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 2012 National Compensation Survey of Social Justice Organizations Produced by:Through the collaboration of RoadMap, the Data Center and the National Organizers Alliance (NOA), we are pleased to present the results of our 2012 National Compensation Survey of community-based organizing and advocacy groups. The study focused on salary and benefits information, as well as how social justice organizations build on their values in creating just compensation packages and thriving workplaces. We wanted to provide data from social justice groups because most compensation studies of the overall non-profit sector are skewed to larger organizations or organizations focused on social services. We hope you will find the data useful for hiring and setting salary rates, as well as opening dialogue in your organization on policies and practices to promote social justice values in the workplace. To complement the survey, RoadMap also offers tools and templates on its Resources web page.
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Good leaders know that people are their most important resource. Compensation is one of the most important tools for nonprofits to recruit and retain talented leaders and have significant and lasting impact on their communities. It's also a resource that's highly vulnerable to economic circumstance.

As documented in Data Center's 2010 study with NOA, Sustaining Organizations: A Survey of Organizations During the Economic Downturn, many communitybased groups saw drops in grant funding and individual giving, and groups have been coping by making full or partial layoffs, salary freezes and salary cuts, and reductions in health benefits and staff development programs. We also know that a significant number of groups advocating for and serving lowincome communities closed completely during the worst of the recession. At the same time, the economic crisis has increased the burden on our communities - social justice groups are rooted in and run by their constituencies: low-income, rural and urban, people of color, immigrants and refugees of many backgrounds who are suffering high unemployment, cuts in public services, police violence and right wing attacks. Managing these tensions has taken both financial and emotional tolls on groups and their staff.

On the positive side, this survey indicates that the heavy financial effects of the recession have stabilized, with a majority of groups reporting budget staying stable or growing over the last eighteen months. However, a significant number of groups (20-30\%) report cuts in budgets, salaries and/or benefits packages, with many having suspended or reduced raises, pension contributions and other benefits. Over half of groups anticipate no budget growth in the coming year and all continue to see rising costs in health insurance that is leading them to make adjustments to their compensation plans. The survey shows groups making efforts to keep staff reductions to a minimum and to mitigate low or stagnant salaries with generous benefits packages.

Economic constraints and the difficult nature of social justice work will continue to place a heavy burden on staff and may contribute to turnover and instability in these organizations. Social justice groups make a big difference in issues as far-reaching as living wage, marriage equality and climate justice. We hope this report contributes to making these groups more sustainable workplaces.

## METHODOLOGY

The 2012 Social Justice Nonprofit Compensation Survey consisted of 34 multiple-choice questions and was distributed electronically in June 2012 to clients, partners and members of RoadMap, Data Center and the National Organizers Alliance. Responses came from 191 organizations in 28 states, with 175 fully completing the survey. Please note that bar graphs shown throughout the survey do not represent "no responses" and some questions allow more than one response so totals may exceed $100 \%$.

## Profile of Organizations

This report focuses on salary and benefits provided to employees in community-based organizing and advocacy groups, primarily serving low income and people of color communities. The responding groups work in multiple issue areas with a variety of approaches including local and regional organizing ( $28 \%$ ), statewide organizing ( $46 \%$ ), national policy and organizing groups (combined 11\%), and other groups (15\%) including technical assistance intermediaries, human service providers, and faith based groups.

The responding organizations reflect a wide swath of the social justice sector with regard to budget and staff size, years in operation, field of work, organizational structure and funding sources. Two-thirds of the participants in this survey have budgets of less than one million dollars and additional 20 percent have budgets between one million and two million dollars, with 17 percent over $\$ 2$ Million.

| BUDGET SIZE OF GROUPS | TOTAL N= 175 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Budget \$2-11 Million | 30 | $17.14 \%$ |
| Budget \$1-2 Million | 35 | $20.00 \%$ |
| Budget \$500,001-\$1Million | 51 | $29.14 \%$ |
| Budget under \$500,000 | 59 | $33.71 \%$ |

KINDS OF SOCIAL CHANGE ORGANIZATIONS


The groups are small size, with the median of 7 staff, the highest with 50 staff and some with no paid staff at all, only volunteers and occasional contractors. The median year of founding of the groups was 1996 (17 years old), with 30 percent in existence less than 10 years, and 16 percent in existence for at least 30 years. Non-profits in urban centers and those that have been in operation longer may be likely to pay higher salaries than their more rural and younger counterparts.

Forty-two percent of the responding organizations are based in the West (with 23\% from California), followed by the Northeast/ Mid Atlantic area and Southeast. A small sample of groups responded from the Southwest (4\%) and Midwest (6\%). These patterns likely correlates to the concentration of social change groups in larger urban centers, and the fact that outreach lists reflect historical relationships of the 3 sponsoring organizations.

| NUMBER OF PAID STAFF | TOTAL N=136 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $0-3$ | 43 | $31.62 \%$ |
| $4-8$ | 42 | $30.88 \%$ |
| 9 or more | 52 | $38.24 \%$ |

An additional factor is that some regions social justice work is less likely to be done by paid professionals. The South, Appalachia in the Southeast, the Southwest, and parts of the Midwest have few organizations serving large geographic areas. In the South, funding of social justice work has been very limited. We know that the number of social justice organizations has declined in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crash, and others suffered heavy layoffs and still struggle to survive. The survey likely over-represents groups that have recovered from the worst effects of the recession.

| LOCATION BY REGION | TOTAL N=175 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| West | 74 | $42 \%$ |
| Northeast/Mid Atlantic | 49 | $28 \%$ |
| Southeast | 34 | $20 \%$ |
| Midwest | 11 | $6 \%$ |
| Southwest | 7 | $4 \%$ |



STAFF COMPOSITION
(groups with staff who self-identify in these categories)


## STAFF DIVERSITY

The survey asked about the size and composition of staff. The average number of staff of the groups that responded is 7 full time staff, and 3.9 part time staff. The graph shows the percent of groups that have staff who identify with each category.

