

Minutes of the Senate Library Committee
Meeting of December 14, 2021
3:00 PM to 4:00 PM

In Attendance: Mark Lynn Anderson, Jeff Aziz, Mark Bernstein, Tyler Bickford,[†] Lauren Collister, Charlotte Johnson, Robin Kear, Jonah McAllister-Erickson, Susanna Leers, Matt Moore, Diana Khoi Nguyen, April O'Neil, Elizabeth Reich, Jessica Rolke, Lucy Russell, Ken Salzer, and Fran Yarger.*

* for Renae Barger

[†] guest speaker from Senate Budget Policies Committee.

Excused: Renae Barger, Susanna Leers, Kornelia Tancheva.

1. Anderson began the meeting with a proposed draft of a new Senate Library Committee mission statement that both shortened the already brief statement but added emphasis on the Committee's more recent concerns with the promotion of the social value of libraries and library workers. There was some discussion about this revision with general support. Anderson noted how many Senate committees have rather lengthy mission statements, with some reading like committee bylaws. He preferred the briefer more elegant mission statement that attempts to capture the spirit and general commitment of the committee's work rather than a detailed description of process. Kear mentioned that other committees are including diversity statements in their statement revisions. Anderson said that he would leave the new draft available as an editable Google Doc and urged members to read other committee mission statements if they were so inclined.

2. The Committee then turned to a discussion of "last steps" before submitting our proposal to the Office of the Provost for the creation of a new funding stream in support of open access creation and scholarship by those faculty hired under the Provost's two most recent DEI cluster hire initiatives. Questions were posed about how we arrived at the proposed amounts for funding levels, the \$15,000 figure for APCs (article processing charges) and \$60,000 for grant proposals. Collister explained that such a figure would cover approximately five requests at \$3,000 a piece. Anderson added that the grant funding amount was arrived at from thinking about current caps on Momentum Funding of Seed [and finishing] Grants, about \$25,000 per project. Questions arose concerning needed funding to cover additional labor for administering these funds. Collister mentioned that her office already processes such fees, and if they could obtain a list of eligible faculty for any newly dedicated portion of APC funding, then processing could proceed as usual. McAllister-Erickson mentioned how he administers these funds, relying on "a staff person in technical services and then unknown personnel in the central payments processing unit to actually disperse the funds." Anderson felt that while the possible extra labor issue was important, the proposal should probably remain unburdened by such concerns at present in order to remain as effective as possible. As far as the processing and review of grants, Anderson pointed to the proposal's suggestion of a review process that is grafted on to the existing structure of grant proposal review conducted by the University Research Council, with the addition of a rotating committee of librarians. Russell asked if this funding would go to ULS. Collister explained that HSL is excluded, and others pointed out that Health Science is not a Provost area. Kear mentioned the already existing example of OER funding that runs through the Office

of the Provost, bit a brief recounting followed of how this funding proposal is similar and different from that successful program, particularly with respect to benchmarking. Kear asked if John Wallace in the Provost's Office was aware of our work on this proposal. Russell said that she had mentioned the proposal to him. Kear offered to take the proposal to him before the discussion was tabled.

3. The rest of the meeting was reserved for a presentation by Tyler Bickford, Chair of the Budget Policies Committee, who discussed his own committee's work and findings on staff and faculty compensation. Bickford described the difficulty of obtaining detailed information about faculty compensation, particularly at present when the University is observing a "status quo" period after the election of a faculty union in October. As for staff compensation, it's unclear how much longer the rollout of the new staff job classification will take to solve the long-standing and ongoing issues with the University's convoluted staff job descriptions that have place severe limits on staff salary increases and promotion, although Bickford indicated that this was a priority for Vice-Chancellor DeJong.

As for librarian salaries, the 2015 benchmarking report, which was the last time there was data for faculty librarians (Table 6/Page 9), the average librarian salary is listed as \$81,200 (12-months). But this seems like an error as the mean and median report (below) from that same year lists it as only \$54,656 (or \$66,801 adjusted to 12 months). The 2016 report is the first one not to include librarian salaries, with this note (p1): "Note that this analysis usually includes Librarian salaries as reported in the ARL Annual Salary Survey. However, while the 2015-16 salary data for faculty was available in April, 2016, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) has not given a definitive date for the release of the 2015-16 Librarian salary data. Rather than delay the entire report, this abbreviated report showing only faculty salary data was developed. A revised report that includes Librarian salary data may be released after the ARL publishes the 2015-16 Salary Survey results." The 2017 report included the same note, and then the 2018 report made no mention of librarians. Bickford described other irregularities in the reporting of librarian compensation. Bickford pointed out that Association of University Professors (AAUP) had a policy that faculty salaries should have a target, something that faculty librarians at the University haven't had since 2015. Bickford said that the Budget Policies Committee has not had librarian representation, though his committee continues to seek information and explanations.

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 PM

Minutes submitted by Mark Lynn Anderson
Minutes approved in Committee meeting of January 25, 2022