# LAUNC-CH Professional Welfare 2012-2013 Committee Report 

Committee Members: Libby Chenault, Nancy Kaiser, Mohamed Hamed, Diana McDuffee (Chair)

The LAUNC-CH Professional Welfare Committee completed an analysis of the salaries of UNC Chapel Hill Librarians compared to their national and local peers. This analysis relies on data from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Annual Salary Survey. LAUNC-CH Professional Welfare committees have been doing this analysis for over ten years. The analysis shows that UNC Chapel Hill Librarians' salaries reach their highest median salary ranking in 2007-2008 when UNC Chapel Hill Academic Affairs Librarians' median salaries ranked $37^{\text {th }}$ out 113 ARL libraries. Since that high point the median salaries for UNC Chapel Hill Librarians has steadily declined in ranking to $77^{\text {th }}$ out of 115 libraries in 2011-2012. A complete report of our analysis follows.

The LAUNC-CH Professional Welfare Committee met with Sarah Michalak on March 1, 2013 in order to share our concerns about the level of salaries for librarians at UNC Chapel Hill. We discussed the methodology library administration used to assign 20122013 raises, and their emphasis on bringing entry level and early career librarian salaries to new minimum levels. Sarah also shared with us the newly released preliminary data from the 2012-2013 ARL Salary Survey. Since the publication has not been released yet we have only a few tables so we are not able to report at this time on rankings of UNC libraries compared to the complete list of ARL libraries; however we are able to compare to our selected national and local peer libraries. Unfortunately we remain below our peers for median salaries even with the modest salary increases awarded in 2012-2013.

Future topics that the LAUNC-CH Professional Welfare Committee may wish to pursue include:

1. Retention: in lieu of salary increases, what else can be leveraged to create a culture in which librarians are not tempted to look around? expanded funding support for professional development? mentoring? training support?
2. Management experience for mid-level librarians: when our senior level administrators retire, will there be people behind them who will have enough experience to apply for their positions?

## ANALYSIS OF UNC Chapel Hill Librarians Salaries compared to ARL salary survey data

The LAUNC-CH Professional Welfare Committee has completed its annual examination of the ARL salary survey data. The results show a steep decline in our rankings for median salaries since 2007-2008 when UNC AA librarians' salaries ranked at 37/113. The attached graphs illustrate the downward trend in the rankings. The Health Sciences Library and Law Library ARL salary rankings have also declined but they remain in the top half of the rankings.

By 2008, UNC Academic Affairs Librarians' median salaries had been steadily rising in the rankings from the low point of 85/111 in 1999-2000 to 37/113 in 2007-2008. However, by 2011-2012 UNC AA Librarians' median salaries have slipped to 77/115.

In 2011-2012 the median salary was $\$ 61,858$. At the peak in 2007-2008 the median salary was $\$ 62,825$. The slide in librarians' salary and median salary during the period from 2007-2008 to 2011-2012 could be explained by the economic slide that the United States has experienced during this period. However our peer universities have continued to improve their rankings while UNC's have declined. We are now ranked lower than our national and local peers.

## Median Salary at UNC and Peers

## Peers

- UC Berkeley \$82,524
- UCLA \$76,083
- Michigan \$67,920
- Virginia \$66,600
- North Carolina State University \$65,000
- Duke $\$ 62,525$
- UNC $\mathbf{\$ 6 1 , 8 5 8}$

The ARL ranking for the library as a whole has also declined but not as steeply as librarian's salaries. The overall ranking of the library in the ARL data was at 15 in 20072008. In 2010-2011 that ranking had dropped to 19.

## Beginning salary

The beginning librarians' salaries at UNC are ranked at $73 / 115$, lower than at all peers except for University of Michigan.

## Peers

- Rank 18 NC State $\$ 53,000$
- Rank 47 UC Berkeley \$47,544
- Rank 48 Virginia \$47,500
- Rank 52 UCLA $\$ 46,164$
- Rank 61 Duke \$45,000
- Rank 73 UNC $\mathbf{\$ 4 4 , 0 0 0}$
- Rank 80 Michigan \$43,500

Cost of living Index (100 is the norm for US cities):
Sometimes a presumed lower cost of living in our area compared to peer university communities is offered as a rationalization for lower salaries at UNC Chapel Hill, however, a check of those index numbers shows that Chapel Hill COL index is at 113, higher than Ann Arbor and Charlottesville.
102.0 Ann Arbor, MI (Detroit 99.4)
107.0 Charlottesville, VA
113.0 Chapel Hill, NC (Durham 96.6, Raleigh 98.2)
136.4 Los Angeles (housing 207)
139.9 Oakland, CA (164.0 San Francisco, housing 281)

Before the recession began, the Library Administration had been making laudable and significant progress in improving the salaries of librarians at UNC Chapel Hill. LAUNCCH understands that the effects of the recession influenced many of the decisions made by the State Legislature and University Administration which negatively impacted librarians' salaries, and that this may have been unavoidable. LAUNC-CH is raising the issue to signal our interest in making a positive contribution to the discussion about the state of Librarians' salaries.

## ***March 2013 Updated information from 2012-2013 preliminary ARL data

 (received from Sarah Michalak)The LAUNC-CH Professional Welfare Committee met with Sarah Michalak on March 1 to share our concerns about the level of salaries for librarians at UNC Chapel Hill. She shared with us the newly released preliminary data from the 2012-2013 ARL Salary Survey. Since the publication has not been released yet we have only a few tables so we are not able to report at this time on rankings of UNC libraries compared to peers except in the broad category of ARL libraries.

