

V. ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Administration	2
The School: Integral yet Distinctive Unit.....	2
Administration of the School	2
History of Title, Status and Authority of School and Unit Head	2
The Executive Officer.....	3
Current Title, Status, Authority of School and Unit Head	4
Qualifications of Unit Head	4
Administrative Autonomy Issues.....	5
Participation and Governance	7
Participation of Faculty in University Governance	7
Financial Support.....	7
Institutional Support of Program.....	7
Changes in Income and Expenditures	9
Comparing School to Other LIS Schools	10
Equitably Established Compensation.....	10
Number and Compensation of Faculty.....	11
Institutional Funds for Research, Travel, Etc	14
Travel and Other Support for Faculty	14
Number and Compensation of Staff.....	14
Comparability of Salary of School Unit Head	15
Support for Students and Faculty.....	16
Support for Faculty Development and Travel.....	16
Support for Students and Learning Environment.....	16
Budget Autonomy.....	17
Review of Planning and Evaluation Process.....	17
Recommendations.....	18
Appendices (list).....	19

V. ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Introduction

The year 2003 marked the tenth anniversary of the merger of the College of Library and Information Science with the College of Communications to form the College of Communications and Information Studies. After a decade, the benefits from the merger are clear and significant. Since our 1997 *Program Presentation* there have been two major administrative changes at the University of Kentucky. In the first, administration of the community college system was removed from UK. In the second, President Lee Todd, who took office July 1, 2001, moved to a provost administrative model to replace the chancellor model that he inherited.

Administration

The School: Integral yet Distinctive Academic Unit

V.1 The school is an integral yet distinctive academic unit within the institution. Its autonomy is sufficient to assure that the intellectual content of its program, the selection and promotion of its faculty, and the selection of its students are determined by the school within the general guidelines of the institution. The parent institution provides the resources and administrative support needed for the attainment of program objectives.

Administration of the School

The University of Kentucky School of Library and Information Science is one of three units within the College of Communications and Information Studies. The unit head of the school has the title director and reports to the dean of the college. Organization charts of the college and the university are provided in Appendix A.

Since an important aspect of Standard V is that "the executive officer of a program has title, salary, status and authority comparable to heads of similar units in the parent institution," in this section of the *Program Presentation* we explain the history and current status of the unit at the University of Kentucky and offer comparisons regarding the directors and faculty ranks and salaries of similar units on the UK campus. Following the discussion of the unit head, we explore issues of administrative autonomy.

History of Title, Status and Authority of School and its Unit Head

A program of library science has existed at the University of Kentucky since 1932. As the university grew and changed in organizational structure, so did the library science program. In 1970 the program was designated the College of Library Science with the executive officer, the dean, reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the chief academic officer. A change in the early 1980s in the organizational structure of the university's central administration produced the chancellor system, with a Chancellor for the Community College System, a Chancellor for the Medical Center, and a Chancellor for the Lexington Campus.¹ The dean of this program, which was renamed the College of Library and Information Science in 1982, continued to report to the chief academic officer, the Chancellor of the Lexington Campus. How-

¹ When the university comprised three sectors, "Lexington Campus" was one of the three. The others were the medical center and the community college system. Emphasis today is on UK as a single administrative unit.

ever, the Dean of the College of Library and Information Science represented the smallest and one of only two single-program colleges of the 13 colleges of the Lexington Campus.²

In 1993, when the College of Library and Information Science merged with the College of Communications to form the College of Communications and Information Studies, the program in library and information studies was renamed the School of Library and Information Science, and the unit head became the director.

During the merger deliberations, several issues emerged that related to the unit head of our program. One had to do with the status of the program, whether it would be a department or a school. When the decision was made to establish it as a school within the college, it was determined that the unit head would be designated a director. The new post of director reported to the dean of the college, rather than directly to the chancellor.

In 1994, then College of Communications and Information Studies Dean Douglas Boyd authorized the school to conduct a national search for a new director. Donald O. Case, then Associate Professor at UCLA, joined the school in July of 1994 and served as director until August of 1997, when the current director, Timothy Sineath, took the post.

Beginning in the late 1990s, two major changes were made to the administrative structure of the university. In the first of these, administration of the 14-member community college system was severed from UK, and 13 of the two-year schools were combined administratively with the state's technical colleges, to form the Kentucky Community and Technical College System.³ In the second major change, President Lee Todd, who assumed that office July 1, 2001, moved to a provost administrative model. Previously, the University of Kentucky comprised two "sectors,"⁴ which were Lexington Campus and the Medical Center, each of which was headed by a chancellor. In the new structure, the post of Lexington Campus Chancellor was eliminated, and the Medical Center Chancellor became a Senior Vice President. All vice presidents report to the president, including a Senior Vice President for Administration, a Vice President for Corporate Relations and Economic Outreach, a Vice President for Fiscal Affairs and Information Technology, a Vice President for Auxiliary and Campus Services, and a Vice President for Research. The Vice President for Research also has a liaison relationship with the provost. The university's first provost was appointed in 2001; reporting to the provost are all of the college deans, the Dean of Libraries, the Director of the University Press of Kentucky, a vice provost and various associate provosts. These structural changes were especially welcome on the former Lexington Campus. They eliminated one layer of hierarchy, and, according to President Lee Todd, "will save \$1.25 million annually."⁵

The Executive Officer

V.3 The executive officer of a program has title, salary, status, and authority comparable to heads of similar units in the parent institution. In addition to academic qualifications comparable to those required of the faculty, the executive officer has leadership skills, administrative ability, experience, and understanding of developments in the field and in the academic environment

² The College of Social Work was the other.

