## Salary Survey Trends 2013-2014

Data for 10,168 professional staff members were reported this year for the 115 ARL university libraries, including their law and medical libraries ( 907 staff members reported by 72 medical libraries and 761 staff members reported by 77 law libraries). For the 10 nonuniversity ARL members, data were reported for 3,791 professional staff members.

The tables are organized in seven major sections. The first section includes Tables 1 through 4, which report salary figures for all professionals working in ARL member libraries, including law and medical library data. The second section includes salary information for the 10 nonuniversity research libraries of ARL. The third section, entitled "ARL University Libraries," reports data in Tables 7 through 27 for the "general" library system of the university ARL members, combining US and Canadian data but excluding law and medical data. The fourth section, composed of Tables 28 through 39, reports data on US ARL university library members excluding law and medical data; the fifth section, Tables 40-46, reports data on Canadian ARL university libraries excluding law and medical data. The sixth section, (Tables 47-56) and the seventh section (Tables 57-66) report on medical and law libraries, respectively, combining US and Canadian data.

The university population is generally treated in three distinct groups: staff in the "general" library system, staff in the university medical libraries, and staff in the university law libraries. Any branch libraries for which data were received, other than law and medical, are included in the "general" category, whether or not those libraries are administratively independent. Footnotes for many institutions provide information on branch inclusion or exclusion.

In all tables where data from US and Canadian institutions are combined, Canadian salaries are converted into US dollar equivalents at the rate of 1.0046 Canadian dollars per US dollar. ${ }^{1}$ Tables 4 and 40 through 46, however, pertain exclusively to staff in Canadian university libraries, so salary data in those tables are expressed in Canadian dollars.

## Race and Ethnicity

There were 1,302 minority professional staff reported in 99 US ARL university libraries, including law and medical libraries. ${ }^{2}$ Note that the data for minority professionals comes only from the US ARL university libraries following the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) definitions; Canadian law prohibits the identification of Canadians by ethnic category.

Currently, $14.6 \%$ of the professional staff in US ARL university libraries (including law and medical libraries) belong to one of the four non-Caucasian categories for which ARL keeps records. The percentage of minorities in managerial or leadership positions in ARL academic libraries is far lower: $8 \%$ are directors ( 9 out of 113), $7.7 \%$ are associate directors ( 25 out of 324 ), $7.2 \%$ are assistant directors ( 11 out of 153 ) and $9.5 \%$ (36 out of 379 ) are the head of a branch library (see Table 31). Figure 1, below, depicts the overall racial/ethnic distribution of professional staff in US ARL university libraries: Caucasian/Other 85.4\%, Asian/Pacific Islander 6.9\%, Black 4.4\%, Hispanic $2.9 \%$, and American Indian/Alaskan Native $0.4 \%$.

1 This is the average monthly noon exchange rate published in the Bank of Canada Review for the period July 2012-June 2013 and is used in converting figures that are shown effective as of 1 July 2013. This information can be accessed at: http://www. bankofcanada.ca/en/rates/exchange.html.

2 Some US institutions offer their librarians the option of not reporting race and ethnicity; others forbid the tracking of racial and ethnic classification altogether. See Footnotes.

Figure 1: Race/Ethnicity of Professional Staff in US ARL University Libraries, FY 2013-2014


Minority professional staff in US ARL university libraries continues to be disproportionately distributed across the country. Using Figure 2, we can compare the number of minority staff with other staff, region by region. These patterns of distribution have been relatively stable for the entire history of ARL's data-collection experience. Minorities are underrepresented by almost $41 \%$ in the West North Central region and by $31 \%$ in the New England region (see Table 27 for a definition of the regions). Proportionately to other regions, there are more minorities in the Pacific, South Atlantic, and West South Central regions.

Figure 2: Minority Professionals by Region in US ARL University Libraries, FY 2013-2014

| Race/ <br> Ethnicity <br> Category | New <br> England | Middle <br> Atlantic | East <br> North <br> Central | West <br> North <br> Central | South <br> Atlantic | East <br> South <br> Central | West <br> South <br> Central | Mountain | Pacific | Total | \% |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Black | 26 | 64 | 66 | 21 | 127 | 25 | 26 | 9 | 31 | 395 | $30 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 21 | 44 | 30 | 8 | 41 | 9 | 38 | 22 | 44 | 257 | $20 \%$ |
| Asian | 81 | 106 | 83 | 18 | 90 | 11 | 44 | 19 | 166 | 618 | $47 \%$ |
| American <br> Indian/Alaskan <br> Native | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  | 3 | 9 | 2 | 32 | $2 \%$ |
| Minority Total | 133 | 218 | 183 | 51 | 259 | 45 | 111 | 59 | 243 | 1,302 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Minority Percent | $10.2 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $19.9 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ |  |  |
| Nonminority <br> Total | 1,125 | 1,243 | 1,281 | 503 | 1,314 | 365 | 619 | 434 | 763 | 7,647 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Nonminority <br> Percent | $14.7 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |  |  |