2012-2013 UNC Chapel Hill Information on median, average, and positions filled.
AA Library: Median \$62,683; Average \$67,097; 95 filled positions
HSL Library: Median \$67,200; Average \$70,058; 28 staff
Law Library: Median \$68,816; Average \$74,168; 12 staff
All U.S. ARL Libraries (includes AA, Med, Law): Median \$67,257; Average \$74,002 When we drop the Canadian ARL libraries out of the tables our salaries are closer to the median and average although still below on both measures for AA and HSL.

## 2012-2013 Median Salary at UNC \& Peers from preliminary ARL data

## Peers

- UC Berkeley \$82,783
- UCLA \$77,976
- Michigan $\$ 66,225$
- Virginia $\$ 68,100$
- North Carolina State University \$70,385
- Duke \$64,225
- UNC $\mathbf{\$ 6 2 , 6 8 3}$

Beginning salary (from 2012-2013 ARL Preliminary Salary Data)

## Peers

- NC State $\$ 54,000$
- UC Berkeley \$47,544
- UC UCLA $\$ 47,544$
- Virginia $\$ 47,500$
- Duke $\$ 47,000$
- Michigan \$47,000
- UNC \$45,000






## UNC Law Librarians' Median ARL Salary Rank 1999-2012

Year
1999-2000 2000-2001 2001-2002 2002-2003 2003-2004 2004-2005 2005-2006 2006-2007 2007-2008 2008-2009 2009-2010 2010-2011 2011-2012


Median Salary and Ranking by Median Salary

| Year | Library | Rank | Median <br> Salary | POSI TI ONS <br> FI LLED | AVERAGE <br> Years Exp | Change from <br> Previous <br> Year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $1999-$ <br> 2000 | AA | $85 / 111$ | 42,050 |  |  |  |
|  | HSL | $30 / 62$ | 43,654 |  |  |  |
|  | Law | $50 / 63$ | 41,626 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,950 |
| $2000-$ <br> 2001 | AA | $74 / 112$ | 46,000 |  |  | 4,440 |
|  | HSL | $22 / 63$ | 48,094 |  |  | 5,364 |
|  | Law | $43 / 64$ | 46,990 |  |  | 1,350 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | -534 |
| $2001-$ <br> 2002 | AA | $70 / 113$ | 47,350 |  |  | 2,994 |


| Year | Library | Rank | Median <br> Salary | POSITI ONS <br> FI LLED | AVERAGE <br> Years Exp | Change from <br> Previous <br> Year |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| $2002-$ <br> 2003 | AA | $62 / 114$ | 49,517 | 87 | 17.6 | 2,167 |
|  | HSL | $13 / 66$ | 54,236 | 30 | 17.8 | 6,676 |
|  | Law | $37 / 71$ | 52,500 |  | 10 | 14.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,516 |
| $2003-$ <br> 2004 | AA | $82 / 114$ | 48,500 |  |  | $-1,017$ |
|  | HSL | $33 / 66$ | 50,206 |  |  | $-4,030$ |
|  | Law | $37 / 71$ | 53,000 |  |  | 500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2004-$ | AA | $66 / 113$ | 52,750 |  |  | 3,250 |
| 2005 | HSL | $23 / 67$ | 53,713 |  |  | 3,507 |
|  | Law | $35 / 71$ | 56,200 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,200 |


| $\begin{aligned} & 2005- \\ & 2006 \end{aligned}$ | AA | 56/113 | 55,650 |  |  | 2,900 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HSL | 19/66 | 56,734 |  |  | 3,021 |
|  | Law | 34/70 | 57,324 |  |  | 1,124 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2006- \\ & 2007 \end{aligned}$ | AA | 44/113 | 60,000 | 97 | 19.3 | 4,350 |
|  | HSL | 22/67 | 58,000 | 30 | 20.1 | 1,266 |
|  | Law | 32/71 | 61,910 | 11 | 14.1 | 4,586 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2007- \\ & 2008 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | AA | 37/113 | 62,825 | 92 | 19.3 | 2,825 |
|  | HSL | 14/67 | 64,506 | 28 | 21.3 | 6,506 |
|  | Law | 24/74 | 66,010 | 12 | 13.2 | 4,100 |
| 2008- | AA | 52/113 | 63,750 | 104 | 17.6 | 925 |
|  | HSL | 21/67 | 64,002 | 32 | 17.9 | -504 |
|  | Law | 24/66 | 68,000 | 11 | 12 | 1,990 |
| Year | Library | Rank | Median Salary | POSITIONS FILLED | AVERAGE <br> Years Exp | Change from Previous Year |
| 2009- | AA | 50/114 | 63,712 | 99 | 17 | -38 |
|  | HSL | 19/63 | 64,002 | 32 | 19.2 | 0 |
|  | Law | 22/66 | 68,000 | 12 | 15.8 | 0 |
| 2010- | AA | 68/115 | 62,300 | 96 | 17.3 | -1,412 |
|  | HSL | 29/67 | 65,049 | 30 | 19.9 | 11,047 |
|  | Law | 25/66 | 68,000 | 12 | 16.1 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2011- } \\ & 2012 \end{aligned}$ | AA | 77/115 | 61,858 | 97 | 17.2 | -442 |
|  | HSL | 30/67 | 65,860 | 28 | 21 | 811 |
|  | LAW | 32/66 | 65,268 | 12 | 16.2 | -2,732 |


| $2012-$ <br> 2013 | AA |  | 62,683 | 95 | 825 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | HSL |  | 67,200 | 28 |  | 1,340 |
|  | LAW |  | 68,816 | 12 | 3,548 |  |