³ The 14th community college, which was located on the UK campus, remained a part of the University of Kentucky.

⁴ When the community college system was a part of the University of Kentucky, the system was a third "sector."

⁵ University of Kentucky 2001 Annual Report, p.4, available at <http://www.uky.edu/Home/AnnualReport/2001.pdf>

needed to fulfill the responsibilities of the position. The school's executive officer nurtures an intellectual environment that enhances the pursuit of the school's mission and program goals and objectives; that environment also encourages faculty and student interaction with other academic units and promotes the socialization of students into the field.

Current Title, Status, Authority of School and Its Unit Head

The roles and responsibilities of deans of colleges, directors of schools, and department chairpersons are found in the Governing Regulations VII.B.4-5 (see Appendix B), portions of which are quoted below.

The director of a school with one department assumes the role of department chairperson. In addition, "The director's administrative responsibilities shall be those delegated by the dean of the college, of which the school is a part." The title and the status of the director are defined in the Governing Regulations. The authority, and to a great extent the autonomy, of the program is determined by the degree to which the dean of the college delegates responsibility to the director.

Areas where the Dean of the College of Communications and Information Studies has delegated the major share of responsibility to the director and the school include curriculum, instruction, recruitment, assignment of duties to school personnel, and service.

Areas where the Dean of the College of Communications and Information Studies is involved to some degree include:

- Reviews of faculty performance submitted by the director
- Faculty and staff Salaries
- Reviews of appointment recommendations from the school
- College-level reviews for promotion and tenure
- Two-year and four-year reviews of assistant professors
- Budgeting

In these areas the dean reviews what the director has done and frequently offers advice. There have been, thus far, no instances in which the dean has refused to sign off on a decision of the director. In the case of promotion decisions, we have not seen instances where there have been strong disagreements between the school and college promotion and tenure committees, or between the latter committee and the dean.

The dean regularly reviews the performance of the school's director. During 2002-2003, Director Sineath underwent a full administrative review, during which all school faculty were consulted; the review resulted in Dr. Timothy Sineath's reappointment as director.

Qualifications of Unit Head

Dr. Sineath's academic credentials and experience are appropriate for appointment as director. His professional (MLS) and research (PhD) degrees are from Florida State University and University of Illinois, respectively. Having served as a professor in the school for more than 30 years and dean/director for more than 17 years, Dr. Sineath has a thorough grounding in library and information studies education. Furthermore, his pre-doctoral experience includes five years of practical experience in the field as a librarian. Particularly noteworthy are his areas of special competence and research in management planning, organ-

izational development, psychology of small groups, assessment, and administration of professional education, which is an ideal background for a unit head. In addition, his PhD minor in educational psychology is a beneficial credential for an educational unit head.

In particular, Dr. Sineath's administrative experience as a former dean of what was then the UK College of Library and Information Science, in the 1980s, and as Director of the School of Library and Information Science in the College of Communications and Information Studies from 1997 to the present, supports his continuing appointment in this position.

In the six years that Dr. Sineath has been the director, he has conducted the administrative business of the school with efficiency and has directly involved faculty in governance through the school council and other committees, in an atmosphere of collegiality. As chair of the school council, he has developed and guided the faculty through agendas at the regular meetings of the council, where consensus is usually reached on issues. Dr. Sineath has encouraged faculty to be innovative in their teaching. He has demonstrated sensitivity to issues related to students' academic and professional experiences in the program and has supported faculty efforts. He has participated in and guided student groups and activities which contribute to their professional awareness. He has worked steadily on building a continuing relationship with the school's alumni. He also has represented the school well in professional activities in the state and the region while continuing his participation on the national level.

The survey administered each semester to degree-candidates as they leave the program provides evidence that the director and the administrative staff are effective in what they do. Responses to the single question rating administration on a one-to-five scale were analyzed for the period of 2000-2003, when such data were available in a consistent format. They show high ratings every semester, and much consistency across semesters, from the 130 graduates who answered the question. With a rating of 5 signifying excellent, the responses per semester averaged from 4.0 to 4.6, with an overall average of 4.5 on the scale. Indeed, it is unusual for a degree-candidate to mark anything less than a 4; there were only two students who responded with either a 1 or 2 over this three-year period. In addition, various marginal comments praised the school staff for their responsiveness to student questions and problems.

Administrative Autonomy Issues

The College of Communication and Information Studies contains two professional schools (Library and Information Science, and Journalism and Telecommunications), and the academic Department of Communication (see Organization Chart for College, in Appendix A).

