

OFFICE FOR LIBRARY PERSONNEL RESOURCES
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

50 EAST HURON STREET · CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 · (312) 944 6780



54.4
34.3
EXHIBIT 18

(5 pp)

me eta
106.12

see also
54.10

November 1978

TO: ALA Council
FROM: Margaret Myers, Director *MM*
RE: Comparable Rewards

In July 1974, the ALA Council directed the Office for Library Personnel Resources to develop guidelines "Whereby persons in both administrative and service positions may receive comparable rewards resulting from an accurate, non-discriminatory valuation of these two major categories of employment with the library field." (Item no. 106.12 - "Valuation of Positions" in ALA Position Statements and Policies and Procedures.)

After various drafts and efforts, the attached statement on "Comparable Rewards: The Case for Equal Compensation for Non-Administrative Expertise" was developed for the OLPR Advisory Committee by David C. Weber and Tina Kass. These guidelines were adopted by the Advisory Committee in June 1977. This advisory document is attached for your information. It is based on a review of the literature and a questionnaire plus discussion and refinement by the authors and others. We feel that this is the best type of guideline that is logical at this point in time given the present state-of-the-art.

At the 1978 Annual Conference, the OLPR Advisory Committee discussed a possible policy statement drawn from the article by Weber and Kass which could be presented to Council for its consideration and adoption. The following item was included as a draft statement in item no. 54.3 in the ALA Policy Manual (ALA Handbook of Organization 1978-1979, p. 117). As pointed out in the Handbook, the principle was adopted in 1974 at the time the "valuation of positions" resolution was passed, but the specific wording below has not yet been adopted by Council. Therefore, it is presented at this time for your consideration as a public policy statement.

Comparable Rewards

The American Library Association supports salary administration which gives reasonable and comparable recognition to positions having administrative, technical, subject and linguistic requirements. It is recognized that all such specialist competencies can be intellectually vigorous and meet demanding professional operational needs. In administering such a policy, it can be a useful guide that, in major libraries, as many non-administrative specialities be assigned to the top classifications as are administrative staff. Whenever possible there should be as many at the top rank with less than 30 percent administrative load as there are at the highest rank carrying over 70 percent administrative load.

The case for equal compensation for nonadministrative expertise . . .

COMPARABLE REWARDS

By David C. Weber and Tina Kass

A MAJOR ISSUE in library personnel administration has emerged in the past 15 years. Whereas in the 19th Century a librarian could often combine exceptional subject expertise with administrative talent and receive the status accorded to such dual responsibilities, during the first half of the 20th Century substantial growth in the size of libraries has resulted in a consequent increase in administrative complexities and separation of tasks. Those carrying administrative responsibilities have salaries which have generally kept up with salaries in other professions. The exceptional bibliographer, literature specialist, cataloger, or other specialists who finds nonadministrative work in libraries challenging, however, has found his or her status and financial compensation weakening in comparison with those of people in administration. This is true even though this specialist group is clearly as important in attaining the goals of libraries as are the administrative officers. By carrying out the basic bibliographic functions of building and organizing collections and providing service to readers, they may even be considered more important than those who handle budgetary, organizational, personnel, planning and other administrative tasks, however complex and demanding these duties may be.

During the past 30 years, bibliographic complexities have become staggering and the intricacies of libraries demand expert talent in providing access to and use of resources. It is not

surprising, therefore, for members of the library profession to express concern at this time about the relationship between the compensation of bibliographic specialists whose work is defined by the level of expertise required and administrators whose work is defined by level of accountability for operations.

A policy of equal compensation for nonadministrative expertise, or "comparable reward," based on the American Library Association's "Library Education and Personnel Utilization" policy of 1970, responds to the recent developments in libraries which have brought this issue to the attention of the profession. This document will review the background leading to such a policy, including compensation theory, recent library practice in classification and compensation, related American Library Association policies, survey of current practices, and statements in the published literature which have led to a theoretical base for a compensation policy. It proposes a restatement of compensation policy and its application, based on a concept of "comparable rewards."

Those preparing the document offer special thanks to Margaret Myers, Director of the Office for Library Personnel Resources, Beverly P. Lynch, the recent Executive Secretary of the Association of College and Research Libraries, and the library officers who have described their policies or statement of practice and thereby have contributed to this document.