| RACE/ <br> Ethnicity <br> CATEGORy | New England | Middle <br> Atlantic | EAST <br> North <br> Central | West <br> North <br> Central | South <br> Atlantic | EAST <br> South <br> Central | West <br> South <br> Central | Mountain | PACIFIC | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regional Percent Total staff | 14.1\% | 16.3\% | 16.4\% | 6.2\% | 17.6\% | 4.6\% | 8.2\% | 5.5\% | 11.2\% |  |  |
| Proportional <br> Minority <br> Representation | -30.61\% | 2.45\% | -16.07\% | -40.91\% | 15.70\% | -27.08\% | 4.94\% | -21.05\% | 87.00\% |  |  |

According to Figure 3 below, $69.4 \%$ of female professional staff in US ARL university libraries are members of the four racial/ethnic groups in Figure 2, whereas $61.8 \%$ of female professional staff are members of the Caucasian/ Other racial/ethnic group. The overall gender balance in the 115 Canadian and US university libraries (including law and medical libraries) is $36.3 \%$ male and $63.7 \%$ female. See Figure 2, above, and Figure 3, below, for more detail on race/ethnic and gender distribution.

Figure 3a: Distribution of Professional Staff in US ARL University Libraries by Sex, FY 2013-2014

| United States | Men |  | Women |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Staff | Percent of Staff | Number of Staff | Percent of Staff | Staff |
| Main | 2,904 | $38.6 \%$ | 4,615 | $61.4 \%$ | 7,519 |
| Medical | 206 | $26.1 \%$ | 584 | $73.9 \%$ | 790 |
| Law | 249 | $34.7 \%$ | 468 | $65.3 \%$ | 717 |
| All | $\mathbf{3 , 3 5 9}$ | $37.2 \%$ | 5,667 | $\mathbf{6 2 . 8} \%$ | $\mathbf{9 , 0 2 6}$ |

Figure 3b: Distribution of Professional Staff in US ARL University Libraries by Minority Status and Sex, FY 2013-2014

| United States | Men |  | Women |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Staff | Percent of Staff | Number of Staff | Percent of Staff | Staff |
| Minority* | 399 | $30.6 \%$ | 903 | $69.4 \%$ | 1,302 |
| Non-minority | 2,924 | $38.2 \%$ | 4,723 | $61.8 \%$ | 7,647 |
| All | 3,323 | $37.1 \%$ | 5,626 | $\mathbf{6 2 . 9} \%$ | $\mathbf{8 , 9 4 9}$ |

*Note: There are six US institutions that did not report race/ethnicity data; therefore, the totals will not aggregate to the total needed for the US and Canadian sub-totals to equal the figure displayed in the combined total.

Figure 3c: Distribution of Professional Staff in Canadian ARL University Libraries by Sex, FY 2013-2014

| Canada | Men |  | Women |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Staff | Percent of Staff | Number of Staff | Percent of Staff | Staff |
| Main | 307 | $31.3 \%$ | 674 | $68.7 \%$ | 981 |
| Medical | 13 | $11.1 \%$ | 104 | $88.9 \%$ | 117 |
| Law | 16 | $36.4 \%$ | 28 | $63.6 \%$ | 44 |
| All | 336 | $\mathbf{2 9 . 4} \%$ | $\mathbf{8 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 0 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 4 2}$ |

Figure 3d: Distribution of Professional Staff in All ARL University Libraries by Sex, FY 2013-2014

| Combined | Men |  | Women |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Staff | Percent of Staff | Number of Staff | Percent of Staff | Staff |
| Main | 3,211 | $37.8 \%$ | 5,289 | $62.2 \%$ | 8,500 |
| Medical | 219 | $24.1 \%$ | 688 | $75.9 \%$ | 907 |
| Law | 265 | $34.8 \%$ | 496 | $65.2 \%$ | 761 |
| All | $\mathbf{3 , 6 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 3} \%$ | $\mathbf{6 , 4 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 7} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 1 6 8}$ |

ARL recognizes the difficulties that the profession has in attracting a diverse workforce and continues to work actively in the development of workplace climates that embrace diversity. One way that ARL achieves this end is through the work of the ARL Diversity Program. The ARL Diversity Program through its Leadership and Career Development Program and the Initiative to Recruit a Diverse Workforce, emphasizes ARL's and its members' commitment to creating a diverse academic and research library community to better meet the new challenges of global competition and changing demographics. Further, the diversity program focuses on issues surrounding work relationships in libraries while considering the impact of diversity on library services, interactions with library users, and the development of collections. More information about the diversity program can be found at http://www.arl.org/leadership-recruitment/diversity-recruitment.