While obvious intellectual and functional commonalities exist among the three units, there continue to be several internal divisions among them. One division is physical: The Department of Communication (COM) and the School of Journalism and Telecommunications (JAT) occupy the Grehan Building, while the School of Library and Information Science occupies a floor of King Library, about 60 meters away. Although School of Library and Information Science faculty and staff look forward to the eventual move to remodeled space on the top floor of Lucille Little Library (about 120 meters from the Grehan Building), nevertheless the move, when it materializes, means that the school is certain to remain physically separate from the other two units for some years to come.

Another division among the units is historical: The once-separate faculties of the School of Journalism and the Department of Telecommunications had a history of interactions with each other and with the Department of Communication before creation of JAT and, later, the College of Communications. The School of Library and Information Science and the four-member telecommunications faculty were the last to join with the other units, although there had been both personal and professional relationships among some library and information science faculty and those of the other departments.

Finally, there are some functional relationships that set library and information science apart: In 1995 the position Associate Dean for Graduate Studies (ADGS) was established within the College of Communications and Information Studies; and the person in the position, currently Professor Roy Moore, is the Director of Graduate Studies for all graduate students and courses (600-700-level sections designated as CJT) taught in communication and in journalism and telecommunications.

The School of Library and Information Science has its own Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), who oversees only those students and courses in the library and information science master's degree programs. It is not possible that the college ADGS could serve as school DGS, since each such directorship is tailored to a specific graduate program, and each DGS is appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School on the basis of particular qualifications for overseeing a degree program. The DGS for library and information science needs to be familiar with the school's MSLS and MA programs, and needs to work closely with the staff and student records in the school offices in King Library. Sending student files, correspondence, and explanations back and forth between the two buildings would be impractical and would delay the necessary actions of the office of the DGS.

The fact that the other two unit heads within the college do not serve as DGS (see "Salary of School Unit Head," below) is a workload issue that could be addressed internally by designating as DGS a library and information science faculty member other than the director. In some recent years the assistant director served as DGS, but that situation is not ideal since the current assistant director does not hold the PhD.

That the college has two directors of graduate studies is an illustration of potential problems with resource-distribution under a merged structure: The operations of the DGS for the CJT sequence are funded out of the college dean's office, while those of the DGS for library and information science are not. While the funds involved are relatively modest, the creation of the office of associate dean may represent a trend that could decrease the fiscal autonomy of the school, if monies designated to the college are used to support staff and services that benefit mainly, if not exclusively, the units located in the Grehan Building.

In conclusion, there is some concern about resource-distribution in the college, given both the physical and functional separation of the units, depending on the inclinations of the person who serves as dean (currently J. David Johnson). Thus far, there have been no serious threats to the administrative or fiscal autonomy of the School of Library and Information Science. Neither has there been any loss of autonomy in the area of academic programs or the intellectual content thereof.

Participation and Governance

V.2 The school's faculty, staff and students have the same opportunity for representation on the institution's advisory or policy-making bodies as do those of comparable units throughout the institution. The schools administrative relationships with other academic units enhance the intellectual environment and support interdisciplinary interaction; further these administrative relationships encourage participation in the life of the parent institution.

Participation of School Faculty in University Governance

The integration of the school within the college has the beneficial aspect of making the director more aware of practices and standards in the other units. The presence of the school within the college has exposed the library and information science faculty and students to a larger, interdisciplinary environment. Thus, the merged nature of the college supports the goal of standard V to "encourage participation in the life of the parent institution."

As reported in the Faculty section of this document, school faculty have been very active on university committees and special offices outside of the college. Participation of school faculty in university governance has included service on the graduate council, the university senate, the equal opportunity panel, the librarians' academic advisory committee, the library committee, and the organizational development committee of the university libraries. Other highly visible activities have included service as a university marshal, on the president's commission on diversity, the NCAA self-study academic integrity committee, and for the UK chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

One advantage of the school's having several faculty who have been at UK for two decades or more, we are called upon to serve in governance roles in the university. We will continue to be actively involved in UK governance by that means.

Financial Support

V.5 The parent institution provides continuing financial support sufficient to develop and maintain library and information studies education in accordance with the general principles set forth in these Standards. The level of support provides a reasonable expectation of financial viability and is related to the number of faculty, administrative and support staff, instructional resources, and facilities needed to carry out the school's program of teaching, research, and service.

Institutional Support of Program

Institutional support for the school has varied. Faculty and staff have benefited from average salary increases of between 2 percent and 3.2 percent during the 1996-2003 period, except for 2002-2003, when a budget contraction fueled by rising health insurance costs resulted in a one-time bonus being given in lieu of a salary increase. The information is summarized in table V-1.

Table V-1 Merit Pool Raises for Faculty and Staff

Year	Percent Increase
2003-2004	3 %*
2002-2003	3 %**
2001-2002	4 %*
2000-2001	3 %*
1999-2000	4 %*
1998-1999	4 %*
1997-1998	3 %*
*Actual increases were about 0.5% less due to usual withholdings by the president/chancellor for retention offers and other purposes. **This year's raise was given as a non-recurring bonus.	