I. Background

In July 1974 the Council of the American Library Association directed the Office for Library Personnel Resources to address this aspect of compensation. The motion was as follows:

WHEREAS these hierarchical structures perpetuate traditional sexist divisions between administrative and non-administrative staff, and

WHEREAS the actual skills involved in doing both service and administrative work, although different in nature, are comparable in social importance, complexity, difficulty, degree of responsibility, degree of independent judgment and decision making, and,

WHEREAS a non-discriminatory valuation of service and administrative skills would demonstrate them to be much more nearly equal than is commonly reflected in salaries, advancement, recognition and other forms of reward;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the ALA Council direct the Office for Library Personnel Resources to develop guidelines whereby persons in both administrative and service positions may receive the comparable rewards resulting from an accurate, nondiscriminatory valuation of these two major categories of employment within the library field.

For a year and a half following the resolution, the Office for Library Personnel Resources and its Advisory Committee discussed a variety of useful models offering suitable guidelines to the profession. They also considered the ALA policy of 1970 ("Library Education and Manpower," now "Library

Education and Personnel Utilization") which is succinct, simple, and generally applicable in the matter of comparable rewards. Paragraph 19 of this document states that the topmost classification in the professional ranks:

is not limited to administrators, whose specialty is only one of several specializations of value to the library service. There are many areas of special knowledge within librarianship which are equally important and to which equal recognition in prestige and salary should be given. A highly qualified person with a specialist responsibility in some aspect of librarianship—archives, bibliography, reference, for example—should be eligible for advanced status and financial rewards without being forced to abandon for administrative responsibilities his/her area of major competence.

The policy of the American Library Association was considered to be appropriate and applicable to all types and sizes of libraries.

The 1970 ALA policy does not say that there ought to be identical salaries, but that those making the judgments must understand and appreciate the contributions of subject, linguistic, or technical experts to the operation and services of a library when comparing them to those with administrative responsibilities. It is important to point out that this policy does not attempt to denigrate those having the substantial administrative tasks which can be extremely demanding, require extraordinary breadth of competence, and create a unique kind of pressure. Instead, it recognizes that the special preparation, unique talents, and particular expertise of rare and competent specialists can contribute as much to library operations on an individual basis as can middle level or senior level administrative officers.

II. Theory of compensation

The concept of "comparable rewards" rests on two important aspects of compensation theory: "equal pay for equal work" and the forces of a defined labor market. The application of "equal pay for equal work" requires analyses and comparisons of widely differing responsibilities to determine common factors which may include expertise, level of autonomy, and level of administrative/managerial responsibility. One can compare responsibilities of individuals who make decisions about the development of a collection, about the records which provide access to the collection, or about service programs which enable patrons to use the collections with the line manager of the unit in which such specialists work. The key factors in such a comparison, however, would not be the level of administrative/managerial responsibility, but rather the level of expertise, the

amount of autonomy, and the nature of external contact. It is thus the relative importance of the total contribution to the organization which must be considered. Individuals responsible for making such comparisons must have both the ability to carry out complex analytic work and to communicate the conclusions of such work to others as well as an understanding of and appreciation for diverse talents in a library.

An understanding of the effects of labor market forces is also essential for individuals responsible for making compensation decisions. The definition of an appropriate market for comparison should take into account the cost of living and salary levels of other comparable labor groups. For example, school librarians may compare themselves with teachers, public librarians may compare their status with that of others in government service, and academic librarians may compare themselves with other academic staff, or in some cases, with faculty. Although the analysis of the market is often helpful in assessing adequacy of aggregate salaries, it is less helpful in assessing individual salaries. In dealing with individuals, one must also consider the expertise required in the position (often reflected by academic preparation and experience) and the needs of the institution as well as the market forces which reflect scarcity of particular talents and knowledge. Although supply and demand is a factor, consideration of this factor should not result in inequity for a person who finds that because of inadequate advertising or particular historical circumstances, there is not significant competition for the job at the time that the individual is hired. Those working in areas with an exceptionally high cost of living or under particularly adverse physical circumstances can also expect compensation equal to others facing similar circumstances. Taken together with objectivity and an overriding ethic of fairness, consideration of these circumstances will lead to appropriate rewards for the talents of individuals essential to the program of the library, regardless of their status as "specialists" or "administrators."

III. Current practices

In order to ascertain the current practices of libraries with regard to librarian compensation, a letter requesting information was sent to almost 200 institutions. Of these institutions, 111 were academic libraries, 53 municipal public, 16 governmental (operated at state or federal levels), and 12 were specialized libraries. The total response was 50, or 25 percent of those contacted. Twenty-nine percent of the academic libraries contacted responded, 17 percent of the public libraries, 44

percent of the governmental, and 17 percent of the specialized.