ClimateQUAL ${ }^{\circledR}$ is an assessment initiative that focuses on some of the same issues. It is the statistics and assessment program's tool that assesses organizational climate and diversity in libraries. ClimateQUAL helps libraries plumb the dimensions of climate and organizational culture important for a healthy organization in a library setting. The survey addresses climate issues such as diversity, teamwork, learning, and fairness, as well as current managerial practices, and staff attitudes and beliefs. Libraries use their survey data to improve their organizational climate and diversity culture for delivering superior services to the communities they serve. More information about ClimateQUAL can be found at http://www.climatequal.org.

## Gender data

Many readers of previous surveys have inquired about evidence of gender-based salary differentials in ARL libraries. Additionally, data on salary comparisons for directors are frequently requested. In 2008-2009 and 20092010, the average salary for female directors was slightly higher than that of their male counterparts. For the past three years, the trend was reversed. For the first time since 2009-2010, the average salary for female directors was slightly higher than that of their male counterparts (see Table 18).

In keeping with previous years, the 2013-2014 data show that salaries for women in US ARL university libraries have not yet met parity with that of men (see Table 18). In 2013-2014 the overall salary for women was $96.3 \%$ of that of men for the 115 ARL university libraries (compared to $96.22 \%$ in 2011-2012). This suggests a slow, longterm trend towards closure of the gender gap in ARL libraries - in 1980-81, women in ARL libraries made roughly $87 \%$ that of men.

Table 18 displays 19 job categories; females earn more than their male counterparts in just 6 of the 19 categories listed. Table 20 provides average years of professional experience for many of the same staffing categories for which salary data are shown in Table 18, revealing that experience differentials may explain some differences within specific job categories. Women have more experience in all but one of the six job categories in which they
average higher pay. In keeping with the 2012-2013 data, there are seven categories where women, on average, have more experience and less pay: Associate Director, Administrative Specialist, Digital Specialist; Head, Rare Books/Manuscripts/Special Collections; Head, Library Technology; Department Head-Other; and Public Services. Table 22 further reveals that the average salary for men is consistently higher than the average salary for women in all ten experience cohorts. Among minority librarians, the pattern is the same (see Table 39).

There is a sense that the gender gap persists in academe in areas beyond the library and that a renewed commitment to resolve the problem is needed. ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~A}$ variety of reasons have been offered as to why these trends persist, most notably the perception that work is peripheral in a woman's life and, consequently, femaledominated professions are undervalued. Librarianship is predominantly and persistently a woman's profession. The scarcity of men in the profession has been well documented in many studies - the largest percentage of men employed in ARL libraries was $38.2 \%$ in 1980-81; since then men have consistently represented about $35 \%$ of the professional staff in ARL libraries.

## The Specialist Breakdowns

The job categories and job codes for the university libraries in the ARL Annual Salary Survey 2013-2014 reflect the continued revision and modernization of the survey, a process that began with the 2012-2013 survey under the direction of the Task Force on Reviewing the ARL Statistics, the ARL Annual Salary Survey, and the ARL Supplementary Statistics. A new code was added to the Digital Specialist category: SS for Digital Specialists with Subject expertise, and four new codes were added to the Subject Specialist category: HFA, SCI, SBS, and AREA for the Humanities/Fine Arts, Sciences and Technology, Social/Behavioral Sciences, and Area Studies, respectively. For each of the new job codes, ARL institutions were offered two options: either use one of the new job codes to describe that position; or, if none of the new job codes could adequately describe that position, use one of the broader category job codes: FSPEC, ADMSPEC, or DIGITALSPEC.

As seen in the revised Figure 4, which now includes all positions, the category that includes Administrative Specialists (no subgroup) makes up $2 \%$ of the dataset; the category that includes Digital Specialists (no subgroup) makes up $1.0 \%$ of the dataset, and the category that includes Functional Specialists (no subgroup) makes up $2 \%$ of the data set. Archivists comprised the largest percentage of Functional Specialists who used an alternative code (5.8\%), and Information Technology specialists comprised the largest percentage of Digital Specialists who used an alternative code (9.1\%).