Mirroring the increases in salaries and benefits, the primary budget for the school (i.e., “income from parent institution,” not including grants/contracts and continuing education activities, but including scholarships and gifts) rose from \$956,581 in 1997-98 to \$1,195,715 in 2002-03 – yearly increases of 1.8 percent, 3.7 percent, 4.7 percent, 1.9 percent and 10.9 percent, respectively. However, the latter increase (i.e., for the 2002-2003 budget) includes \$26,020 that the school received back from the previous year’s general fund balance – a practice that began in 2001. Thus, the actual increase was 8.5 percent, and even this reflects mainly an increase in scholarships and gifts rather than income from the university per se. The average increase in base income was 3.0 percent per year over the first five years of the school’s accreditation cycle, and 3.9 percent if we consider the 2002-2003 year as well. The information is summarized in table V-2.

Table V-2 Income from Parent Institution

Year	Income	
	University	Distance Learning
2002-2003	\$1,195,715	\$ 98,750
2001-2002	\$1,077,804	\$ 72,750
2000-2001	\$1,057,928	\$ 80,750
1999-2000	\$1,010,568	\$ 80,500
1998-1999	\$974,269	\$ 90,707
1997-1998	\$956,581	N/A

During the last four academic years (1998-2002), the school brought in between \$218,000 and \$772,000 in external income each year, mainly from grants and contracts and off-campus teaching. The income from off-campus teaching is particularly important. Over the last six years, the school averaged about \$86,000 in gross income each year from the distance-learning and summer-session sections. The most recent year’s (2002-2003) income of \$98,750 reflects the greater efficiencies afforded by web-based courses, suggesting that distance-learning income may be larger in years to come.

During the previous accreditation-review visit, the school had recently been hit with a budget decrease based solely on short-term declines in enrollment between 1992 and 1997. Consequently, the COA review team raised the issue that a move to base UK departmental budgets on enrollments might present future difficulties for the school. As it turned out, there have been no further attempts to establish budget cuts based on enrollments, so that issue is moot. However, if enrollment-based budget decreases were to be contemplated again, the school should be in good shape, as recent enrollments have been high, and the school is efficient in its student-faculty ratios.

Unfortunately, Kentucky state budgets for higher education are expected to be cut mid-year 2003-2004 (following the gubernatorial election in November), due to growing shortfalls in state revenue. Campus administrators have been told to plan for a reduction of between 1 percent and 5 percent of recurring funds. In a budget exercise among college faculty held on August 25, 2003, a five percent cut for the school was estimated to amount to \$41,199. Such a reduction could be handled by cutting one junior faculty position, or, alternatively, by eliminating virtually all of the school's funds for graduate assistants, travel, and "current expenses" (the latter budgeted for only \$4,671 this year). Given earlier budget cuts, such a recurring reduction could have a serious impact on the ability of the school to carry out its mission, unless replacement funds from external sources could be secured.

Changes in Income and Expenditures

Appendix C shows the budgets and income for the School of Library and Information Science since the last accreditation review. Salaries and benefits have increased overall, due to regular annual salary raises of 2.5 percent to 4 percent, despite the loss of one faculty position through budget reductions. The category "Other Personal Services," which includes staff lines, administrative services, student employees, and some part-time instructors, includes staff salaries and some income from distance-learning activities.

Grants and contracts have tended to fluctuate, according to the school's success in getting grants, particularly fellowship and institute grants from the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS). The school submitted proposals to the US Department of Education for each of the last seven academic years. IMLS grants were received for 2001, 2002, and 2003. The amount of federal funds the school received for 2001-2002 (\$408,800) is 9 percent less than the average (about \$450,000) received by other library and information studies schools yearly during the academic years from 1998-2002 – and most of the other 55 schools have much larger faculties.

Other sources of grants obtained by individual faculty have been OCLC, Inc. (Chan, Lin), the Council on Library and Information Resources (Chan), and the office of the UK Vice President for Research (Andrews, Benoit, Case, Chan and Lin). During the review period, the school regularly contracted with two state agencies, the Department of Environmental Protection and the Department for Libraries and Archives, to provide library services. Overall, grants and contracts activity has increased over this review period (especially in terms of numbers of proposals submitted). As a category, "Gifts, continuing education and other" sources of income, while fluctuating somewhat from year to year, have increased quite a bit from the previous accreditation-review cycle.

Among the reasons for the increase in gifts has been the college-wide annual phonathon, begun in 1993, which has led to more donations to the school from its alumni. Donations from graduates and other

sources now exceed \$10,000 per year, most of which monies goes towards various scholarship endowments, which now earn more than \$11,000 per year. (Not counted among these estimates is the \$10,000 the school receives in Wilson Foundation fellowship funds every fourth year, which translates into an additional \$2,500 per year in gifts.)

“Continuing Education” fees have also added to the growth in that area of the budget. The school rarely charges for the many workshops conducted each year, with one exception: the annual McConnell Conference on Children's Literature; that two-day event charges a modest amount and normally breaks even after expenses. In recent years the Conference has received financial support from Book Wholesalers, Inc. (BWI, located in Lexington), ensuring that the event does not have to raise fees substantially.

