LFPA Committee Final Report

Committee Name: Committee on Salaries and Benefits (SBC)

Committee Chair: Chair duties were shared between Vickie Doll and Jon Giullian


Fiscal Year: 2012-2013

Standing Charges:

3.3.7.1 The Committee on Salaries and Benefits, in consultation with the library administration and the Library Faculty and Professionals Assembly, shall prepare such reports and statistical studies as may be needed to support the library’s budget request for salaries and shall seek ways to educate staff concerning benefit options.

3.3.7.2 The Committee on Salaries and Benefits shall be composed of three members of the Library Faculty and Professionals Assembly appointed by the Executive Committee, and one administrative staff member appointed by the Libraries’ Human Resources Director (ex officio).¹ The appointed members shall serve two-year overlapping terms, and shall select a presiding officer and a recording secretary.

Standing Charges Progress Summary (please include progress and/or accomplishments related to Standing Charges):

3.3.7.1 Given the state of the budget, no action was taken. Faculty and staff were notified by email from HR regarding health benefit options.

3.3.7.2 SBC requested a replacement for the position left vacant following the departure of Julie Buchsbaum in November of 2012. SBC recommends that the wording highlighted above in Standing Charge 3.3.7.2 be changed to reflect current practice.

Special Charges:

1. Complete and distribute the professional development support survey. Review the survey results and use to formulate recommendations to LFPA Exec regarding travel/professional development funding.

¹ Shannon Royer, Director of Fiscal Services is the ex officio member for FY 2012-2013. SBC recommends that the wording highlighted above in Standing Charge 3.3.7.2 be changed to reflect current practice.
2. Work with the ad hoc committee assigned to review the faculty evaluation plan in order to inform the committee on salary-related issues.

**Special Charges Progress Summary (please include progress and/or accomplishments related to Standing Charges):**

1. On January 22, 2013 SBC submitted a draft of the 2013 LFPA Professional Development Survey to LFPA Exec., which approved the survey following minor corrections on January 31, 2013. A link to the survey (in Survey Monkey) was distributed to all library faculty and unclassified professionals. Survey results were compiled and submitted to LFPA Exec, which provide the following response on March 26, 2013:

   “[T]he LFPA Executive Committee has decided that the survey should not be released to the general assembly at this time. The survey instrument you developed will be integrated into a more comprehensive questionnaire that will incorporate the issues and concerns that LFPA members have expressed to LFPA Exec.

On April 12, SBC met with LFPA Exec to discuss the reasons why the result of the survey will not be released to the general assemble at this time. Following this meeting LFPA Exec provided SBC with concerns related to specific questions on the survey. These concerns, accompanied by SBC’s response to those concerns are provided in the Addendum below.

Following the increase in the amount of funds available to library faculty (from $750/$1000 to $1,000/$1350) that was implemented in the fall of 2012, SBC revised data previously collected about travel/professional development funding at other institutions relative to KU Libraries’ funding. In 2013 KU ranks 7th among institutions surveyed. See attached PDF.

2. SBC was not given direction from LFPA Exec in regard to Special Charge 2.

**Progress on Previous Year’s Recommendations (if applicable, please describe any progress or work towards last year’s committee recommendations):**

**Other Activities or Accomplishments:**

**Recommendations:**

1. The committee will need to fill two vacant positions for FY 2013-2014

2. Revise the questionnaire based on the 2013 LFPA Professional Development Survey to address the issues and concerns expressed by LFPA Exec and then distribute to LFPA membership. LFPA Exec recommends creating two separate surveys, one for Library Faculty (Fac) and another for Unclassified Professionals (UPs), in order to account for each group’s specific needs and concerns. Revise the survey instrument. The new SBC should also consider comments from the previous
survey results as they revise the survey instrument. Results of the survey were submitted to LFPA Exec in May 2012.