[^0]Figure 4: Distribution of Job Codes and Sub-Codes by Position and Type of Library, FY 2013-2014

| Position | Main |  | Medical |  | Law |  | All Positions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Director | 113 | 1.3\% |  |  |  |  | 113 | 1.1\% |
| Associate Director | 324 | 3.8\% | 55 | 6.1\% | 51 | 6.7\% | 430 | 4.2\% |
| Assistant Director | 153 | 1.8\% | 37 | 4.1\% | 53 | 7.0\% | 243 | 2.4\% |
| Head, Medical |  |  | 64 | 7.1\% |  |  | 64 | . $6 \%$ |
| Head, Law |  |  |  |  | 73 | 9.6\% | 73 | .7\% |
| Head, Branch | 379 | 4.5\% | 21 | 2.3\% |  |  | 400 | 3.9\% |
| Dept. Head |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acquisitions | 116 | 1.4\% | 23 | 2.5\% | 32 | 4.2\% | 171 | 1.7\% |
| Cataloging | 160 | 1.9\% | 11 | 1.2\% | 31 | 4.1\% | 202 | 2.0\% |
| Circulation | 121 | 1.4\% | 16 | 1.8\% | 26 | 3.4\% | 163 | 1.6\% |
| Library Technology | 113 | 1.3\% | 12 | 1.3\% | 5 | .7\% | 130 | 1.3\% |
| Rare Book/Manuscripts/ Special Collections | 104 | 1.2\% | 8 | .9\% | 3 | . $4 \%$ | 115 | 1.1\% |
| Research/Reference/ Information or Learning Commons | 126 | 1.5\% | 21 | 2.3\% | 25 | 3.3\% | 172 | 1.7\% |
| Other Department Heads | 606 | 7.1\% | 58 | 6.4\% | 28 | 3.7\% | 692 | 6.8\% |
| Administrative Specialist (no subgroup); Administrative support, Marketing/ Communication/IP Permissions, Other Administrative | 180 | 2.1\% | 12 | 1.3\% | 9 | 1.2\% | 201 | 2.0\% |
| Business Manager | 170 | 2.0\% | 11 | 1.2\% | 4 | .5\% | 185 | 1.8\% |
| Human Resources | 89 | 1.0\% | 3 | . $3 \%$ |  |  | 92 | .9\% |
| Development/ Advancement | 44 | . $5 \%$ | 2 | . $2 \%$ |  |  | 46 | . $5 \%$ |
| Digital Specialist (no subgroup), Institutional Repository Curator; Digital Specialist with Subject Expertise | 94 | 1.1\% | 4 | .4\% | 8 | 1.1\% | 106 | 1.0\% |
| IT, Systems | 372 | 4.4\% | 26 | 2.9\% | 17 | 2.2\% | 415 | 4.1\% |
| IT, Web Developer | 169 | 2.0\% | 17 | 1.9\% | 10 | 1.3\% | 196 | 1.9\% |
| IT, Programmer | 294 | 3.5\% | 17 | 1.9\% |  |  | 311 | 3.1\% |
| Scholarly Communications | 60 | .7\% | 3 | . $3 \%$ |  |  | 63 | . $6 \%$ |
| Digital Acquisitions | 89 | 1.0\% | 6 | .7\% | 4 | .5\% | 99 | 1.0\% |
| Digital Collections Curation | 114 | 1.3\% | 2 | . $2 \%$ | 4 | .5\% | 120 | 1.2\% |


| Position | Main |  | Medical |  | Law |  | All Positions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent | No. | Percent |
| Functional Specialist (no subgroup); Coordinator, Team Leader (non-supervisory responsibility) | 181 | 2.1\% | 18 | 2.0\% | 9 | 1.2\% | 208 | 2.0\% |
| Archivists | 558 | 6.6\% | 24 | 2.6\% | 4 | .5\% | 586 | 5.8\% |
| Assessment, Management Information Systems, Planning | 60 | .7\% | 1 | .1\% | 2 | .3\% | 63 | .6\% |
| Media Specialists | 98 | 1.2\% | 4 | .4\% | 3 | .4\% | 105 | 1.0\% |
| Preservation, including digital collections | 150 | 1.8\% | 1 | .1\% |  |  | 151 | 1.5\% |
| Subject Specialist (no subgroup) | 839 | 9.9\% | 132 | 14.6\% | 72 | 9.5\% | 1043 | 10.3\% |
| Subject Specialist in Humanities/Fine Arts | 193 | 2.3\% |  |  | 1 | .1\% | 194 | 1.9\% |
| Subject Specialist in Sciences \& Technology | 202 | 2.4\% | 33 | 3.6\% | 1 | .1\% | 236 | 2.3\% |
| Subject Specialist in Social/ Behavior Science | 187 | 2.2\% | 6 | .7\% | 10 | 1.3\% | 203 | 2.0\% |
| Subject Specialist in Area Studies | 172 | 2.0\% |  |  | 1 | .1\% | 173 | 1.7\% |
| Catalogers/Metadata analysts | 662 | 7.8\% | 16 | 1.8\% | 37 | 4.9\% | 715 | 7.0\% |
| Research/Reference/Instruction | 872 | 10.3\% | 191 | 21.1\% | 193 | 25.4\% | 1256 | 12.4\% |
| Public Services | 207 | 2.4\% | 43 | 4.7\% | 28 | 3.7\% | 278 | 2.7\% |
| Technical Services | 129 | 1.5\% | 9 | 1.0\% | 17 | 2.2\% | 155 | 1.5\% |
| All Positions: | 8,500 |  | 907 |  | 761 |  | 10,168 |  |