Comparing the School to Other Library and Information Studies Schools

Looking at external indicators of budget adequacy, the 2002 *ALISE Statistical Report* (based on data from 2000-2001) shows that the University of Kentucky school base budget is in the low end of the range for most library and information studies programs (i.e., \$800,000 to \$1 million) but in the bottom third of programs in terms of total base budget from the parent institution. Since the UK school is not far from the mean in terms of numbers of students (e.g., a seven-year running average of 210 students, compared to the North American mean of 255), the school is under-funded compared with some other institutions. However, it is also the case that some schools with just a few more faculty have student bodies that are between two and four times the size of the UK school (e.g., University of South Carolina and San Jose State, respectively); here again, the importance of off-campus instruction to growth in programs is highlighted.

While budgets will continue to be tight at UK, on the whole the school is comparable to many of the other small programs in North America, judging from ALISE statistics on budget, faculty size, and enrollments. However, the school must ensure multiple sources of funding to protect against likely future shortfalls in state revenue. For over a decade, the school has depended heavily on income from off-campus programs. During the last seven years, off-campus enrollments have declined somewhat, but use of distant-learning technologies (i.e., interactive video and Internet) has made off-campus teaching more cost-effective. Most of the faculty participate in off-campus teaching to some degree, usually by offering Internet-based courses. Yet there is always the possibility that UK will renegotiate the terms on which it allows the school to earn income from off-campus programs.⁶ Any serious erosion of that income would incur budget difficulties for the School of Library and Information Science.

Equitably Established Compensation

V.6 Compensation for a program's executive officer, faculty, and other staff is equitably established according to their education, experience, responsibilities, and accomplishments and is sufficient to attract, support, and retain personnel needed to attain program goals and objectives.

⁶ The school receives \$250 for each registration in an off-campus (i.e., distance-learning) section of its courses.

Number and Compensation of Faculty

The school had ten full-time faculty in 1992, when a faculty position was lost at retirement. In 1996, the funding for another position was lost at the time of a university budget crunch, leaving the school at nine faculty. Despite that, enrollments at the school (along with other demands on faculty) have continued to be higher than the years before 1990. Currently, the average faculty size among library and information studies programs is 13, up from an average of 11 a decade ago.

For 2003 a former faculty line that was a staff line has been reconverted to a special title faculty position. Conversion of that position brought the number of faculty back to ten, and resulted in fairer compensation for that individual. The school would like to regain the faculty position lost in 1996, and return to a strength of at least 11 faculty. With one retirement since the last accreditation review, one resignation, and another retirement possible in the near future, we hope to replace at least one of these positions beginning in August of 2004.

For external comparisons of faculty compensation, the most recently available (2002) *ALISE Statistical Report* provides comparative data on 2001-02 average salaries. At our school, the three full professors were paid an average of \$82,493, compared to \$86,336 in other North American programs (the 2003-04 average salary for all UK professors is \$84,711); associate professors averaged \$58,479 compared to \$62,649 elsewhere (the 2003-04 average salary for UK associates is \$58,498); assistant professors averaged \$46,726 compared to \$53,290 in the U.S. and Canada.

For new assistant professor appointments, the mean was \$53,107 in other North American programs, compared to \$45,000 at the UK school, resulting in a difference of \$8,107. The 2002 ALISE averages even exceed the current (2003-2004) average assistant professor salary of \$48,527 in our school. (For 2003-2004, the school has two regular title assistant and one special title assistant, one regular title associate and one special title associate professor). The school continues to be behind other schools in what it can pay assistant professors. In the past seven years, at least three assistant professors have left our school for other institutions, with increases of between \$4,000 and \$10,000 over their UK salaries.

A more comparable set of data, reflecting UK's choice of "benchmark" institutions (University of Illinois-Urbana, University of Iowa, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and University of Texas-Austin, to which we have added the neighboring University of Tennessee), is available in the 2001-02 salary data from the 2002 *ALISE Statistical Report*. For the most recent year, UK average salary for professors is \$82,493, which is \$3,843 below the average for all North American library and information studies programs and \$1,879 higher than the average full professor salary for the benchmark schools. Assistant professor average salary at UK is \$45,783, which is a substantial \$7,507 below the average assistant professor salary for all North American library and information studies programs and \$7,254 less than benchmark library and information studies program averages.

Associate professors at our school do not fare much better, as the average salary of \$58,479 is \$4,170 less than the average associate professor salary for all North American library and information studies programs and \$4,907 less than the benchmark library and information studies program averages. On a North American basis, then, all ranks of faculty are underpaid at the University of Kentucky School of Library and Information Science. On the basis of benchmark institutions, only full professors at the UK school are paid slightly higher than average, while assistant and associate professors at our school are significantly

underpaid. It must be noted, however, that these figures are based on relatively small numbers of faculty, the average salaries of which can shift markedly from year-to-year, with the hiring and promotion of faculty. The information is summarized in table V-3.