The following questions were asked of each:

1. How is (the ALA policy stated in Paragraph 19 of LEPU) applied in your library system?

2. To what degree has the policy been applied?

3. What are the numbers of administrative and nonadministrative librarians in the top one or two classifications?

4. What problems has your library system had in furthering or defining such a dual ladder policy of providing comparable rewards for comparable responsibilities, and do you have any reservations about it being a wise policy for all libraries of your type?

5. How are you coping with such problems as may inhibit its application, such as pressures from a bargaining group, attitudes of certain administrative staff, historical practices, policies of higher authorities, etc.?

6. Do you believe your institution can improve its application of this policy? How, and are these techniques applicable to all libraries of your type?

7. Do you believe the American Library Association should modify, recast, or revise the policy statement in paragraph 19 of LEPU?

For the purposes of this survey, the responses from specialized libraries are not pertinent. For the most part, the size of the staff in these institutions is either so small or so specialized that, except for the head librarian, it is impossible to assign individuals either purely administrative or purely service responsibilities.

The governmental libraries group consists of those which are funded at either the state or federal level and which are obliged to follow a civil service system. It appears from the responses received that state institutions are less flexible in applying compensation policies than federal ones. In the Library of Congress, for example, a number of specialists have reached the top four grade levels (GS 15-18) without taking on administrative responsibilities.

Public libraries surveyed on the whole fall under the jurisdiction of the municipal personnel department and therefore also have little flexibility in determining and implementing compensation policy. One exception is the Detroit Public Library which offers opportunity for promotion and development up to the level of Librarian III for persons with particular competence in a subject area; administrative officers in this classification may be First Assistants (the second-in-command position) in operative departments. In general, however, most responders from this type of library would agree with the statement from Irwin Sexton, direc-

tor of the San Antonio Public Library: "... inevitably most public libraries are funded from city general account receipts, and in budgeting they are subjected to rigid criteria that tend to recognize administration." It is this state of affairs in public libraries which may explain why there was relatively little response to the questionnaire (only 17 percent of those contacted answered the questions posed).

Among academic libraries, college libraries were on the whole too small for clear-cut distinctions to be made on the basis of administrative and service responsibilities, although those with staffs of at least ten professionals support the philosophy of comparable rewards without reservation.

The university libraries which responded, whether privately or publicly supported, almost without exception work within a "two-track" system of compensation which recognizes achievements in both service and administrative assignments. There were only two exceptions to this, both publicly supported institutions. Three libraries, however, including two privately supported ones, give an extra stipend to administrators. In the case of one academic library, librarians are assigned a rank based on service responsibilities and each rank is assigned to a salary range. Those librarians who also bear administrative responsibilities are given a special increment above their salary in the range, an increment which may be as high as \$2000. David R. Dowell, Assistant University Librarian at Duke University, the institution in question, states: "I feel that some differential is necessary, but the exaggerated differentials of the past have only encouraged those ill-suited for administrative responsibilities to seek such duties even if they are uncomfortable in such positions. By creating a scale in which the librarian receives a salary on the basis of his/her professional contribution and with increments for certain special responsibilities, better utilization of the staff might be possible."

In answer to question number five, those libraries with librarians represented by bargaining groups report that unions favor a system of comparable rewards because of the greater possibilities for advancement it offers to the group of librarians as a whole. As noted earlier in this section, policies of higher authorities which generally tend to reward administrators present the greatest problems and are indeed insurmountable in a number of publicly supported institutions. Attitudes of administrative staff based on historical practices have been changed, but hierarchical civil service practices are more difficult to alter.

In general, the responses indicate that in those libraries in which a policy of providing comparable rewards is fol-

lowed, increased application of that policy rests to a great extent on improved definition of both individual positions and of criteria used in the promotion process, as well as refinement of peer review processes in some cases. For those libraries which give administrators a special stipend, special provision in the budgeting process must be made to accommodate this. For the most part, however, any official application of this policy is recent, and for this reason it is difficult for libraries to know exactly where the problems will arise.

Of all the responses, only three (two public libraries and one specialized library) indicate that the LEPU policy stated in Paragraph 19 should be revised. The reasons ranged from a concern that it would be difficult to recruit administrators if they did not receive the highest salaries, to a feeling that the policy is simply unrealistic and not affordable. It appears that research libraries require a large number of specialists who possess unique academic background and experience and therefore see a special value in a policy of comparable rewards.

