

Submission on the Remuneration Survey From PUB-Sig

Copies to be e-mailed to PUB-Sig list and Metronet (via Ruth Halliday)

3 November, 2004

Prepared by: PUB-Sig Treasurer Jeff Cabral, with input from PUB-Sig committee – the topic was discussed at the first Wellington region PUB-Sig committee meeting on 20 October, 2004.

To Whom It May Concern:

Our comments, concerns and points follow. These are in regard to the LIANZA and NZLL Remuneration Survey Discussion Paper from September 2004.

We strongly support the survey concept and the general approaches outlined.

We believe that Funding Options 1, 2, and 3 (from the paper) are possible and preferable in combination – with a tiered funding structure, i.e larger institutions contributing more.

We would like to see the survey capture information about the different labour markets in which public libraries operate, information on how salaries are arrived at and evaluated, and whether the salaries are linked to market trends and factors (i.e. small towns, low salaries). We would like to know what other information providers Councils are using to help inform the salary process.

We regard as highly important the element of ‘role clarity’ on the survey, and support data capture of a wide variety of job titles, with accompanying descriptive job definitions and lists of tasks, due to the many different titles attributed by public libraries to similar jobs. This is necessary to inform future data analysis to ensure that survey data users are comparing ‘like with like’. We would like to see this be a compulsory section, so that those completing the survey were forced to pick the title that most accurately describes the job. This may mean a table with many summarised options, specific to library sector type (e.g. ‘Library Assistant’ may be further segmented).

We would like to see factors captured on the survey that help group libraries, such as total operating budget, income, usage factors (issues, electronic usage such as databases and e-requests, visits, website visits), and population of community served (with respect to public libraries).

In general, we would like to see the survey include questions that are customised for public library needs.

We would like to see full information on the individual staff members captured – whether by summary (if submitted on behalf of libraries by Management) or individually (if submitted by individual staff members of libraries). Such information

would include: library and equivalent qualifications (the latter would be useful for specialist roles), number of staff under them, financial authority, outcomes of role. We would also like to see those completing the survey given an opportunity to flag where roles overlap in the library so that those analysing the data could compare individual roles and staff members in their own libraries.

We support the inclusion of an open question on contextual factors – e.g. different market conditions for specialist roles.

We would like to see a second stage consultation once the draft survey and the table with the titles and job definitions/roles are written, with the survey and table circulated for further comment. We strongly believe public libraries would be able to provide valuable feedback here.

We support site-specific data collection, and would like to see the full profession surveyed, including professional and non-professional positions in libraries. We would like to see one individual completing it on behalf of the site.

We support the availability of customised data requests following the survey, as well as ongoing support from the provider of the data (availability to answer questions, mine data, etc.) We would recommend the ‘base summary’ of the survey be supplied to all participants and funders, with additional analysis made available on a user pays basis. Perhaps a second-level ‘public library summary’ could be prepared for public libraries. Public libraries will have customised information needs particular to their individual situations.

We believe that National Library, LIANZA and large institutions should fund the majority of the survey costs.

We support the further consultation and solicitation of feedback from statistical experts and data collection professionals, to further aid the project.

We would recommend an incentive for those completing the survey, to assist in increasing responses.

We recommend a standard evaluation process along certain set criteria be used to select the service provider, not necessarily the cheapest.

In principle, PUB-Sig would be prepared to offer financial support for the Remuneration Survey project.

Thank you for offering us the opportunity to comment on the paper.

Regards,

Jeff Cabral
Library Manager, Upper Hutt City Library
Treasurer, PUB-Sig 2004