## Key Findings

The effects of the recession seem to have stabilized for many groups with 47 percent reporting an increased budget in 2012 compared to 2011, and 36 percent expecting this year to be the same as last year. Fifty percent of groups report a growth in the number of staff positions over the last 18 months, and 27 percent report the same number of staff positions. Likewise, 60 percent of respondents say total staff hours have stayed the same, 22 percent have increased total staff hours.
> "Our budget is increasing with more foundation support but, a bit less government funding."

## "Our strategic plan includes expansion in the state so we anticipate budget growth."

Some of those reporting higher budgets and increased staffing this year report special revenue related to advocacy during election years that cyclically attracts added funding for issue advocacy, voter registration and voter turnout.
"In 2012, an election year, our budget needs increase because we staff up with part time, temporary full time or contract staff."

TRENDS IN BUDGET SIZE 2011 VS. 2012
(\% of organizations who anticipate larger, smaller or stable budgets)


By contrast, 17 percent of groups anticipate a smaller budget in 2012 than 2011, 10 percent cut salaries, 16 percent have decreased staff hours, 22 percent cut staff positions and about a third report limiting health care coverage and other benefits. Survey comments indicate that organizations with budget constraints are prioritizing keeping staff in place and maintaining health coverage, but forgoing raises and pension contributions.
"We have had to reduce a staff position to part time and close one of our offices due to lack of funding."
"The current economy has negatively impacted our operations and fundraising, which in turn has impacted our compensation package."
> "I'm totally embarrassed we don't offer health insurance. I've offered it to staff but told them the truth-it would mean laying off one of them. That's the sad truth."

- These patterns were more difficult for organizations under $\$ 500,000$ : Eighteen percent reported cuts in salaries and 34 percent suspended COLAs this year (compared to $24 \%$ of the national sample that suspended COLAs) and another 10 percent of the smaller groups suspended other increases such as step raises and bonuses.

Salaries in the social justice sector, particularly those focused on organizing and advocacy, remain low compared with the non-profit sector overall.

- Overall median pay for Executive Directors in the social justice sector is $\$ 67,000$, which is generally lower than the wider non-profit sector (see box for California and National averages).
- The top salary from our respondents was \$150,000 from a $\$ 6$ Million organization, and the lowest was $\$ 30,000$ in an organization with a budget of \$450,000.

■ We asked organizations to share how they rate their salary scale. A large majority reported that their organizations offer a living wage for their area ${ }^{1}$ ( $60 \%$ ). Only 22 percent report that they offer generous salaries and 23 percent want to increase salaries.

As many studies show, the overall non-profit sector offers lower wages and benefits for individuals with comparable skills in private sector positions, and the organizing/advocacy segment has even tighter budget constraints.

Low pay affects longevity for all employees, and for young workers with high college debt it is particularly challenging to make the decision to join or stay in the non-profit sector. A national survey of 1,100 nonprofit workers from 2011 found that commitment to remaining in a non-profit job weakened, as employees got older. Source: http://philanthropy.com/article/ Fledgling-Nonprofit-Workers/133001/

## REFLECTING SOCIAL JUSTICE VALUES

The findings show organizations build social justice values into their practices through considering equity in overall pay scales, and supporting health and well being of their staff. For example, 67 percent of organizations limit the ratio between lowest and highest paid employees to less than 3:1, and 50 percent of the groups keep the ratio under 2:1.

Groups at the forefront reflect social justice values by addressing health needs, family coverage, worklife balance and long-term sustainability of their employees. And most offer pro-rated benefits for parttime staff. For example, a significant proportion of groups offer the following comprehensive benefits:

- Paid parental leave (50\%)

■ Employer pension contributions (47.6\%)
■ Full cost of health benefits for spouse, domestic partners and dependents ( $30-38 \%$ )
■ Paid sabbaticals ( $33 \%$ ) and severance benefits ( $20 \%$ ).

## NATIONAL AND CALIFORNIA COMPARISONS FROM BROAD NON-PROFIT SURVEYS

- For comparison, national surveys have reported that the average nonprofit Executive Director/CEO makes approximately $\$ 120,000-140,000$. These figures are drawn studies focus that exclusively on mid-sized to large organizations including human services and educational institutions.
- According to a national survey of IRS tax returns, for organizations with budgets between \$500,000 and \$1 million the median Executive Director salary was $\$ 68,386$. (Source: GuideStar 2010 national report).
- In a recent California study of 402 nonprofit organizations, executives who headed the smallest groups, with budgets of less than $\$ 500,000$, made a median of $\$ 78,427$. This study found that 66 percent of groups were increasing their salary budgets in 2012, up from 60 percent in 2011. The median overall increase in employee pay was 2 percent, the same as last year. (Source: http://www.nonprofitcomp.com)

[^0]
## Salary Ranges for Common Positions

The following tables provide comparative salary data for key positions at social change organizations. A wide variety of factors influence salaries, including organizational age and budget, staff size, geographic scope, scale and nature of programs, revenue structure, education and technical skills requirements, etc. As with most salary surveys, the data presented here reflect two common correlations: salaries are higher in groups with larger organizational budgets and larger staff size, especially for executives and senior staff positions.

The composition of survey respondents should be kept in mind; for instance 36 percent of respondent organizations are located in the California and 17 percent in New York State, and salaries trend higher in the larger population centers (see charts by region).