IV. Recent practice

It is not easy to generalize about recent compensation practice in libraries because relatively few items in the literature clarify what actually has been done in this area in recent years. There is, however, an assumption made by several writers that compensation practice in the past few decades of this century has clearly reflected a hierarchy based on administrative responsibilities. Without being able to go back a decade or more and check payrolls, however, it becomes more a matter of hearsay than of fact that this kind of imbalance has been a prevalent practice. One cannot say, however, that the policy of comparable rewards advocated here has been commonly followed. There appear to be a sufficient number of disturbing practices even today when this issue is better understood, and there must have been a much larger number in the past.

Although a comprehensive reordering of classification and compensation practices in libraries does not seem necessary, a significant readjustment in practice may be required in all types of libraries. One appreciates the subtleties of compensation practice when one tries to weigh and combine relevant factors. These include such factors as the years of applicable experience, the current classification, and the contribution to quantitative and qualitative production. They also include other aspects of professional activity such as contributions to library and external agencies or committees, counseling of students or clients, or

contributing to community services which may also have some rather direct and recognizable benefit to one's professional performance.

V. Compensation policy restated

Library needs have changed and the wide variety of nonadministrative experts who are now required by major libraries deserve appropriate rewards. If such specialists are to continue to choose librarianship as a career and if the organizations in which they work wish to recognize their talents, policies and procedures which make this intention explicit must be developed. To apply the compensation theory described above and to provide a guideline as requested by the ALA Council in 1974, it is proposed that whenever possible in major libraries as many specialists be assigned to the top classification as are administrative staff. In this context, "major libraries" refers to those with at least 20 librarians; it is understood that this guideline would be difficult to follow in smaller institutions. "Administrative staff" includes individuals who spend the majority of their working time on planning and implementing programs, managing staff, defining goals and setting policies. Thus a library with five administrators classified at the top level would try to place there no less a number who may be a cataloging specialist, reference specialist, book selection specialist, systems specialist, public relations specialist, etc. In some libraries these may predominantly be in one type of work such as readers' advisory or book selection; in other libraries, high ranking specialists may be in other fields.

In practice it may often be impossible to assign staff following the guidelines because of the traditional library organizational structures and because many specialists also have administrative responsibilities whose importance may dominate classification decisions. The spirit of the policy, however, can and should be reflected in the distribution of classifications and should be tested by evaluation of individual instances.

It is understood that many, if not most, librarians combine a specialty with administrative assignments. For instance, a branch librarian may spend one-third of his or her time on book selection, one-third on reference and teaching, and one-third on administrative matters. This makes the guidelines more difficult to apply; if it seems necessary the basic guideline could be refined to require that whenever possible there be as many at the top rank with less than 30 percent administrative load as there are those at the highest rank carrying over 70 percent of an administrative load.

This policy for major libraries as

applied under such a guideline would be valid regardless of whether the library management uses traditional departmental structure or a collegial form. It is valid on an FTE basis regardless of whether individuals have split assignments, work part-time, or choose to work only part of the year. It is valid regardless of whether compensation is determined under civil service or not, whether salaries follow published steps or are on a curve, and whether cost of living increases are separate from merit or not.

It therefore is incumbent upon libraries of all types in the 1970s to revise their compensation policies in order to recognize such specialists. To this end it is especially important for libraries to review and apply locally the theories contained in the American Library Association's 1970 policy "Library Education and Personnel Utilization" and the Association of College and Research Libraries' 1973 policy "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion and Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians."

Although the Association of College and Research Libraries represents only one type of library and its policies have been developed specifically for its member institutions, the statements on comparable rewards contained in the documents cited above, particularly the one of 1973, are of value to all libraries. Because of the requirements of academic programs and the presence of the model of higher paid and highly ranked professors, academic libraries have moved towards rewarding specialists; this special environment is reflected by ACRL's 1973 statement.

Of the four ranks which are defined, the description of the next to the highest states that "promotion to this rank shall require evidence of substantial professional contributions to the library and to the institution as well as attainment of a high level of bibliographical activities, in research, or in other professional endeavors." Criteria for appointment to the highest rank are "outstanding achievements in bibliographical activities in research, or in other professional endeavors." Just as in the case of the ALA policy of 1970, this ACRL policy is important for what it does not say as for what it does say. There is no mention of administrative responsibilities and there is no place in the entire model statement which could permit anyone to conclude that the highest ranks are exclusively for those with the major administrative responsibilities of the library.