Table V-3 Comparable Salary Data 2001-2002 UK versus Benchmark Institutions with Library and Information Studies Programs

Accredited Library and Information Studies Programs	Faculty Rank		
	Assistant	Associate	Full
Kentucky*	\$45,783	\$58,479	\$ 82,493
All North American	\$53,290	\$62,649	\$ 86,336
Illinois-Urbana	\$60,083	\$73,683	\$100,415
Wisconsin-Madison	\$49,090	\$58,672	\$73,985
Texas-Austin	\$54,981	\$58,082	\$ 78,648
Iowa	\$53,940	\$68,756	None
Tennessee**	\$47,093	\$59,736	\$69,409

*Kentucky salary data are from the 2002-2003 academic year, while salary data for benchmark institutions with library and information studies programs are taken from the 2002 *ALISE Statistical Report*, which is based on data from 2001-2002.
 **While the University of Tennessee is not an official benchmark institution identified by UK, it was chosen because of regional similarities.

Within the University of Kentucky, we can use 2002-2003 AAUP salary data to make comparisons of average salaries across departments. For all of UK, average full professor salary was \$86,870, compared with \$82,493 for the school, a difference of \$4,377. Average associate professor salary was \$60,186, compared with \$58,479 for the school, for a difference of \$1,707. Finally, for assistant professor, the average was \$51,754, compared with \$46,674 for the school, a disparity of \$5,080. (According to *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, the average faculty salaries statewide for Kentucky public universities were: professor, \$75,274; associate, \$55,110; and assistant, \$45,155.⁷) The information is summarized in table V-4.

Table V-4 AAUP Salary Data – University of Kentucky Overall versus UK School of Library and Information Science - 2002-2003

Average Salary	Faculty Rank		
	Assistant	Associate	Full
Overall	\$51,754	\$60,186	\$86,870
School	\$46,674	\$58,479	\$82,493

⁷ Issue of August 29, 2003.

Within the college, comparisons show that assistant professors were paid comparable amounts across the three units for 2002-03: \$48,754 for COM, \$46,674 for the school and \$44,425 for JAT); the COM faculty earn about two thousand dollars more, while the JAT faculty make about \$2,000 less. The disparity with JAT is partly due to that unit's greater use of special Title faculty (who typically lack PhDs and therefore are paid somewhat less) and partly due to shorter time-in-rank for JAT assistants. School full professors are underpaid both in comparison to average UK full professor salaries (by \$4,377) and to average full professor salaries within the college (by between \$3,602 and \$8,826). The information is summarized in table V-5.

Table V-5 AAUP Salary Data – University of Kentucky Overall versus College of Communication and Information Studies – 2002-2003

Average Salary	Faculty Rank		
	Assistant	Associate	Full
Overall	\$51,754	\$60,186	\$86,870
College			
COM	\$48,754	\$60,186	\$86,095*
JAT	\$44,425	\$59,295	\$91,319*
SLIS	\$46,674	\$58,479	\$82,493
*The salaries of two additional full professors in CCIS are not included as one serves as dean on a 12-month contract, and one serves as VP for Foreign Affairs and International Relations on a 12-month contract.			

In conclusion, the compensation picture is mixed for school full professors and clearly negative for school assistant professors. School full professors are paid about 4.5% less than other full professors in North American library and information studies programs, about 5% less than comparable faculty within UK, and about 2% more than other full professors of library and information studies at UK benchmark institutions (a small pool, it must be noted). School assistant professors fare badly in all comparisons, and have been underpaid by at least \$5,000, or 10 percent, in recent years, compared with other assistant professors within UK. School assistant professors are paid about 12 percent less than other assistant professors in North American library and information studies programs and about 12 percent less than other assistant professors of library and information studies at UK benchmark institutions.

According to the recently adopted UK Strategic Plan for 2003-2006, one of five primary goals for the university is to “attract, develop and retain a distinguished faculty.” The first objective identified under this goal is to “offer competitive salaries and benefits to attract and retain distinguished faculty.” Through a combination of new appointments and salary adjustments, the school intends to address this institutional objective. Newly hired assistant professors will start at salaries of at least \$50,000, which will put UK closer to the North American average of \$53,000. It is simply unrealistic to match the \$60,000 average at schools like the University of Illinois.

Institutional Funds for Research, Travel, Etc

V.7 Institutional funds for research projects, professional development, travel, and leaves with pay are available on the same basis as in comparable units of the institution. Student financial aid from the parent institution is available on the same basis as in comparable units of the institution.

Travel and Other Support for Faculty

Over the last four years, the school has spent an average of \$13,837 per year on faculty travel to conferences and workshops, with an average amount received of approximately \$1,880 per faculty member. In addition, each year about \$1,000 is spent on faculty travel to Northern Kentucky University and University of Louisville for teaching assignments there. (Travel funding for the director, assistant director, and computing coordinator is included in these figures; funds for faculty recruitment are not.)

The amount spent by the school on faculty travel is \$674 under the average per faculty member (\$2,554) reported in the 2002 *ALISE Statistical Report*. However, as that report explains, the figures for faculty travel are conflated with travel for unit heads and, in some cases, faculty recruitment. It is likely, therefore, that travel support for faculty at our school falls in the middle of the range of other library and information studies programs and is adequate in comparison.

Number and Compensation of Staff

The school staff is the same in size as at the last accreditation review, except that one staff position has been converted to a faculty position with major administrative duties. Support for faculty instructional development, research, and writing projects is limited. Other than that provided by future grants, administrative support is unlikely to increase in the near term.