Tables below show the median annual salary for each position, as well as highest, lowest, $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile and $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile ( $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile means 25 percent of groups pay this amount or less, $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile means the top 25 percent pay this amount or more). Additional tables and bar charts show breakdown by budget size, and tables by region.
(Note regarding position titles: This survey did not capture data on all position titles at all organizations, and did not ask for a description of duties associated with the positions, but to a large extent the titles represent common usage in the social justice sector. It was up to the respondent to interpret the title most similar to positions in their particular organization.)

## SALARY BY BUDGET SIZE

Note: The following bar charts present median salaries for each position broken down by budget size of the organization. Data does not include null responses.
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NATIONAL SALARY DATA

| TITLE | N \# | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | $\begin{gathered} \text { 25TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 75TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Executive Director (or Co-Directors) | 131 | \$67,000 | \$200,000 | \$18,000 | \$51,250 | \$83,743 |
| Associate or Deputy Director | 58 | \$63,500 | \$125,000 | \$18,000 | \$52,850 | \$77,750 |
| Program or Campaign Director | 96 | \$54,690 | \$109,816 | \$0 | \$45,000 | \$62,000 |
| Political Director | 26 | \$57,100 | \$90,000 | \$41,600 | \$49,250 | \$60,000 |
| Policy Advocate | 26 | \$45,000 | \$93,000 | \$0 | \$38,000 | \$52,963 |
| Policy Researcher | 13 | \$45,000 | \$55,000 | \$35,000 | \$40,669 | \$47,000 |
| Community Organizer | 77 | \$37,000 | \$55,000 | \$0 | \$32,000 | \$40,000 |
| Senior or Lead Organizer | 53 | \$45,000 | \$70,000 | \$18,000 | \$40,000 | \$50,000 |
| Outreach Coordinator | 18 | \$36,500 | \$75,000 | \$21,512 | \$33,000 | \$46,766 |
| Training Coordinator | 18 | \$41,500 | \$60,000 | \$17,000 | \$36,000 | \$45,000 |
| Campaign Associate | 4 | \$32,500 | \$48,000 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$38,250 |
| Field Coordinator | 8 | \$41,000 | \$60,000 | \$28,000 | \$34,500 | \$46,250 |
| Data Coordinator | 7 | \$35,000 | \$61,000 | \$17,900 | \$23,420 | \$46,750 |
| Phonebank or Canvass Coordinator | 1 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 |
| Phonebank/Canvassers (hourly pay) | 5 | \$15 | \$25,000 | \$11 | \$12 | \$15 |
| Direct Services Coordinator | 9 | \$31,824 | \$76,000 | \$17,000 | \$30,000 | \$40,750 |
| Direct Services Associate | 5 | \$38,000 | \$40,000 | \$17,000 | \$32,000 | \$40,000 |
| Finance or Operations Director | 50 | \$60,000 | \$110,608 | \$20,000 | \$45,338 | \$72,000 |
| Finance Associate/Bookkeeper | 26 | \$42,000 | \$59,750 | \$45 | \$36,250 | \$48,750 |
| Development Director | 46 | \$57,000 | \$100,000 | \$36,000 | \$45,000 | \$65,000 |
| Grants Coordinator/Writer | 19 | \$43,680 | \$76,000 | \$20,500 | \$40,000 | \$50,000 |
| Development Associate | 32 | \$39,500 | \$58,000 | \$18,000 | \$33,750 | \$46,500 |
| Office Manager | 49 | \$36,000 | \$56,650 | \$10,000 | \$30,660 | \$42,000 |
| Executive Assistant | 23 | \$40,000 | \$70,000 | \$27,780 | \$36,000 | \$45,000 |
| Admin Assistant | 30 | \$31,100 | \$50,000 | \$5,000 | \$25,000 | \$37,750 |
| IT or Web Manager | 21 | \$45,000 | \$70,000 | \$1,300 | \$39,000 | \$53,000 |

## BUDGET UNDER \$500,000

| TITLE | N \# | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | $\begin{gathered} \text { 25TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ | 75TH <br> PERCENTILE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Executive Director (or Co-Directors) | 39 | \$50,000 | \$119,000 | \$18,000 | \$41,800 | \$61,500 |
| Associate or Deputy Director | 10 | \$51,125 | \$93,000 | \$18,000 | \$42,838 | \$63,750 |
| Program or Campaign Director | 25 | \$45,000 | \$63,000 | \$0 | \$33,000 | \$52,000 |
| Political Director | 4 | \$51,750 | \$60,000 | \$41,600 | \$47,900 | \$55,125 |
| Policy Advocate | 4 | \$40,000 | \$93,000 | \$0 | \$26,250 | \$57,000 |
| Policy Researcher | 3 | \$45,000 | \$55,000 | \$40,000 | \$42,500 | \$50,000 |
| Community Organizer | 24 | \$32,250 | \$55,000 | \$0 | \$28,090 | \$35,500 |
| Senior or Lead Organizer | 9 | \$37,000 | \$50,000 | \$18,000 | \$30,000 | \$40,000 |
| Outreach Coordinator | 2 | \$33,000 | \$35,000 | \$31,000 | \$32,000 | \$34,000 |
| Training Coordinator | 3 | \$30,000 | \$35,040 | \$17,000 | \$23,500 | \$32,520 |
| Campaign Associate | 1 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 |
| Field Coordinator | 2 | \$45,000 | \$60,000 | \$30,000 | \$37,500 | \$52,500 |
| Data Coordinator | 1 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 |
| Phonebank or Canvass Coordinator | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Phonebanker | 1 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 |
| Direct Services Coordinator | 1 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 |
| Direct Services Associate | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Finance or Operations Director | 4 | \$37,000 | \$60,000 | \$30,000 | \$33,750 | \$44,250 |
| Finance Associate/Bookkeeper | 2 | \$19,200 | \$36,000 | \$2,400 | \$10,800 | \$27,600 |
| Development Director | 6 | \$42,635 | \$60,000 | \$36,000 | \$40,250 | \$52,318 |
| Grants Coordinator/Writer | 2 | \$52,500 | \$60,000 | \$45,000 | \$48,750 | \$56,250 |
| Development Associate | 4 | \$28,000 | \$40,000 | \$18,000 | \$24,000 | \$32,500 |
| Office Manager | 11 | \$27,000 | \$40,000 | \$10,000 | \$16,000 | \$30,330 |
| Executive Assistant | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Admin Assistant | 5 | \$22,000 | \$30,000 | \$5,000 | \$18,000 | \$28,000 |
| IT or Web Manager | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