3. Review results of a revised questionnaire and combine with data about travel/professional development funding from other institutions relative to KU Libraries’ funding. 4. Once all the data is compiled BC should analyze it and make recommendations to LFPA Exec regarding travel/professional development funding policy.

Potential Charges for Future Committees:

See Recommendations above

ADDENDUM

SBC Response to concerns about specific questions on the 2013 LFPA Professional Development Survey that were raised by the LFPA Executive Committee

I. Background on the development process and approval of the survey

SBC resumed work on the survey in October 2012. The committee discussed whether to create one survey or two separate surveys, one for the Library Faculty (Fac) and another for Unclassified Professionals (UPs). We decided to make one survey based on the following:

a) LFPA consists of both Fac and UPs, so it seemed logical to have one survey.
b) Separate surveys might create bias from one group toward another.
c) Library staff development funds belong to the same pot of money—funds are not divided into separate pots Fac and UPs.
d) Whether one survey or two, there will be criticism.

Procedures:

a) The committee designed the survey from October through December of 2012.
b) On Jan. 8, 2013, SBC sent a trial version of the survey to 3 library faculty, 3 UPs, and 1 SBC committee member in order to elicit feedback. We incorporated some of the recommendations before forwarding the survey to the LFPA Executive Committee (LFPA Exec) on Jan. 23, 2013.
c) On Jan. 25, 2013, SBC received three responses from LFPA Exec, all of which supported the survey without changes.
   o “I think the survey looks good. I don’t see anything that I would change.”
   o “I think it will get the desired responses about the way funds are distributed; I don’t see any confusing or awkwardly phrased sentences or anything like that.”
   o “Excellent questionnaire!”
d) On Jan. 31, 2013 the survey was sent to all the Library Faculty and UPs.

II. Post-survey concerns about selected questions raised by LFPA Exec

Q3. *Over the past three years, has the level of funding for professional development been sufficient to support the minimum level of scholarly activities required by your position?*

LFPA Exec concern:
“Not all positions have a requirement for scholarly activity, so such language is confusing or misleading.”

SBC Survey Results and Response
a) 16 -Yes, 14 -No, 3 participants chose not to answer this question, which could be interpreted as Not Applicable. N/A should have been an option on the question.

b) Two comments indicated N/A
- One was N/A.
- The other one indicated “no scholarly activities required in my position”. This was the purpose of the comment box.

c) More than half of the respondents indicated that funding for professional development has been sufficient for the past three years. If positions do not require engagement in scholarly activities, then professional development funds ARE sufficient….

d) The definition of “scholarly activities” is general – not limited to research and service.

e) We would hope everyone agrees that “minimum level of scholarly activities” is strongly encouraged by this library administration. Minimum level of scholarly activities such as and not limited to attending library information/digital scholarship/data collecting lectures, scholarly events, exhibitions; engaging in intellectual discussion; participating in library or professional development or human resources webinars or conferences are encouraged by the library. This includes programs and activities by the LOSDC.

f) “*Over the past three years, has the level of funding for professional development been sufficient to support the minimum level of scholarly activities required or encouraged by your position?*” could have eliminated the confusion.

Q10. *Would additional funds available for presenting papers, poster sessions, committee appointments, committee leadership positions, elected positions, etc.*
provide sufficient incentive to engage more actively in scholarly research or professional service activities?

LFPA Exec concern:
“Again, language specific to research/service requirements. Also, this question seems to be addressing two issues: 1) If you had more professional development funds, what would you do with them, and 2) Do you think people should get additional funds when they are presenting papers or poster sessions or serving committee appointments, committee leadership positions, elected positions, etc.? It would be hard to know what the respondents’ intended to say with their answer.”