Currently, the school has a staff of three, including a student affairs officer, an administrative assistant, and an assistant director (together paid a total of \$103,769). (As mentioned earlier, the position of computer coordinator has been converted to a special title faculty position.) The student affairs officer reports to the assistant director while the administrative assistant reports to the director.

The number of school staff is similar to the other college units: JAT has three staff (paid a total of \$91,358 for 2003-2004) and COM has three staff (paid a total of \$82,248). However, these figures do not include the several grant-funded staff working for COM. The proximity of the other two units to the dean's office, with its seven staff, may mean that there is greater potential for help from the dean's staff for JAT and COM. In the dean's office, there are two clerical staff, three professional staff (in charge of budget, development, and grants), and two undergraduate counselors; some of the dean's staff provide support to the school in terms of accounting, administration of course evaluations, and arrangement for the annual graduation/recognition ceremony.

Thus, the school has comparable staffing to the other units. The school has one student affairs officer and two support staff, as does JAT, while COM has three support staff. The budget for the school staff is higher than in the other two units. In addition to other duties, the school assistant director regularly teaches for the school; Dennis Carrigan's seniority, advanced degrees, and teaching responsibilities make

his job different from staff positions elsewhere in the college and account for the higher combined staff pay in school compared with the other units.

Comparability of Salary of School Unit Head

The salary of unit heads is determined by several factors, including the level or administrative responsibility, the rank and time-in-rank of the office holder, the market, and salary levels within the college and school. Appropriate salary comparisons would be with those for the other unit heads in the college and with other directors of schools within the university. (All department chairs and directors of schools at UK are held to spend no more than 45 percent of their effort on administration, making these comparisons fair.) Two examples of unit heads within the college, and three from outside the college, are given in table v-6.

Table V-6 Comparability of Salary of School Unit Head

Unit	Number of Faculty	Title	Rank	Salary*
College of Communications and Information Studies				
School	9	Director	Professor	\$97,778**
COM	16	Chair	Assoc Prof	\$61,079
JAT	13	Director	Professor	\$105,000***
Graduate School				
Patterson School#	4	Director	Professor	\$76,775
Martin School##	8	Director	Professor	\$127,611
*Salary information is for 2002-2003, except as noted. **Includes non-recurring bonus of \$2,754, added to a base salary of \$95,024. ***Salary information is for 2003-2004, due to non-comparability of temporary JAT Director for 2002-2003. #Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce ##Martin School for Public Policy and Administration				

The examples in table V-6 illustrate that the compensation of the director is comparable to the compensation of the heads of other units on the UK campus – both inside and outside of the college – especially given the relatively small size of the school faculty as compared with the comparison groups, even within the relatively small college in which it is located. The school director makes more than either the communication department chair (with a faculty nearly 80 percent larger), or the director of the Patterson School (with a smaller faculty). The one major discrepancy is the salary of the director of the Martin School, a distinguished economist, who makes much more than other unit heads, partly because of the higher pay scales among business and economics professors at the University of Kentucky.

The variances of the salaries of the other unit heads can be explained by more experience and longer time-in-rank. The chair of the Department of Communication was promoted to associate professor within the last nine years; hence, her salary is somewhat lower than that of either the director of the Patterson School or the director of the Martin School (which both fall under the Graduate School), who have both held their rank longer.

Thus, the school director is paid a comparable amount to other unit heads on campus. Comparisons with other library and information studies programs, however, paint a different picture. The average salary of a director or dean of a library and information studies program, for the fiscal year, was \$112,983 in North America and \$132,647 for the UK benchmark institutions (Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Texas, and Tennessee) in 2001-2002. While many of these comparison programs are larger and headed by deans, the figures suggest that the University of Kentucky, as an institution, under-compensates the heads of professional programs.

Support for Students and Faculty

Support for Faculty Development and Travel

Sabbatical leaves for faculty development are allowed under the Governing Regulations, Part X-C-5. Full-time faculty are eligible for a six-month sabbatical leave at full pay after six years of continuous service; alternatively, a faculty member may take a full year at half pay, or six months at half-pay after just three years of service. Faculty must apply to the director for such leave, and both the dean and the president must approve that plan. The school director keeps a calendar of anticipated sabbaticals for planning purposes. During the current accreditation-review cycle, Professors Case, Chan, and Jeng took sabbatical leaves; Professors Miller, Sineath, and Waldhart were eligible but did not take leaves. (Support for faculty travel is treated above, under "Institutional Support.")

Support for Students and Learning Environment

During 2001-2002, of the 184 students who were enrolled in the master's program (60 of whom were full-time), 15 received fellowship and scholarship support from the university, totaling \$124,721. Twenty-two students received graduate assistantships, totaling \$119,692 in stipends and tuition grants. This works out to approximately \$1,708 in support per FTE student in the master's program.

In 2002-2003, the school, mainly through the generous donations of its alumni, spent approximately \$2,231 on student events (e.g., luncheons) and on registrations for, and travel to, conferences. (This figure is in addition to \$20,197 awarded in student scholarships through school grants and endowments.) It is important that we continue to fund participation of our students in professional events. The annual phonathon, now conducted in conjunction with the other units in the college, has proven to be a reliable source of funds for student support, with more than \$50,000 raised over the last eight years. Beginning in 1996, an endowment was established for future scholarships; the school began to award scholarships from that fund in 2002.