BUDGET BETWEEN \$500,001-\$1 MILLION

| TITLE | N \# | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | $\begin{gathered} \text { 25TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 75TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Executive Director (or Co-Directors) | 44 | \$65,500 | \$150,000 | \$39,520 | \$54,000 | \$77,825 |
| Associate or Deputy Director | 19 | \$60,000 | \$125,000 | \$37,440 | \$50,000 | \$62,247 |
| Program or Campaign Director | 31 | \$50,586 | \$90,000 | \$31,200 | \$45,000 | \$57,500 |
| Political Director | 7 | \$47,000 | \$60,000 | \$42,600 | \$46,000 | \$57,500 |
| Policy Advocate | 6 | \$43,500 | \$70,000 | \$33,000 | \$35,500 | \$55,250 |
| Policy Researcher | 2 | \$39,418 | \$40,669 | \$38,166 | \$38,792 | \$40,043 |
| Community Organizer | 25 | \$38,000 | \$50,586 | \$25,000 | \$34,000 | \$39,000 |
| Senior or Lead Organizer | 18 | \$49,000 | \$67,000 | \$29,000 | \$40,500 | \$51,488 |
| Outreach Coordinator | 8 | \$36,000 | \$50,586 | \$31,200 | \$32,829 | \$43,590 |
| Training Coordinator | 4 | \$44,000 | \$45,000 | \$40,000 | \$42,250 | \$45,000 |
| Campaign Associate | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Field Coordinator | 3 | \$42,000 | \$45,000 | \$40,000 | \$41,000 | \$43,500 |
| Data Coordinator | 4 | \$23,420 | \$52,000 | \$17,900 | \$20,855 | \$31,750 |
| Phonebank or Canvass Coordinator | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Phonebank/Canvassers (hourly pay) | 2 | \$14 | \$15 | \$12 | \$13 | \$14 |
| Direct Services Coordinator | 5 | \$35,000 | \$76,000 | \$20,200 | \$31,824 | \$60,000 |
| Direct Services Associate | 4 | \$39,000 | \$40,000 | \$17,000 | \$32,750 | \$40,000 |
| Finance or Operations Director | 14 | \$50,293 | \$60,000 | \$20,000 | \$45,000 | \$57,224 |
| Finance Associate/Bookkeeper | 7 | \$38,500 | \$50,000 | \$7,000 | \$26,450 | \$46,500 |
| Development Director | 14 | \$47,793 | \$67,000 | \$37,000 | \$40,500 | \$56,750 |
| Grants Coordinator/Writer | 3 | \$38,000 | \$50,000 | \$20,500 | \$29,250 | \$44,000 |
| Development Associate | 6 | \$42,500 | \$50,000 | \$33,000 | \$36,750 | \$48,503 |
| Office Manager | 16 | \$36,000 | \$48,021 | \$21,000 | \$32,000 | \$40,500 |
| Executive Assistant | 3 | \$35,000 | \$55,000 | \$27,780 | \$31,390 | \$45,000 |
| Admin Assistant | 9 | \$36,000 | \$50,000 | \$12,000 | \$27,000 | \$40,000 |
| IT or Web Manager | 8 | \$43,750 | \$47,000 | \$1,300 | \$40,500 | \$45,000 |

## BUDGET BETWEEN \$1-\$2 MILLION

| TITLE | N \# | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | $\stackrel{\text { 25TH }}{\text { PERCENTILE }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { 75TH }}{\text { PERCENTILE }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Executive Director (or Co-Directors) | 29 | \$80,000 | \$150,000 | \$40,000 | \$70,000 | \$92,000 |
| Associate or Deputy Director | 14 | \$68,000 | \$100,000 | \$46,500 | \$59,570 | \$76,500 |
| Program or Campaign Director | 25 | \$60,000 | \$580,000 | \$40,000 | \$53,000 | \$69,000 |
| Political Director | 10 | \$58,098 | \$90,000 | \$45,000 | \$51,750 | \$67,250 |
| Policy Advocate | 13 | \$45,000 | \$72,301 | \$28,000 | \$39,000 | \$52,850 |
| Policy Researcher | 4 | \$45,000 | \$50,000 | \$35,000 | \$42,500 | \$46,250 |
| Community Organizer | 21 | \$40,000 | \$55,000 | \$28,000 | \$36,000 | \$44,000 |
| Senior or Lead Organizer | 17 | \$45,000 | \$60,000 | \$32,000 | \$41,512 | \$50,000 |
| Outreach Coordinator | 5 | \$38,000 | \$75,000 | \$21,512 | \$33,000 | \$43,064 |
| Training Coordinator | 10 | \$42,500 | \$60,000 | \$33,000 | \$37,000 | \$46,875 |
| Campaign Associate | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Field Coordinator | 3 | \$36,000 | \$50,000 | \$28,000 | \$32,000 | \$43,000 |
| Data Coordinator | 1 | \$61,000 | \$61,000 | \$61,000 | \$61,000 | \$61,000 |
| Phonebank or Canvass Coordinator | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Phonebank/Canvassers (hourly pay) | 1 | \$15 | \$15 | \$15 | \$15 | \$15 |
| Direct Services Coordinator | 2 | \$35,375 | \$40,750 | \$30,000 | \$32,688 | \$38,063 |
| Direct Services Associate | 1 | \$32,000 | \$32,000 | \$32,000 | \$32,000 | \$32,000 |
| Finance or Operations Director | 17 | \$60,000 | \$79,000 | \$36,000 | \$46,750 | \$70,000 |
| Finance Associate/Bookkeeper | 8 | \$45,500 | \$59,750 | \$45 | \$39,613 | \$49,355 |
| Development Director | 13 | \$58,000 | \$97,335 | \$40,000 | \$52,900 | \$64,000 |
| Grants Coordinator/Writer | 5 | \$43,000 | \$44,228 | \$36,000 | \$42,000 | \$43,680 |
| Development Associate | 11 | \$40,000 | \$48,000 | \$33,000 | \$35,000 | \$44,000 |
| Office Manager | 8 | \$40,500 | \$46,556 | \$35,000 | \$36,000 | \$43,500 |
| Executive Assistant | 7 | \$37,310 | \$45,000 | \$32,134 | \$34,500 | \$41,000 |
| Admin Assistant | 11 | \$31,200 | \$42,000 | \$20,093 | \$28,708 | \$37,000 |
| IT or Web Manager | 5 | \$38,408 | \$53,000 | \$33,852 | \$36,000 | \$42,000 |