SBC Survey Results and Response:
a) The intent of this question was to find out whether additional funds would provide sufficient incentive to increase engagement.
   • 14 Would attend one or more additional conferences, etc.
   • 10 Would use to reduce out-of-pocket expenses
   • 14 Would not change my level of engagement in scholarly activity
b) The last choice “Would not change my level of engagement in scholarly activity” is suitable for those who are not required to engage in research or service.
c) Note that the survey did not use “research/service requirement” in the wording. Instead, the survey used “scholarly activity” in order to include a broader range of staff development activities.

Q11. What amount of additional professional development funds would be desirable for each of the following activities?

LFPA Exec concern:
“Membership are obviously going to answer “the more the better”, i.e. the highest available category. Question 7, regarding how much people spend above and beyond the funds provided, would have given a more realistic idea of how much people spend.”

SBC Survey Results and Response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>$100</th>
<th>$200</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation / Poster session</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee membership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee leadership position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) SBC did not presume that members would want “the more the better”. The question was designed to find out what members think of levels of engagement in scholarly activity IF additional funds were available and how much would be “desirable”. Although most prefer a higher amount, there are still differences in answers. Those who responded “Other” suggested alternatives in their comments. Members are realistic and sincere in answering the survey in hope that the answers will help future decision making process.

b) 21 respondents answered this question. Based on the results, it showed more prefer additional funds for Presentation/Poster session than Committee Service.

c) 12 did not answer the question. The questionnaires were designed not to have each question mandatory.

Q12. Should professional development allocations be the same amount for library faculty and for unclassified professionals? (NOTE: Research and Service are mandated requirements for library faculty positions; Research and Service are not mandated requirements for Unclassified Professional positions.)

    LFPA Exec concern:
    This question sounds especially biased; the note implies UPs are not *required* to do professional development and therefore have no need for the funds.

    SBC Survey Results and Response:
    a) LFPA Exec has misinterpreted this question. The question has no hidden meaning. The question is worded neutrally and only presents the facts. There are differences in responsibilities. One may feel biased about the differences, but that does not make the question biased. Not to mention the fact of these differences would be to withhold information, and that would represent a bias.
    b) 14 - Same, 17 - Different. There were 20 comments for this question and only one commented that the note in the question “sounds like you’re trying to influence the response”. This is a survey. We cannot control for a respondent’s perception or judgment.
    c) By the same token, question #13 asked, “Should professional development allocation for tenured and tenure-track faculty be the SAME amount?” (15-Same, 6 - Different, 11 -No opinion, 12 comments).
    d) Survey questions #12 and #13 collect opinions toward current level of funding between different classifications.

III. Response rate
Potential respondents to the survey include 45 Library Faculty (Lib Fac) and 33 Unclassified Professionals (UPs).* The number of respondents is indicated below.

Overall response rate was 42% including Library Fac 67% and UPs 33%. Statistically, this is a good response rate.

Q15. I am a/an:
   4 Untenured and non-tenure track librarians
   18 Tenured librarians
   5 Unclassified Professional (7-14 years in service)
   3 Unclassified Professional (0-6 years in service)
   3 Unclassified Professional (more than 15 years in service)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Returns</th>
<th>Return rate within each classification</th>
<th>Overall return rate by classification</th>
<th>Percent of all respondents by classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untenured and non-tenure track Librn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Librn</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.40%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During Fiscal Years 2010-2012, on average each year, 25.5% or 12 of the Lib Fac and 48.5% or 16 of UPs did not use any professional development funds. In survey Question One, 5 respondents indicated that they had never used the funds in the past three years. The rate of those who had never used the funds in the past three years who responded the survey was 17.86%. This indicates that those who used funds might be the majority of those who responded.

**SBC Final Report Prepared By:** Jon Giullian and Vickie Doll with input from Shannon Royer.

---

* The survey was sent via email to 51 Library Faculty (Lib Fac) and 36 Unclassified Professionals (UPs). The number of potential respondents excludes both Lib Fac and UPs who have discretionary travel funds (including 5 Lib Fac administrators and 3 UPs) as well as one member of SBC (Vickie Doll).