

**Summary of meeting concerning the status of the
UC Librarian Compensation, Recruitment, and Retention Task Force**
Lincoln Cushing, UC Berkeley AFT bargaining representative

On Wednesday, April 13, 2005 Karen Sawislak (AFT Executive Director), Shelley Nielsen (UCOP Labor Relations), and Lincoln Cushing (UC Berkeley bargaining representative and Task Force member) met to discuss the status of the joint labor-management compensation task force that had been set up per a side letter produced during the last bargaining meetings (see document at http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/~lcushing/pdfs/AFT/UC_AFT_Unit17_Comp.html). The group met several times and, with good faith and effort, attempted to tackle these difficult issues. However, for a variety of personnel reasons the task force stumbled in its schedule and last met June 17, 2004.

The side letter included a deadline of June 30, 2004 by which the group was to have attempted to conclude its mandate. Although progress was made, only some of the designated tasks were accomplished, and rather than try and reinstitute the Task Force to continue the work it was agreed by the parties present that these issues could be raised again at the upcoming bargaining sessions and discussed at that level. Should these remain unresolved it is always possible that another body could evolve to pursue similar investigation, but this group's work is over.

The progress made by the group resulted in these two accomplishments:

1. Revision of the methodology used in calculating Association of Research Libraries (ARL) survey data. As was pointed out by AFT, there were numerous problems with the standard published ARL data, most notably variations in UC campus reporting and inclusion of library employees that were well outside the librarian series. After reviewing campus procedures (one of which, at UCB, ended up raising the number of reported librarians from 89 in 2003-2004 to 125 in 2004-2005) and requesting more detailed analysis from the ARL survey staff, we succeeded in making the ARL data more accurate as a guide to salary comparisons with other college librarians. However, as even UCOP's Shelley Nielsen notes, "I do not necessarily agree that this is accurate because it is quite possible that these other institutions are providing data in a similar way that we were previously sending it in. There is no real way for us to test the accuracy of data submitted by other institutions."

To wrap up the work begun by the Task Force, UCOP has agreed to:

- 1) Order the same special cut of the 04-05 ARL survey that they ordered last year. (Tables 7a, 7b, 11 and 13);
- 2) Add UCSC compensation data to the ARL tables as they did last summer; and
- 3) Provide unit information that they provided last April with two calculations, one for mean salary and one for median salary by campus. These datasets will help validate the accuracy of the ARL data.

The problems of how to deal with comparison institutions that are absent from the survey (such as Stanford, which dropped out last year) or institutions that do not report because they do not rank librarians (such as Northwestern and Johns Hopkins) were not addressed.

2. Creation and implementation of a useful recruitment and retention survey document. The lack of hard data on exactly why people do not take positions at UC or why they leave has made serious discussion difficult. At the request of the Task Force, UC Library Human Resources created (and the Task Force reviewed) a "Librarian Retention & Separation Survey" and a "Librarian Recruitment and New Hire Survey" designed to capture useful data. Campuses have instituted gathering data with these documents since summer 2004. No effort is being contemplated for retroactive surveying.

Broader differences concerning compensation still exist between UCOP and AFT, and in truth were beyond the scope of this Task Force. The biggest issue remains - UCOP accepts the accuracy of the ARL survey alone (even as adjusted above) as a valid yardstick for UC librarian compensation, while AFT holds the position that ARL (modified by other real-world factors such as local cost of living) in combination with other relevant labor markets (such as major metropolitan California public libraries and CSU's) makes for a more accurate metric.