## BUDGET OVER \$2 MILLION

| TITLE | N \# | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | $\begin{gathered} \text { 25TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 75TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Executive Director (or Co-Directors) | 19 | \$98,000 | \$200,000 | \$57,200 | \$79,000 | \$122,442 |
| Associate or Deputy Director | 15 | \$85,800 | \$120,000 | \$52,800 | \$70,000 | \$90,000 |
| Program or Campaign Director | 15 | \$65,000 | \$109,816 | \$40,000 | \$60,000 | \$75,000 |
| Political Director | 5 | \$60,000 | \$62,800 | \$55,000 | \$57,200 | \$60,000 |
| Policy Advocate | 3 | \$50,000 | \$60,000 | \$45,000 | \$47,500 | \$55,000 |
| Policy Researcher | 4 | \$46,000 | \$49,000 | \$42,000 | \$44,250 | \$47,500 |
| Community Organizer | 7 | \$40,000 | \$49,500 | \$30,000 | \$38,500 | \$47,400 |
| Senior or Lead Organizer | 9 | \$49,500 | \$70,000 | \$35,000 | \$42,000 | \$55,000 |
| Outreach Coordinator | 3 | \$50,000 | \$50,000 | \$35,000 | \$42,500 | \$50,000 |
| Training Coordinator | 1 | \$44,000 | \$44,000 | \$44,000 | \$44,000 | \$44,000 |
| Campaign Associate | 3 | \$35,000 | \$48,000 | \$30,000 | \$32,500 | \$41,500 |
| Field Coordinator | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Data Coordinator | 1 | \$41,500 | \$41,500 | \$41,500 | \$41,500 | \$41,500 |
| Phonebank or Canvass Coordinator | 1 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 |
| Phonebank/Canvassers (hourly pay) | 1 | \$11 | \$11 | \$11 | \$11 | \$11 |
| Direct Services Coordinator | 1 | \$31,200 | \$31,200 | \$31,200 | \$31,200 | \$31,200 |
| Direct Services Associate | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Finance or Operations Director | 15 | \$75,000 | \$110,608 | \$45,000 | \$66,000 | \$88,900 |
| Finance Associate/Bookkeeper | 9 | \$42,000 | \$55,000 | \$35,000 | \$42,000 | \$49,000 |
| Development Director | 13 | \$70,000 | \$100,000 | \$55,000 | \$60,000 | \$82,500 |
| Grants Coordinator/Writer | 9 | \$49,500 | \$76,000 | \$30,000 | \$43,000 | \$52,000 |
| Development Associate | 11 | \$40,000 | \$58,000 | \$32,000 | \$34,000 | \$50,000 |
| Office Manager | 14 | \$39,000 | \$56,650 | \$30,000 | \$34,500 | \$46,500 |
| Executive Assistant | 13 | \$45,000 | \$70,000 | \$31,200 | \$36,600 | \$49,500 |
| Admin Assistant | 5 | \$32,988 | \$49,500 | \$25,000 | \$25,000 | \$41,000 |
| IT or Web Manager | 8 | \$60,720 | \$70,000 | \$39,000 | \$49,843 | \$65,000 |

WESTERN REGION: California, Colorado, Alaska, Washington, Oregon

| NUMBER <br> OF GROUPS | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | 25TH |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PERCENTILE | PERCENTILE |  |  |  |

MIDWEST REGION: Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin

| NUMBER <br> OF GROUPS | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | 25TH <br> PERCENTILE | PERCENTILE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | 75TH