Figure 5 below has been revised to include law and medical libraries and this table now displays the average salaries for all positions in the salary survey, including the subcategories by position and sex. The salaries in each of the sub-categories deviates widely from the average salaries for the new specialist categories, which are $\$ 69,808$ for the category containing the Administrative Specialist (no subgroup) category (ADMSPEC), $\$ 66,065$ for the category containing the Digital Specialist (no subgroup) category (DIGITALSPEC), and \$64,967 the category containing the Functional Specialist (no subgroup) category (FSPEC).
Development/Advancement specialists have the highest average of all subcategories of the Administrative Specialist category: \$78,209; Media/Multimedia specialists have the lowest average salary overall: \$59,441. IT Programmers have the highest average salary of the Digital Specialist category: $\$ 73,631$, and professionals with Assessment, Management Information Systems, Planning responsibilities (a new subcategory) have the highest salaries of the Functional Specialist category: \$70,758.

Figure 5: Number and Average Salaries of ARL University Librarians by Position and Sex, Specialist Breakdown, FY 2013-2014

| Position | Women |  | Men |  | All Positions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | No. | Average | No. | Average | No. |
| Director | 220,407 | 67 | 219,034 | 46 | 219,848 | 113 |
| Associate Director | 120,052 | 260 | 123,650 | 170 | 121,474 | 430 |
| Assistant Director | 97,598 | 155 | 108,098 | 88 | 101,400 | 243 |
| Head, Medical | 134,961 | 53 | 150,770 | 11 | 137,678 | 64 |
| Head, Law | 166,052 | 38 | 172,362 | 35 | 169,077 | 73 |
| Head, Branch | 86,653 | 278 | 91,636 | 122 | 88,173 | 400 |
| Dept. Head |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acquisitions | 76,327 | 120 | 75,272 | 51 | 76,012 | 171 |
| Cataloging | 80,962 | 147 | 78,252 | 55 | 80,224 | 202 |
| Circulation | 75,100 | 108 | 70,896 | 55 | 73,681 | 163 |
| Library Technology | 92,624 | 41 | 95,959 | 89 | 94,907 | 130 |
| Rare Book/Manuscripts/Special Collections | 94,712 | 56 | 92,677 | 59 | 93,668 | 115 |
| Research/Reference/Information or Learning Commons | 82,363 | 120 | 84,487 | 52 | 83,005 | 172 |
| Other Department Heads | 83,586 | 452 | 86,112 | 240 | 84,462 | 692 |
| Administrative Specialist (no subgroup); Administrative support, Marketing/ Communication/IP Permissions, Other Administrative | 68,718 | 151 | 73,099 | 50 | 69,808 | 201 |
| Business Manager | 75,293 | 115 | 76,239 | 70 | 75,651 | 185 |
| Human Resources | 74,307 | 80 | 72,478 | 12 | 74,069 | 92 |
| Development / Advancement | 80,374 | 29 | 74,515 | 17 | 78,209 | 46 |
| Digital Specialist (no subgroup), <br> Institutional Repository Curator; Digital Specialist with Subject Expertise | 64,041 | 64 | 69,148 | 42 | 66,065 | 106 |
| IT, Systems | 72,470 | 132 | 69,742 | 283 | 70,610 | 415 |
| IT, Web Developer | 64,334 | 80 | 69,005 | 116 | 67,099 | 196 |
| IT, Programmer | 71,753 | 71 | 74,186 | 240 | 73,631 | 311 |
| Scholarly Communications | 72,223 | 42 | 74,928 | 21 | 73,125 | 63 |
| Digital Acquisitions | 67,336 | 74 | 69,214 | 25 | 67,810 | 99 |
| Digital Collections Curation | 64,106 | 68 | 67,870 | 52 | 65,737 | 120 |


