

The professional librarian salary survey, requested by the college presidents, is now complete. An attempt was made to make this survey correspond as closely as possible to the seven-state survey for college and university academic salaries. This was done by:

- 1) Soliciting information from the same seven states as the academic survey, 2) categorizing professional librarians under academic titles, and 3) using the same salary weighting techniques.

With the survey questionnaires returned and tabulated, the following observations may be made:

1. Comparing state colleges, Washington Librarians' salaries are higher than the seven state average. Only two of the states surveyed had higher average salaries and this was attributable mostly to greater numbers in the higher ranking positions. EWSC is the only college that is below the seven state average.
2. Comparing state universities, Washington Librarians' salaries are substantially below the seven state average. Internally within Washington, the University librarians' average salary is 80.6% of the average salary of college librarians. This is true even with the universities having a higher proportion of higher ranking personnel.

In addition to salary information, the survey included questions on librarians' academic status and whether or not the rights and privileges recommended by the Committee on Academic Status of the Association of College and Research Libraries are formally endorsed.

Results of this portion of the survey are:

	<u>College</u>	<u>University</u>
A. Are professional librarians given academic status?		
Yes _____	13	11
No _____	3	0
Incomplete _____	1	0
B. Does your institution formally endorse "ACRL" recommendations?		
Yes _____	4	2
No _____	11	9
Informally _____	2	0

One problem encountered in the survey was attempting to place library positions within the accepted university and college rankings. What one state may consider an associate professor's position, another state may consider appropriate for the assistant professor's category. Such possible inconsistencies could distort the weighted comparative salary positions. For this reason, non-weighted average comparison was included along with the weighted.

Another problem was how to incorporate The Evergreen State College into the survey. It was decided that because of the non-existence of traditional personnel rankings and various degrees of functional differences to the other institutions, it should be excluded from this survey as a non-comparable area.

Also surveyed were the library administrators. The over-all average salaries for Washington institutions tended to be lower than the seven state average.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The following statement, drafted by a special committee of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges, represents the culmination of efforts initiated at a joint conference on this subject in 1965. A report of that conference was published in the AAUP Bulletin (Autumn, 1967), and reprints were distributed to members of the AAC.

The proposed statement, designed to emphasize the value of leaves of absence and give guidance to institutions in making or improving provisions for them, offers what the undersigned members of the AAUP-AAC Special Committee believe to be sound standards for flexible and effective leave programs at institutions of higher learning. It is hoped that the statement will be considered for adoption by the governing bodies and national memberships of both associations during the forthcoming year.

1 Purposes

2 Leaves of absence are among the most important means by which a teacher's
3 effectiveness may be enhanced, a scholar's usefulness enlarged, and an insti-
4 tution's academic program strengthened and developed. A sound program of
5 leaves is therefore of vital importance to a college or university, and it
6 is the obligation of every faculty member to make use of available means,
7 including leaves, to promote his professional competence. The major purpose
8 is to provide opportunity for continued professional growth and new, or
9 renewed, intellectual achievement through study, research, writing, and travel.
10 However, leaves should also be granted for illness, recovery of health, and
11 maternity. Leaves may also be provided in appropriate circumstances for
12 projects of direct benefit to the institution and for public or private
13 service outside the institution.

14 Development of Leave Policies

15 Leave policies and procedures should be developed with full faculty
16 participation. Faculty members should also have a role in the selection of

1 the recipients of individual leaves. The institution and the individual
2 faculty member have a common responsibility for endeavoring to achieve the
3 objective of the leave program, the institution by establishing an effective
4 program, the faculty member by making appropriate use of it. Leave policies
5 should be flexible enough to meet the needs of both the individual and the
6 institution.

7 Eligibility and Procedures

8 A program of leaves should promote the professional development of all
9 faculty members--those who are likely to stay at the institution for a long
10 period but also, although not necessarily to the same degree, those for whom
11 there is no such assurance.

12 Previous service and leaves at other institutions should be taken into
13 consideration in determining eligibility for leave. Persons nearing retire-
14 ment should be eligible for leave if it is clear that the leave will achieve
15 its purposes both for the individual and the institution.