SOUTHEAST REGION: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia

| POSITION TITLE | NUMBER OF GROUPS | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | $\begin{gathered} \text { 25TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 75TH } \\ \text { PERCENTILE } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Executive Director (or Co-Directors) | 29 | \$59,000 | \$120,000 | \$39,500 | \$47,000 | \$77,100 |
| Associate or Deputy Director | 14 | \$53,688 | \$106,961 | \$37,440 | \$47,938 | \$67,623 |
| Program or Campaign Director | 18 | \$50,000 | \$80,000 | \$31,200 | \$41,150 | \$55,785 |
| Political Director | 5 | \$45,000 | \$90,000 | \$41,600 | \$42,600 | \$58,195 |
| Policy Advocate | 2 | \$33,500 | \$39,000 | \$28,000 | \$30,750 | \$36,250 |
| Policy Researcher | 1 | \$40,669 | \$40,669 | \$40,669 | \$40,669 | \$40,669 |
| Community Organizer | 17 | \$35,000 | \$50,000 | \$20,000 | \$30,000 | \$40,000 |
| Senior or Lead Organizer | 10 | \$42,300 | \$60,000 | \$29,000 | \$40,378 | \$49,738 |
| Outreach Coordinator | 5 | \$33,000 | \$43,064 | \$31,000 | \$31,200 | \$38,000 |
| Training Coordinator | 5 | \$45,000 | \$60,000 | \$30,000 | \$40,000 | \$45,000 |
| Campaign Associate | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Field Coordinator | 1 | \$28,000 | \$28,000 | \$28,000 | \$28,000 | \$28,000 |
| Data Coordinator | 2 | \$30,000 | \$35,000 | \$25,000 | \$27,500 | \$32,500 |
| Phonebank or Canvass Coordinator | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phonebank/Canvassers (hourly pay) | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Services Coordinator | 1 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 | \$35,000 |
| Direct Services Associate | 1 | \$40,000 | \$40,000 | \$40,000 | \$40,000 | \$40,000 |
| Finance or Operations Director | 6 | \$43,500 | \$110,608 | \$37,700 | \$40,500 | \$54,000 |
| Finance Associate/Bookkeeper | 3 | \$43,258 | \$50,000 | \$29,500 | \$36,379 | \$46,629 |
| Development Director | 6 | \$39,112 | \$67,000 | \$36,000 | \$37,485 | \$42,992 |
| Grants Coordinator/Writer | 2 | \$48,614 | \$53,000 | \$44,228 | \$46,421 | \$50,807 |
| Development Associate | 2 | \$41,970 | \$45,000 | \$38,939 | \$40,454 | \$43,485 |
| Office Manager | 8 | \$36,500 | \$48,021 | \$15,000 | \$28,740 | \$45,058 |
| Executive Assistant | 4 | \$35,500 | \$36,000 | \$27,780 | \$33,195 | \$36,000 |
| Admin Assistant | 5 | \$25,000 | \$35,000 | \$22,000 | \$22,000 | \$30,116 |
| IT or Web Manager | 6 | \$44,250 | \$56,439 | \$38,408 | \$42,375 | \$45,000 |

SOUTHWEST REGION: New Mexico, Texas

| POSITION TITLE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NUME } \\ & \text { OF GRO } \end{aligned}$ | MEDIAN | HIGH | LOW | 25TH PERCENTILE | 75TH PERCENTILE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Executive Director (or Co-Directors) | 7 | \$49,140 | \$82,000 | \$30,000 | \$44,000 | \$65,000 |
| Associate or Deputy Director | 1 | \$37,440 | \$37,440 | \$37,440 | \$37,440 | \$37,440 |
| Program or Campaign Director | 3 | \$63,000 | \$68,000 | \$54,000 | \$58,500 | \$65,500 |
| Political Director | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy Advocate | 1 | \$45,000 | \$45,000 | \$45,000 | \$45,000 | \$45,000 |
| Policy Researcher | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Organizer | 3 | \$34,000 | \$40,000 | \$20,000 | \$27,000 | \$37,000 |
| Senior or Lead Organizer | 3 | \$30,000 | \$38,000 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$34,000 |
| Outreach Coordinator | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training Coordinator | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Campaign Associate | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Field Coordinator | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data Coordinator | 1 | \$17,900 | \$17,900 | \$17,900 | \$17,900 | \$17,900 |
| Phonebank or Canvass Coordinator | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phonebank/Canvassers (hourly pay) | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct Services Coordinator | 1 | \$20,200 | \$20,200 | \$20,200 | \$20,200 | \$20,200 |
| Direct Services Associate | 1 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 | \$17,000 |
| Finance or Operations Director | 3 | \$30,000 | \$53,000 | \$20,000 | \$25,000 | \$41,500 |
| Finance Associate/Bookkeeper | 2 | \$22,500 | \$38,000 | \$7,000 | \$14,750 | \$30,250 |
| Development Director | 2 | \$48,000 | \$56,000 | \$40,000 | \$44,000 | \$52,000 |
| Grants Coordinator/Writer | 1 | \$20,500 | \$20,500 | \$20,500 | \$20,500 | \$20,500 |
| Development Associate | 2 | \$41,669 | \$49,337 | \$34,000 | \$37,834 | \$45,503 |
| Office Manager | 3 | \$21,000 | \$45,000 | \$10,000 | \$15,500 | \$33,000 |
| Executive Assistant | n/a |  |  |  |  |  |
| Admin Assistant | 1 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 |
| IT or Web Manager | 2 | \$21,650 | \$42,000 | \$1,300 | \$11,475 | \$31,825 |

NORTHEAST REGION: Massachussetts, Maine, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, DC


The following sections present findings regarding salary ranges, policies around raises, and trends in benefits packages. We also discuss how organizations embed their values in compensation practices, and findings about decision-making processes around compensation.

## SALARY TRENDS

- There is strong positive correlation between executive salaries and organizational budget size, and weaker but significant correlation between executive salaries and staff size. For instance, among organizations with annual budgets of less than $\$ 500,000$, the median pay of Executive Directors was $\$ 50,000$, while for organizations with budgets over $\$ 2$ million, the median pay of Executive Directors was $\$ 98,000$.

■ A similar pattern was found among top positions such as Associate Director, Finance Director, Political Director and Development Director which had median salaries in the $\$ 57,000-\$ 63,000$ range overall. In groups with budgets under $\$ 500,000$, these positions earned $\$ 42,000-\$ 51,000$, while in groups with budget over $\$ 2$ Million top managers earned \$60,000-\$85,000.

- One notable finding is that salaries for Development Director are not larger than other senior managers, although anecdotally it is heard that development directors command salaries as high as the Executive Director.
- In the past 18 months, half of the organizations have been able to raise salaries at least by their normal cost of living increases. However, many groups indicate flat or decreasing compensation. Thirty seven percent report that staff salary rates have stayed the same, and 9.5 percent reported cut backs in salary levels.