| Position | Women |  | MEN |  | All Positions |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Average | No. | Average | No. | Average | No. |
| Functional Specialist (no subgroup); <br> Coordinator, Team Leader (non- <br> supervisory responsibility) | 63,621 | 136 | 67,510 | 72 | 64,967 | 208 |
| Archivists |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment, Management Information <br> Systems, Planning | 71,836 | 43 | 68,441 | 20 | 70,758 | 63 |
| Media Specialists | 62,803 | 366 | 66,906 | 220 | 64,344 | 586 |
| Preservation, including digital <br> collections | 60,580 | 43 | 58,652 | 62 | 59,441 | 105 |
| Subject Specialist | 63,477 | 108 | 69,022 | 43 | 65,056 | 151 |
| Subject Specialist in Humanities/Fine <br> Arts | 69,503 | 121 | 74,792 | 73 | 71,493 | 194 |
|  <br> Technology | 66,326 | 168 | 69,242 | 68 | 67,166 | 236 |
| Subject Specialist in Social/Behavior <br> Science | 66,690 | 139 | 72,690 | 64 | 68,582 | 203 |
| Subject Specialist in Area Studies | 71,573 | 107 | 72,476 | 66 | 71,917 | 173 |
| Catalogers /Metadata analysts | 65,466 | 504 | 67,487 | 211 | 66,062 | 715 |
| Research/Reference/Instruction | 67,848 | 927 | 66,795 | 329 | 67,572 | 1,256 |
| Public Services | 64,936 | 189 | 65,613 | 89 | 65,153 | 278 |
| Technical Services | 60,446 | 114 | 57,279 | 41 | 59,608 | 155 |
| All Positions: | 76,123 | 6,473 | 79,344 | 3,695 | 77,294 | 10,168 |

In regards to the gender gap in ARL libraries discussed in the previous section, it is worth noting that the average salaries of men are higher than those of women in 26 out of the 38 categories in Figure 5.

## Institutional Characteristics and Salaries

## Public and Private Institutions

The gap between salaries paid in private ARL university libraries and those paid in publicly supported ARL university libraries decreased in 2013-2014 to $8.7 \%$, with librarians at private institutions earning an average of $\$ 6,298$ more than their peers at public institutions. Librarians in public institutions systematically earned less than their peers employed in private institutions across all 19 job categories in Table 23.

## Library Size

Library size, as measured by the number of professional staff, is another significant determinant of salary. As a rule, the largest libraries tend to pay the highest average salaries, not only overall, but for specific positions as well. However, in 2013-2014 libraries with 75 to 100 staff reported the highest average salary, $\$ 78,283$, followed by the largest libraries, i.e., those with more than 110 staff, which reported the next highest average salary $\$ 77,888$ (see Table 25). The gap between the highest paying cohort and the lowest paying cohort was
cut in half in 2013-2014, decreasing to $\$ 3,208$. The cutoff staffing levels used to determine the largest cohort of libraries, after declining in every year since 1995-96, continued to hold steady at over 110 in 2013-2014. ${ }^{4}$

## Geographic Area

In 2013-2014, the highest average salaries were found in Canada $(\$ 93,154)$ followed by New England $(\$ 82,030)$ with salaries in the Middle Atlantic region $(\$ 80,261)$ coming in third (see Table 27). The Canadian average salary peaked again this year, reflecting another all-time high. For the 2013-2014 survey period, the Canadian currency exchange rate is 1.0046 . The West South Central region had the lowest average salary: $\$ 65,314$.

## Rank Structure

Rank structure provides a useful framework for examining professional salaries in ARL university libraries. Figure 6, below, displays average salary and years of experience in the most commonly used rank structures. Readers should be aware that not all individuals have a rank that fits into the rank structure the library utilizes. Most commonly, directors may have no rank (or a rank outside the structure) and it is common for non-librarians included in the survey (business officers, personnel staff, computer specialists, liaisons, etc.) to be unranked, as well.

The pattern of relationships between rank and salary seen in past years continues: with higher rank associated with higher average years of experience and a correspondingly higher salary. Of the 10,168 librarians in ARL university member libraries, 6,077 occupy a rank within these three most commonly found ranking systems, and the largest number of professionals $(3,072)$ occupy a position in a four-step rank structure.

Figure 6a: Average Salaries and Average Years of Experience of Library Professionals in Libraries with Three, Four, and Five Step Rank Structures, FY 2013-2014

|  | Three-Step |  |  | Four-Step |  |  | Five-Step |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Salary | Experience | No. of Staff | Salary | Experience | No. of Staff | Salary | Experience | No. of Staff |
| Librarian 1 | 63,981 | 8.0 | 467 | 58,020 | 8.4 | 450 | 56,948 | 11.7 | 235 |
| Librarian 2 | 76,072 | 18.1 | 637 | 66,597 | 12.8 | 867 | 61,535 | 12.9 | 290 |
| Librarian 3 | 91,890 | 24.6 | 404 | 78,728 | 20.0 | 1,166 | 73,616 | 17.3 | 525 |
| Librarian 4 | . | . | . | 94,297 | 27.0 | 589 | 88,246 | 23.1 | 320 |
| Librarian 5 | . | . | . | . | . | . | 107,274 | 28.1 | 127 |
| No. of Staff | 1,508 |  |  | 3,072 |  |  | 1,497 |  |  |

The direct relationship between rank and salary is highlighted even more in the three tables below, which show average salary by percentile in each of the three rank structures presented in Figure 6.

