

Proposed Revisions to Indiana University-Bloomington Libraries Salary Policy for Library Faculty

<http://www.indiana.edu/~libpers/libsalary.html>

Bloomington librarians approved a new document governing the peer review process in May, 2003. The document, *Peer Review in Annual Merit Evaluation for the Purpose of Salary Increments*, (<http://www.indiana.edu/~libblfc/20022003/peerreviewrevised.html>) replaced the *Peer Committee for Annual Merit Review* document (approved August 1999).

In the present (new) peer review process, levels II and III deserve a merit increase. In the earlier system levels II, III, and IV deserved merit increases. Below are suggested substitutions relating to the change in title of the document and the change in the levels deemed meritorious. In addition to these, the Budgetary Advisory Committee discovered that some changes are required to accurately make references to source documents mentioned in the policy.

Below are the sections where changes and possible revisions are highlighted. Please visit: <http://www.indiana.edu/~libpers/libsalary.html> to read the original document.

Section IV, Item D:

IV. Non-Merit Adjustments to Individual Salaries

D. Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA)

Librarians shall receive an increment related to the increase in the cost of living. The cost of living increase recommended by the BFC should be distributed to all librarians on the IU Libraries budget. If the COLA is not distributed [Revision: "distributed"] (to an individual librarian or to all), a justification shall be presented in writing, to the individual or to all, as the case may be.

Section V, Item A and B:

V. Merit adjustments to individual salaries

A. Eligibility

Peer review is normally one of the requirements for recommending individual annual salary merit increases. The BLFC document Peer Committee for Annual Merit Review (approved August 1999) identifies four levels of salary increase that may be recommended by [Substitute: "*Peer Review in Annual Merit Evaluation for the Purpose of Salary Increments* (approved May 2003) identifies three levels of salary increase that may be recommended by"] the Committee. Librarians eligible for peer input into salary recommendations are identified in Section I.B.1. of the Peer Committee for Annual Merit Review document. [Substitute "C of the document"] To be considered for a merit salary increase, eligible librarians must have a rating and evaluation from the Peer Review Committee. Section I.B.3. [Substitute "C"] of that document also identifies librarians not included in the peer review process and notes that salary increase recommendations for those individuals should be prepared by the immediate supervisor. [Substitute "merit increase recommendations for those individuals should be made to the Dean by their supervisors."] Salaries for librarians not eligible for peer review, but possibly eligible for merit increases, should be set using an equivalent four [Substitute "three"] levels of increase.

B. Distribution of Funds to Librarians

Merit increases for individual salaries are calculated on the base salary after increases for newly established floors, equity adjustments, promotion, and COLA, have been added.

Librarians who have received ratings at levels II-IV [Substitute "III"] deserve a merit increase. These increases should be differential, and commensurate with each rating described in the Peer Committee for Annual Merit Review [Substitute "Peer Review in Annual Merit Evaluation for the Purpose of Salary Increments"] document. Following the procedures of sequence noted in this document, all available merit dollars should be allocated to the salaries of eligible librarians.

The total amount available for merit increases is calculated by subtracting the following off-the-top deductions from the total salary pool for librarians: salary decisions made by library administration (negotiations, salaries for Associate Deans, non-base administrative supplements, etc.), and the initial salary adjustments listed above (raises to floors, equity, promotion, and COLA). The resulting available pool of dollars should be distributed to the librarian population reviewed by the Peer Review Committee and other continuing librarians not eligible for peer review.

Each year, the BLFC Budgetary Advisory Committee shall recommend the amounts for each merit rating based on projected information provided by the Library Fiscal Officer. The Committee will consider both percentage increases and flat dollar increases in making a recommendation. To try to maintain salary equity, it would be desirable for the sum of the COLA plus the merit increase for a level II-IV [Substitute "III"] performance rating to be equal to or greater than the percentage applied to bring salaries up to the campus-recommended floors. The Committee will report its recommendation to the BLFC Agenda Committee and the BLFC for approval.

Section VII

VII. Appeal Procedures

Librarians who wish to disagree with their merit ranking for salary purposes or add their responses to the Peer Review Committee's evaluation should address their responses to the Dean within two weeks of these ratings being sent out.

Appeals by librarians with regard to unresolved disagreements about salary decisions are governed by faculty/librarian grievance procedures as outlined in the Indiana University Libraries Library Faculty Handbook document Librarians Faculty Review Board, and in the Academic Handbook of Indiana University (see especially the documents D-26, Grievance and Review Procedures of the Bloomington Faculty; D-28, Supplementary Affirmative Action Complaint Procedure Guidelines for the Bloomington Campus; and D-29, Affirmative Action Plan). [Substitute: Grievance, Mediation, and Review Procedures (<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/grievance.htm>), and Supplementary Affirmative Action Grievance Procedures (<http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/supp.html>).]