16 For a non-tenured faculty member on scholarly leave for one year or
17 less, the period of leave should count as part of the probationary period
18 in the same way as prior service at another institution. Exceptions to
19 this policy should be mutually agreed to in writing prior to the leave.

20 A faculty member should apply for leave at a reasonable time in advance
21 and through established procedures, so that the institution can more readily
22 care for his work in his absence and so that he can plan to make the best use
23 of his opportunity. All evidence that the leave will increase individual
24 effectiveness or produce academically or socially useful results should be
25 considered in evaluating applications. Since careful planning is likely
26 to assure productive results, administrators and faculty members concerned
27 with implementation of leave policies should encourage the individual to

1 make advance plans and may suggest changes in them. Such plans, however,
2 should not be considered the only basis for granting leaves. A leave may
3 involve specialized scholarly activity or may be designed to provide broad
4 cultural experience and enlarged perspective.

5 Individual and Institutional Obligations

6 A faculty member has an obligation to return for further service follow-
7 ing leave of absence when the circumstances of granting the leave indicate
8 that this is the equitable action, as may often be the case when leave with
9 pay is granted. He should of course honor an agreement to return to the
10 institution, unless, under exceptional circumstances, other arrangements may
11 be mutually agreed upon. The precise terms of the leave of absence should
12 be in writing and should be given to the faculty member prior to the com-
13 mencement of the leave.

14 Even when there is no obligation to return, the faculty member who
15 resigns while on leave should give notice according to accepted standards.
16 Moreover, a college or university should not knowingly invite a person to
17 join its staff at a time when the individual cannot properly accept the
18 invitation. In most instances, an institution which invites a faculty member
19 to accept a new appointment while on leave should feel obliged to pay at
20 least a portion of the cost of the leave.

21 Frequency and Duration of Leaves

22 Leaves should not be considered as deferred compensation to which a
23 faculty member is entitled no matter what other opportunities he may have
24 had for professional development. They should, however, be provided with
25 reasonable frequency and preferably be available at regular intervals
26 because they are important to the continuing growth of the faculty member

1 and the effectiveness of the institution.

2 Ordinarily, leaves of absence, whatever the source of funding, should
3 not be more than one year in length or come more frequently than once in
4 three years. Exceptions to this rule should be possible in cases involving
5 health, public service, overseas appointments, or other special circumstances.

6 Financial Arrangements

7 Leaves of one semester at full salary or an academic year at half
8 salary are commonly provided. The institution is not obliged to assume the
9 financial burden of all types of leaves. It does have the obligation, how-
10 ever, to use its own leave funds in such a manner as to equalize the oppor-
11 tunity for professional development among and within academic fields.

12 Whatever the source of funding, the amount paid to the person on leave
13 should not depend on the cost of caring for his work in his absence, nor
14 should a leave of absence of a year or less interfere with the opportunity
15 for promotion or increase in salary.

16 Continuous coverage under various types of insurance programs should
17 be provided while a faculty member is on leave. When the faculty member is
18 on leave with pay, both the institution and the individual should continue
19 contributions toward his retirement annuity.

20 If a faculty member, on leave without pay, takes a temporary but
21 full-time appointment at another institution or organization, it is reason-
22 able to expect the appointing institution or organization to assume the
23 cost of institutional contributions to the individual's retirement annuity
24 and group insurance programs.

25 Foundations, government agencies, and other organizations supporting
26 leaves for scholarly purposes should include in their grants an amount

- 1 sufficient to maintain institutional annuity and group insurance contributions
- 2 as well as salaries.

Bertram H. Davis, General Secretary, AAUP
Edward D. Eddy, President, Chatham College (AAC)
John Finch, Professor of Mathematics, Beloit College (AAUP)
John Gillis, Executive Associate, AAC
Mark H. Ingraham, University of Wisconsin (AAUP), Chairman
Neill Megaw, Chairman, Department of English, University of
Texas (AAUP)
Frederic W. Ness, President, AAC
Albert L. Pugsley, President, Youngstown State University (AAC)
Blair Stewart, Associated Colleges of the Midwest (AAC)
Robert Van Waes, Associate Secretary, AAUP