Figure 6b: Average Salary by Percentile in Libraries with Three Step Rank Structures, FY 2013-2014

|  | No. of Staff | Low | 25th Percentile | Median | 75th Percentile | High |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Librarian 1 | 467 | 36,720 | 51,796 | 60,160 | 74,229 | 125,081 |
| Librarian 2 | 637 | 45,000 | 60,000 | 70,211 | 84,991 | 168,549 |
| Librarian 3 | 404 | 35,877 | 75,972 | 91,140 | 105,612 | 168,303 |

4 In 1995-96, the largest cohort of libraries was determined based on staff over 124; in 1996-98, over 120; in 1998-99, over 115; and since 1999-2000, over 110. See Table 23.
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Figure 6c: Average Salary by Percentile in Libraries with Four Step Rank Structures, FY 2013-2014

|  | No. of Staff | Low | 25th Percentile | Median | 75th Percentile | High |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Librarian 1 | 450 | 36,503 | 50,000 | 56,150 | 64,132 | 138,382 |
| Librarian 2 | 867 | 36,750 | 54,645 | 62,734 | 74,300 | 169,226 |
| Librarian 3 | 1166 | 41,091 | 63,558 | 73,393 | 89,901 | 251,500 |
| Librarian 4 | 589 | 47,985 | 75,360 | 87,600 | 107,450 | 240,000 |

Figure 6d: Average Salary by Percentile in Libraries with Five Step Rank Structures, FY 2013-2014

|  | No. of Staff | Low | 25th Percentile | Median | 75th Percentile | High |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Librarian 1 | 235 | 24,570 | 48,058 | 55,738 | 64,360 | 106,850 |
| Librarian 2 | 290 | 25,584 | 52,871 | 60,770 | 70,143 | 108,791 |
| Librarian 3 | 525 | 40,428 | 61,106 | 73,089 | 83,437 | 140,555 |
| Librarian 4 | 320 | 50,228 | 73,208 | 86,819 | 100,307 | 190,000 |
| Librarian 5 | 127 | 52,093 | 92,048 | 103,083 | 125,124 | 172,872 |

## Inflation Effect

Tables 2 and 6 reveal changes in beginning professional and median salaries as reported by both university and nonuniversity research libraries as well as the US Bureau of Labor's Cost of Living Index (CPI-All Urban Consumers). Table 3 is similar to Table 2, but reports data only on US libraries. Table 4 shows trend data for Canadian libraries and compares them to the changes in the Canadian Consumer Price Index (Consumer Price Index for Canada, all-items, not seasonally adjusted). Tables 2, 3, and 4 include law and medical library staff in ARL university libraries. Bucking the two-year trend from 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, Tables 3 and 4 indicate that the purchasing power of professionals in the United States and Canada kept pace with inflation.

For the first time since 2011-2012, US salaries surpassed inflation. US CPI increased by $2 \% \%^{5}$ (see Table 3), and the median salary for US ARL university libraries in 2013 increased by $2.3 \%$ to $\$ 68,773$ (see Table 3). Canadian salaries (reported in Canadian dollars) surpassed inflation by 1 percentage point: the Canadian CPI increased $1.3 \%$, while median salaries in Canadian university libraries increased by $2.3 \%$ to $\$ 89,163$ (Canadian dollars, see Table 4). ${ }^{6}$ The median beginning salary (BPS) for university ARL librarians increased to \$48,000 in 2013-2014 (see Table 2). Table 6 shows that median salaries for nonuniversity librarians increased to $\$ 95,173$, while beginning salaries rebounded in 2013-2014, increasing to $\$ 51,630$.

Readers are reminded that these data reflect only salaries, and that there are other compensation issues which may have influenced the pattern of salaries in various institutions. In addition, a highly standardized structure for capturing data has been used, which may portray results in a way that cannot be fully representative of a local situation.

[^1]
## The Revised 2013-2014 ARL Salary Survey

The ARL Annual Salary Survey 2013-2014 reports salary data for all professional staff working in ARL member libraries. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) represents the interests of libraries that serve major North American research institutions. The Association operates as a forum for the exchange of ideas and as an agent for collective action to influence forces affecting the ability of these libraries to meet the future needs of scholarship. The ARL Statistics and Assessment program, which produces the salary survey, is organized around collecting, analyzing, and distributing quantifiable information describing the characteristics of research libraries. The ARL Annual Salary Survey is the most comprehensive and thorough guide to current salaries in large US and Canadian academic and research libraries and is a valuable management and research tool.

The job categories and job codes for the university libraries in the ARL Annual Salary Survey 2012-2013 were revised and modernized after an extensive review process led by the Task Force on Reviewing the ARL Statistics, the ARL Annual Salary Survey, and the ARL Supplementary Statistics. Members of the ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee and the task force interviewed ARL directors during the Spring of 2011 and collected feedback that helped them articulate the key issues, questions, and revisions for annual data collection purposes. This feedback was shared with ARL library directors and salary survey contacts, and the final list of job categories was approved by the ARL Board in April of 2011.