## INCENTIVE FACTORS IN SALARIES

Regarding how salaries reflect effectiveness or productivity, 28 percent say they reward high performance strongly and 31 percent said they do this somewhat. (See also merit raise data). There were some critiques of the focus on seniority at the expense of quality or volume of work.

## "[Our policy could be stronger] if some positions were paid for actual work done, as opposed to seniority."

Some respondents also noted that pay is sometimes unfairly skewed to certain types of positions and that raises tend to proportionately benefit the higher ranked positions and the longer-term staff, to the point where some felt their scale is unfairly skewed against certain categories of staff.

## [We need] more salary equity up and down the organization and equity among different programs.

## BALANCING COMPETITIVE WAGES AND ROBUST BENEFITS

We asked organizations to share how strongly their compensation practices reflect their social justice values. Fewer than half feel their compensation is "competitive" and only $23 \%$ percent feel salaries are "generous". Twenty four percent want to increase salary levels-a relatively low desire to strengthen wages despite the finding that the groups do not see their scales as competitive or generous. This may simply be a reflection that funding limitations make it unrealistic to approach more competitive levels of compensation, or may reflect a priority on offering comprehensive benefits.

| HOW STRONGLY DO SALARY POLICIES <br> REFLECT YOUR VALUES? | STRONGLY | SOMEWHAT | WANT TO STRENGTHEN <br> THIS ELEMENT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Living Wage/Basic Package | $61 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Less than 3:1 ratio between highest/lowest paid | $63 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Less than 2:1 ratio between highest/lowest paid | $50 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Competitive/Comparable to other groups | $47 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Rewards longevity | $38 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Rewards high performance | $28 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

> "We don't pay our staff enough. I wish our salaries were more competitive, but we have issues staying within our budget. We attempt to reward staff in other ways such as comp time, generous time off policies, etc."

In terms of how policies embed other values, it was interesting to note that a majority of organizations feel they reward longevity strongly ( $38 \%$ ) or somewhat strongly ( $36 \%$ ); but several mentioned high turnover as an issue in anecdotal comments. Annual raises, and increases in vacation time may not be sufficient to retain staff with lower salaries and high-pressure work environments. Turnover rates may also reflect wider demographic trends with a higher turnover pattern in the younger workforce and increasing proportion of boomers nearing retirement age. See Working Across Generations (http://workingacrossgenerations.org/ index.cfm) for generational dynamics in the social justice sector.
"[We need to] work on staff retention. Over 80 percent of our staff has less than 3 years of seniority."

## SALARY RATIOS

One way that organizations reflect their values in their practices is to keep the difference between highest and lowest paid staff under a 2:1 or 3:1 ratio. Combining responses to strongly and somewhat, seventy six percent of organizations report that that ratio is under 3:1 and sixty eight percent report it is even lower, under 2:1.
> "[Our salary scale] is skewed a little bit by the fact that our ED has been here over a decade (and has grown the organization significantly), while our 2 lowest paid people are straight out of college. If you leave out those 2, we are 3 to 1 ratio."

Looking at the position of community organizer that is so essential to this sector, we see that the median salary varies by organizational budget sizes and region from $\$ 32,000-40,000$. But the difference between salaries of community organizers and senior leadership positions gets wider as the organizational budget increases.
"I'd like to bump up the entire salary scale. I don't like how development staff makes so much more than organizers; it's part of the industry standards, but it feels wrong given how much organizers work."

| MEDIAN ANNUAL <br> SALARY | EXECUTIVE <br> DIRECTOR | COMMUNITY <br> ORGANIZER | RATIO |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Budget under <br> $\$ 500,000$ | $\$ 50,000$ | $\$ 32,250$ | 1.6 to 1 |
| Budget <br> $\$ 500 k-\$ 1 M$ | $\$ 65,500$ | $\$ 38,000$ | 1.7 to 1 |
| Budget <br> $\$ 1-2 M i l l i o n ~$ | $\$ 80,000$ | $\$ 40,000$ | 2.0 to 1 |
| Budget over <br> $\$ 2 M i l l i o n ~$ | $\$ 98,000$ | $\$ 40,000$ | 2.5 to 1 |

## TRENDS IN RAISES AND BONUSES

We surveyed practices around various kinds of raises: Cost of living adjustments (COLA), Seniority raises, Step increases for increasing job duties, Merit raises for outstanding performance, and one-time Bonuses. The data and narrative comments illustrate the trends and tradeoffs organizations are making, often prioritizing steady wages or small COLAs, while reducing or shifting fringe benefits. Fewer than 44 percent of groups had formal salary policies, so in most cases raises are decided by the Executive Director or by the Board during the budget process or at year-end depending on a budget surplus, so these trends are highly sensitive to changes in the funding environment.
> "Our raises vary. Bonuses are distributed equally and range from zero to 5 percent of salary. Individual raises are given in conjunction with annual review and take merit, cola, and seniority into account. We are small so we don't have formal 'steps' but when job duties change there is often a salary adjustment. Bonuses are decided at year-end by Board, raises at employees anniversary date but all included in budget forecast."

