

MEMO TO: Mr. Seidl, Mrs. Gibson, Library Board

FROM: Katie Gross, Children's Librarian

SUBJECT: Wages and Benefits

March 8, 1990

When deciding what to do about employee benefits, it seems to me the guiding premise would be that nobody should see their benefits decrease next year. If insurance rates go up in November, the only option that would prevent people from coming out behind would be #5, following the city.

You might also consider that those who have dependent coverage are in most cases the principle wage earner in the family. Losing that coverage would be a severe hardship in many families.

I also question why we are even considering longevity pay! If the basic premise of our two-tier pay schedule is that we are very well paid, why are we considering boosting the salaries of the best paid among us? Once we start hiring people at the lower salary, longevity pay would widen the gulf between new employees and old. Furthermore, longevity is not always an asset. If you truly feel there are long-term employees who need an extra reward, why not allow them to attend ALA, or some worthwhile conference, which would be fun, interesting and benefit both the employee and the library? You might also consider creating another level (or 2) in the organizational chart to boost especially valuable employees, who have special qualifications to offer through their experience and hard work. (I myself have requested that for a particular employee who consistently works above the RA level.) Create opportunities for valuable workers to move up in the organizational structure.

In summation: we are paid well, but I hate to see that pay eroded through a loss of dependent coverage. The bottom line is --- no one should be worse off next year!