Present: Julianne Buchsbaum, Jon Giullian (Chair), Becky Schulte, Shannon Royer (ex officio)

Special Charges

1. “Investigate Travel/Professional Development funding possibilities and review policies from other institutions. Make recommendations to LFPA Exec.”

   a. Reports of previous assignments
      i. Shannon sent a request to Library Business Officers Group listserv for travel policies. A few responses were received
      ii. Other committee members sent requests to their respective electronic discussion lists. More responses were received.
      iii. A majority of results were compiled into an Excel spreadsheet

   b. Discussion of results ensued
      i. KU seems underfunded compared to responses received.
      ii. Committee members were opposed to the idea of having a committee review funding requests for the following reasons: 1) potential for conflict--this model was used in the past, and it was viewed as unfair in some cases; 2) inefficient--takes up too much staff time to review requests.
      iii. Committee members affirmed the need for KU Libraries to be competitive for recruitment and retention.
      iv. What kind of policy is preferable? A policy with complicated schedules and limits per category and limits per category; or an open, less restrictive policy?

   c. Principles that should guide KU Libraries’ travel/professional development guidelines. The should:
      i. be fair
      ii. be efficient – not overburden the process
      iii. stimulate more active participation in scholarly communication (cf. this ties into the strategic plan)
      iv. be competitive for recruitment and retention
      v. support mandates for service an research

   d. Preliminary recommendations
      i. Set amount per year (current)
      ii. Registration paid by libraries (current)
      iii. Additional amount for active participation (committee meetings, presentation, officer, etc.). Recommended amounts TBD. (new)
      iv. Apply for additional funds (i.e. administrative funds) through ADs. (current)
      v. Requirement to submit annual travel plan to AD (currently recommended but not required).
e. Is there a need for further data collection? No (unanimous)

f. Action items?
   i. Rank order travel policies received and see where KU stands.
   ii. Explore how the travel policy recommendations support the strategic plan.
   iii. Survey LFPA members about how the reduction in support for professional development has affected LFPA members’ ability to pursue research and service opportunities. Members will submit suggestions to Jon
   iv. Shannon will create and administer the survey once questions are ready.

2. Investigate compression studies and report back to LFPA Exec with a proposed project prospectus for conducting a compression study in FY2013. Elements of the report and plan should include:
   • criteria for gathering information
   • what time of year is best to conduct a compression study
   • pros and cons of conducting a compression study if no funding available for pay increases
   • estimate the financial cost involved in conducting the study
   • other information as needed

a. Reports on previous assignments?
   i. Data collection - Is there a need for further data collection? No. We have compiled a body of literature on salary compression. Articles are stored in Hawk Drive and are available to all library staff.
   ii. Jon Giullian: Hawk Drive vs. Base Camp. We have been using Hawk Drive to store documents. After resolving problems, everyone has access to all documents.
   iii. Becky and Shannon: analysis of ARL data?
      1. Shannon created a small spreadsheet on the Hawk Drive folder for Salary Compression which includes the ARL average salaries by rank (for institutions reporting a 3-level ranking system) and the corresponding KU average salaries by rank (as well as average years of service- YOS)
      2. Shannon also contacted the Budget Office and learned that departments are able to augment promotion increases with their own funds.
      3. Shannon tried to think of a way to come up with some sort of calculation which takes into consideration years of service and rank to determine a ‘fair’ method of calculating a promotion increase, but I didn’t had much luck. If you use the average salary, it means that newly promoted staff would surpass half of the existing staff in the new level, which would only serve to create additional salary compression issues. This question needs to be further explored. It was suggested that Jon get more information about the Arizona model.

b. Recommendations/Action Items
   i. Jon will contact colleagues at Arizona to find out more about their process for calculating salary increases for promotion from one rank to another.
   ii. Given the Libraries Administration’s ongoing efforts to address salary compression issues, LFPA recommends that the SB committee conclude its work on the investigation of salary compression for FY 2011-2012; referring interested parties to the collection of articles on salary compression that are stored on Hawk Drive.