The activities of various student organizations figure in the learning environment. Chapters of both ALA and SLA are active, as is the UK Library and Information Science Student Organization. These chapters sponsor regular social and professional events to which the school budget sometimes contributes.

Physical resources available to the students include the Center for Applied Information Technology (CAIT), the McConnell Center, a student commons, and classrooms. We readily acknowledge that all of

these could be, and will be, improved, once the school moves into new space. Other improvements, such as new equipment and furniture, have already been purchased for that new space.⁸

Budget Autonomy

The dean is responsible for the budget request for the college and for administration of the budget. He solicits budget-request information from the school's director as well as from the heads of the other two units within the college. Discussion of the college budget takes place in the informal "unit heads" meetings of the dean with the three unit heads, or with the unit heads individually. There are no minutes taken or circulated to faculty from these meetings. Information that reaches faculty about the college budget does so by means of discussion of budget-related issues by the director in monthly school council meetings. In addition, Dean Johnson has made budget issues the focus of some of the more informal "brown bag" discussions.

The rules of the faculty of the college have established a college assembly of all faculty of the three units, which meets three times during the academic year. This group is probably too large and meets too infrequently to provide an effective mechanism for faculty involvement in budgetary matters. The college faculty council, the one standing committee of the college assembly, would provide a forum for involvement of faculty in planning and decision-making related to the budget and its distribution among the three units. It consists of two faculty elected from each of the three units and meets at the call of the dean or any two members. The last faculty council meeting, in mid-November, focused on budget issues.

Decisions about budget requests for the college are made by the dean and submitted to the provost. The dean determines budget allocations to the three units and to support services and personnel in the dean's office. The director of the school has been delegated the major share of responsibility for administration of that portion of the college budget allotted to the school by the dean.

Review of Planning and Evaluation Process

V.8 The school's planning and evaluation process includes review of both administrative policies and its fiscal policies and financial support. Within applicable institutional policies, faculty, staff, students, and others are involved in the evaluation process. Evaluation is used for ongoing appraisal to make improvements and to plan for the future.

The school relies upon a variety of mechanisms for continual assessment and improvement of its policies. These include the regular meetings of the school council, input from school standing committees, an annual retreat for strategic planning, and feedback from course evaluations and surveys of students, alumni and employers. In addition to these periodic mechanisms, the director sometimes consults the executive committee (a body of three tenured members of the faculty) and the school advisory committee (usually five to eight representatives of prominent libraries and other employers of school graduates) for ad hoc input on policy and financial issues. College-wide meetings also provide faculty and staff opportunities to provide input into administrative policies. The college dean formally evaluates all unit heads, including

⁸ Although the school has not moved to what is to become its location, the top floor of the Little Fine Arts Library, which must be renovated prior to the move, nevertheless the classrooms that are a part of the renovation were completed and placed in service in January 2003. They are state-of-the-art so-called "smart" classrooms. See VI Physical Resources and Facilities.

the director of the school, annually. Moreover, every two years more systematic input from faculty will be sought. Finally, before a unit head is reappointed for another term, a more comprehensive review process is used. Together these mechanisms provide ample opportunity to consider, and revise, school policy.

Recommendations

On some of the issues addressed in this section of the *Program Presentation*, action has been taken or can be taken relatively soon. For other operations related to administration or finances, ongoing mechanisms need to be developed to provide better feedback to faculty, staff, and the director.

Activities related to administration or finances that could benefit from intervention and/or improved feedback mechanisms include:

- Improve assistant professor compensation. With new appointments, salary adjustments, and promotions among assistant professors, this latter problem is being addressed; newly hired assistant professors will start at salaries that are competitive with those of other schools.
- Establish a regular schedule for summarizing and reporting of selected budgetary categories by the director to the school faculty. Such reports would include, for example, annual comparisons of donations, grants activity, and distance-learning income, with the comparable amounts for previous years.
- Improve integration of the college faculties through joint courses, colloquia, and projects.
- Improve governance by joining with other college faculty to make the college assembly more of a forum for involvement in planning and decision-making.
- Find ways to increase support of faculty travel through funded research and other grant activities.

Appendices for V. Administration and Financial Support

A. Organization charts of the University of Kentucky,⁹ College of Communications and Information Studies, and School of Library and Information Science

B. University of Kentucky Governing Regulations VII.B.4-5

C. University of Kentucky School of Library and Information Science Gross Income by Category, 1997-2003

Appendix A: Administration and Financial Support Organization Chart, University of Kentucky¹⁰

Appendix A: Administration and Financial Support Organization Chart, College of Communications and Information Studies

Appendix A: Administration and Financial Support Organization Chart, School of Library and Information Science

Appendix B: Administration and Financial Support University of Kentucky Governing Regulations VII.B.4-5

⁹ The organization chart for the university excludes the medical center and the community college.

¹⁰ Excluding the medical center and the community college.