The ARL Annual Salary Survey 2013-2014 reflects the continuation of this work. For the second consecutive year, the salary survey collected working job titles for the university libraries to evaluate the new job codes and their use in response to feedback from survey coordinators. Also, five new job categories were added to the ARL Annual Salary Survey 2013-2014: SS for Digital Specialists with Subject expertise; and HFA, SCI, SBS, and AREA for subject specialists in the Humanities/Fine Arts, Sciences and Technology, Social/Behavioral Sciences, and Area Studies, respectively.

These new codes highlight the subject-based and subject-specific work of professional librarians in ARL libraries, thereby providing a more nuanced description of the scope, work responsibilities, and emerging roles of librarians in research libraries. Please see the instructions for the ARL Annual Salary Survey 2013-2014 on p. 131 for a more complete list of the new and revised job codes.

Initial diagnostics showed that some of the new job categories had too few cases. These categories have been aggregated into larger groups. For the second consecutive year, the broader Administrative Specialist category and the Administrative Support category, ADMSPEC (no subgroup) ( $\mathrm{n}=4$ ) and ADMIN ( $\mathrm{n}=176$ ), respectively, were combined to create one category for those who provide general administrative support that may also encompass marketing, communications, and IP permissions work. The broader Digital Specialist category (DIGITALSPEC (no subgroup), $\mathrm{n}=13$ ) was combined with two subcategories with the lowest number of cases: Digital Specialist with Subject Expertise, a new category this year (SS, n=53) and Institutional Repository Curator (IR, $\mathrm{n}=28$ ). Scholarly Communications (SCHOLAR, $\mathrm{n}=60$ ) is reported separately this year. Finally, for the second consecutive year, the broader Functional Specialist category (FSPEC (no subgroup), $\mathrm{n}=153$ ) and the Coordinator, Team Leader (nonsupervisory responsibility) category (CTL, $\mathrm{n}=28$ ) were combined to create one broad category for individuals whose specialized work is not subject based and who do not have significant supervisory responsibilities.

This revision of the ARL Annual Salary Survey job categories was conducted with the understanding that the salary survey attempts to provide a standardized schema to fit more than 100 different and complex research library structures. So, any such standardization is viewed as a reasonable and practical schema that meets management and planning needs to a certain extent, yet it is likely that it will leave important evidence outside any adopted framework. The ARL Statistics and Assessment Committee and the ARL Board Task Force on revising the annual surveys recognizes that the revision of the salary survey job categories is an iterative
process. Such revisions help us keep pace with the rapidly changing workforce in research libraries, while simultaneously codifying and reflecting the evolution of the 21st century research library workforce in the salary survey data.

## Downloadable Data Tables

The online version of the ARL Annual Salary Survey 2013-2014 includes access to a spreadsheet of the data tables that are presented in the publication. Online readers can click on the Resources icon (the downward pointing arrow) in the sidebar menu to download the data tables in Excel format.

Martha Kyrillidou
Shaneka Morris
Association of Research Libraries
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[^0]:    3 There are many instances citing the continuation of gender inequity in academia. See, for example: Mary Ann Mason, "Still Earning Less," Chronicle of Higher Education 13 January 2010 http://chronicle.com/article/Still-Earning-Less/63482/; Katherine Mangan, "Women in Academic Medicine: Equal to Men, Except in Pay," Chronicle of Higher Education 31 March 2010 http://chronicle.com/article/Women-in-Academic-Medicine-/64892/; Paula Wasley, " Gender Gap in Pay Widens Over Time," Chronicle of Higher Education 4 May 2007 http://chronicle.com/article/Gender-Gap-in-Pay-Widens-Over/9208/; Denise K. Manger's articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education, "Faculty Salaries Increased 3.7\% in 1999-2000" (14 April 2000: A20) and "Faculty Salaries are Up 3.6\%, Double the Rate of Inflation" (23 April 1999: A16); D. W. Miller, "Salary Gap Between Male and Female Professors Grows Over the Years, Study Suggests," Chronicle of Higher Education, Today's News, 27 April 2000; and Yolanda Moses, "Salaries in Academe: The Gender Gap Persists," Chronicle of Higher Education 12 December 1997: A60.

[^1]:    5 CPI data retrieved from the US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index-All Urban Consumers (US All items, 1982-84=100-CUUR0000SA0) available online at http://www.bls.gov/data/.
    6 The source for Canadian CPI data is Table 5: The Consumer Price Index for Canada (All-Items, Not Seasonally Adjusted, Historical Data) published in The Daily, a Statistics Canada publication, available online at http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/62-001-x/2014003/t040-eng.htm