VI. Application of the policy

How does one apply such a policy? It is a matter of judgment. Each case requires individual assessment of

the total importance of the position to the library, and the quality of performance of the incumbent, as evaluated by analyzing a number of variable elements: the complexity of assignment, preparation required, degree of independence, total relative impact on the library effectiveness, experience in the assignment, amount of training and supervision, contributions to general library planning and to institutional or civic programs, local professional leadership, demonstrated advancement in competence, extent of formal external contact, importance of contributions to policy formulation and program planning, and direction of execution.

As an example, one may compare a library's Arctic Specialist with the Chief of the Intrainstitutional Service Department. The Arctic Specialist provides library support for the national research institute in Arctic studies, edits the annual Arctic Bibliography, supervises one research assistant and a student typist, conducts a literature seminar for the six graduate students who are concentrating in Arctic Studies, and reports to the Assistant Chief of the Reference Department. Because of unique bibliographic expertise, this person may deservedly rank as a Librarian IV where IV is the top classification. The Chief of the Intrainstitutional Service Department sits on the librarywide administrative council and supervises four librarians and ten clericals who process over 10,000 requests per year. This individual may appropriately be ranked as a Librarian II. An elaboration of the application of this theory is provided in the article by Wilkinson cited below. Similar examples may exist in public and other governmental or special libraries.

An example of the importance of all the aspects of a librarian's position described above may be seen in the application of regression analysis (See "Beyond the *prima facie* case in employment discrimination law: statistical proof and rebuttal," *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 98 (1975), p. 387-422, for a good description of regression analysis and its use in determining salary equity.) to the review of librarians' salaries. This analysis is based on the definition of a number of variables which constitute major components of a professional position, including level of professional expertise, amount of autonomy and external contact, involvement in planning and development, and level of supervisory responsibility. Of these variables, only the last two can be considered exclusively administrative. Each position included in the survey is assigned a value for each variable, and after additional information about rank, years of applicable experience, and date of hire is coded, these data are statistically analyzed us-

ing multiple regression; the purpose of this analysis is to compare one variable at a time while holding all others constant in order to determine the effect of each variable on salary. The use of the factors of expertise, amount of autonomy and external contact in such a study reflects their importance in equitable classification and compensation.

It is true that most senior level librarians, whether in public, academic, school libraries or other types of libraries, may be presumed to have a clear idea of the relative importance of jobs at subordinate levels. This is because the vast majority of these librarians started out in reference departments or catalog departments, or have managed branch units, and have demonstrated to senior officials their capacity for growth and understanding. They have eventually moved through the ranks to a position of authority which trusts them to make compensation judgments for persons handling a wide variety of responsibilities.

As one director of an academic library in the eastern part of the United States has said, "Who says that senior administrative staff don't have more responsibility and grief and shouldn't therefore be differentially compensated?"

Even here, however, is no argument against a policy of comparable rewards. If in fact a department chief or a branch librarian is judged to contribute as much to the organization as does a senior bibliographer/curator or a rare book or automation specialist, then the salary and perquisites should in general be the same. Again, one returns to the need for a wise and fair judgment of the equality of performance and responsibility which requires equality of financial compensation.

VII. Essential commitment

A library which subscribes to the policy developed in the "Library Education and Personnel Utilization" document and which tries to follow the guidelines described in this document should be prepared to expend special efforts in its compensation and classification reviews.

Individuals who make such decisions must be able to analyze both individual positions and the total staffing needs of the library, and such audits are time-consuming and require expertise in both job analysis and planning. Even more important, however, is the commitment of the institution to a policy of "comparable rewards" which must be reflected in constant awareness of and attention to the total contribution made by individual librarians to the program of the library. An equitable compensation plan for librarians can only derive from such a commitment.

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Item: LIBRARY PERSONNEL Item Number: 106.12
Approved by: ALA Council Page: 1 of 1
Issue Date: July 1974 Supersedes: _____

VALUATION OF POSITIONS

WHEREAS, Many library organizational structures are hierarchical, and

WHEREAS, These hierarchical structures perpetuate traditional sexist divisions between administrative and non-administrative staff, and

WHEREAS, The actual skills involved in doing both service and administrative work, although different in nature, are comparable in social importance, complexity, difficulty, degree of responsibility, degree of independent judgment and decision making, and,

WHEREAS, A non-discriminatory valuation of service and administrative skills would demonstrate them to be much more nearly equal than is commonly reflected in salaries, advancement, recognition and other forms of reward;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the ALA direct the Office of Library Personnel Resources to develop guidelines whereby persons in both administrative and service positions may receive the comparable rewards resulting from an accurate, non-discriminatory valuation of these two major categories of employment within the library field.

