not find any particular significance, in this respect, in the fact that such persons are employed in the state college system rather than some other state agency.

"We therefore recommend that this item be approved in the amount requested with the condition that sabbatical leave privileges be limited to teaching faculty only."

Efforts were made during the legislative session to get the limitation on those who could take leaves removed—these were not successful. (The funds appropriated allowed 193 or 3.3% of the regular full-time faculty to take sabbatical leaves in 1964-65.)

Sabbatical leave funds for 1965-66 were increased to allow 247 or 3.9% of the regular full-time faculty to take them that year. However, the restriction on who could take them remained in effect despite efforts to have the restrictions removed.

When the budget for 1966-67 was under consideration a further step was taken during the budget review process in Sacramento to restrict those who could take sabbatical leaves. While up
to that time sabbatical leaves could be taken by any class and rank personnel with sufficient qualifying service and to the extent funds were available. However, in May 1966 the then Assistant Chief Budget Analyst of the Department of Finance wrote the Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs to confirm the program which the Vice Chancellor had been able to achieve:

"This will confirm our agreement of May 3, 1966, regarding the definition of teaching faculty, which we reached in relation to the 1967-68 fiscal year and thereafter. It was my understanding that we agreed to define those persons who would be eligible for sabbatical leaves, under the teaching faculty definition, as those persons occupying a class and rank position where the person being considered had taught at least one quarter time on the average for each year of eligibility considered for the granting of a sabbatical leave."

On May 13, 1966, this further restriction in those eligible for sabbaticals was communicated to the Presidents in FSA 66-25. We advised the Presidents in this communication that leaves already approved for 1966-67 for non-teaching personnel in class and rank position who did not meet the new criteria could be taken.

The Legislative Analyst in his comments on the 1966-67 budget recommended a reduction of $21,183 in the augmentation funds because of the 5% limitation in Title 5. (This limitation was removed in the July 1966 revision of Title 5.) He also reiterated the fact that:

"Further limitation has been established by the Legislature in recent Budget Acts to the effect that funds will be provided only for sabbaticals for full-time teaching faculty."

The Governor's Budget for 1967-68 states in connection with an augmentation of $106,800 for sabbatical leaves:

"The augmentation is distributed in accordance with the number of eligible faculty at each college adjusted by the number of leaves which is printed in the 1966-67 Governor's Budget."
The Legislative Analyst comments negatively in his review of the 1968-69 budget about the change to two-thirds pay for a year's leave (made in July 1966) to accommodate more readily to the change to quarter system year-round operations:

"We believe that the state colleges have reversed their priorities in this policy area by granting additional compensation before increasing the total number of leaves. It is noted that there is currently a backlog of 2,575 faculty members eligible for leaves and that the budget provides for only 166.5 full-year leaves at a cost of $1,574,055 . . . . Our conclusion is that the $237,232 requested should not be allowed for the purpose of increasing faculty leave compensation but that consideration should be given to the possibility of appropriating the funds for an increase in the total number of leaves at the existing budgetary levels."

The Board of Trustees requested a program augmentation of $964,211 for additional sabbatical leaves for 1969-70. This was reduced to $197,110 in the Governor's Budget.

The Legislative Analyst in his report recommends the deletion of this amount in an apparent reversal of his position of the previous year, see above, where concern was expressed about the backlog of eligibles. The "limitation . . . established by the Legislature in prior Budget Acts to the effect that funds will be provided only for sabbaticals for full-time teaching faculty" was again included in his comments.

As a continuation of our efforts, we are currently requesting the Legislature in our sub-committee hearings to place language in the budget act which would include librarians in the sabbatical leave program.
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