- COLA: We found that the most common kinds of raises are COLA raises ( 70 percent of organizations offer these). These COLA raises range from less than $\$ 250$ (11 percent of groups), to $\$ 2000$ (20\%): the most common amount of these is $2-3$ percent of salary or a fixed amount of $\$ 500-1500$ per year. Twenty-four (24\%) percent of groups suspended their COLA raises this year.
- "Step" raises reflect increasing job duties and are the next most common type of raise, offered by 60 percent of groups. These step raises range from less than $\$ 250$ ( 8 percent of groups), to $\$ 2000$ (29\%): the most common amount offered by 37 percent of groups is an increase of \$500-1500 per year. Nine (9\%) percent of groups of groups suspended their step raises this year.
- Seniority: 44 percent of respondents give raises to employees to reflect years of service. 56 percent of respondents who give these, report they range from $\$ 500-1500$, and Seven (7\%) percent of groups suspended their seniority raises this year.
- Merit: 33 percent of respondents give merit-based salary increases to employees, and 50 percent of groups calculate these between $\$ 500-1500$. Six percent of groups suspended merit raises this year.
- Bonuses are also common, with 35 percent saying they offer bonuses of 1-3 percent of salary. Ten ( $10 \%$ ) percent of groups suspended bonuses this year.
"Generally, we do a COLA (based on federal \%) and a salary bump for an additional year of experience. In 2011, the salary bump was equal to \$1164 but we suspended it in 2012 because of budget constraints."
> "We update our salary schedule each year (to reflect COLA and added experience) but raises were not offered this year because of budget constraints. We reduced pension contributions this year (from 5 percent to $2 \%$ )."

"We did year end one time bonus of ( $\$ 250$ across the board) off and on in the past, but not since past five years."

## REFLECTING VALUES IN RAISE POLICIES

Across-the-board increases based on percentage of salary, such as COLAs and seniority increases, result in widening the gap between highest and lowest paid employees, and heavy budgetary impact by compounding the value of raises over time. Though not addressed directly in the study, RoadMap has worked with groups to create policies to mitigate those effects.

Some groups convert annual raises from a percentage basis to a flat dollar amount, or create performance incentives instead of only offering seniority increases. In other cases, groups calculate raises with a weighted formula to bring up lower end while offering smaller raises at the higher end, or offer end of year bonuses instead of annual increases to the base salary.

## PROCESS TO ESTABLISH AND CHANGE POLICIES

A somewhat surprising finding is that 56 percent of groups report they have no established salary scale or written salary policy. Only 44 percent of groups have an established salary policy with clear criteria for salary ranges and raise policies. Among those with formal policies, they describe a process of staff and board working to approve policy changes on a regular basis, some as frequently as every year. Of those groups with policies, 60 percent had updated their policies in the last 2-3 years and of all groups, fourteen percent are planning to create or update their policies this year.
> "Policies are reviewed annually. Staff comment and feedback are collected and presented to the Executive Director and Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee does any additional research necessary and makes a final recommendation to the Board. The Board makes final decision on policies to be changed, removed or added."

While the senior leadership or Board are usually the main decision-makers, in some cases staff are the main drivers of proposing changes and even make final approvals to policies. Reflecting a more democratic culture in their workplaces, 11 percent reported that changes to salary require staff approval and 14 percent report that staff approve benefits changes. In some cases changes are approved through a staff union (1\%).

Social justice groups often explore alternative structures for leadership to promote more participatory management and democratic work place culture. See Structuring Leadership: Alternative Models (http://www.buildingmovement. org/news/entry/277). Formal policies support more transparent and fair practices, and we encourage groups to use the survey and see templates available on RoadMap's Resources web page (http://www.roadmapconsulting.org/latestresources) to develop or update their policies.

WHO IS INVOLVED IN PROPOSING AND MAKING CHANGES?


## Benefits Packages

## PAID TIME OFF

Time off in the form of holidays, sick time and vacation time are all essential to a healthy work force and sustainable workplace culture. The typical U.S. private sector offers "two weeks vacation" for salaried employees, among the lowest levels in developed countries, and often there is little or no paid time off for part-time or low-wage workers.

The non-profit sector in general is somewhat more generous, and the social justice sector perhaps even more generous - this survey found only 6 percent of groups limit paid vacation to 10 days per year.

Eighty four percent of groups report no change in total paid time off (vacation, sick, holidays) in the past 18 months. Six percent increased their paid time off, and 5 percent cut back paid time off.

Holidays: The median number of paid holidays is 12 per year. The low was zero paid holidays and the high was 30 paid holidays, sometimes including an extended winter break.

Sick days: The typical sick time policy is 10-12 days per year. Most sick time policies allow accumulation up to one to two years of unused sick time. Some groups also allow for a 'time-bank' where employees may donate their own unused sick time to another staff person facing a serious illness.

Vacation: The median number of paid vacation days per year is fifteen (3 weeks).

| VACATION DAYS ACCRUED | \# GROUPS | \% OF GROUPS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Under 10 days per year | 7 | $6.36 \%$ |
| 10-19 days per year | 64 | $58.18 \%$ |
| 20-29 days per year | 35 | $31.82 \%$ |
| 30 or more days per year | 4 | $3.64 \%$ |

## COMBINED PAID TIME OFF (PTO)

■ One third ( $32 \%$ ) of the groups combine sick days and vacation into a single benefit pool of paid time off and allow staff to self-manage how it is used. The median number of PTO days for these groups is 20 per year.

- Two groups reported unlimited Paid Time Off, not distinguishing vacation, sick and holidays and allowing staff to self-manage workload and time off.

Caps on Vacation Accrual: Most groups place a cap on how many days of paid vacation can be accrued to limit financial liability and encourage employees to use the vacation time. Twenty-two percent of groups had no cap on vacation accrual.


Cost of Insurance Benefits: The survey shows that the cost of benefits as a proportion of salaries varies widely. Benefit costs include federal and state payroll taxes (typically 12-13\%) plus health coverage, unemployment and other insurance such as workers compensation.

Benefit costs vary widely in different regions, and health benefits are closely tied to employees' age and the number of employees. Nearly twenty-four percent of groups report their total benefits cost between 25$29 \%$ of total salary costs, and 6.1 percent of groups report costs over 35\% percent of salaries. The higher cost packages for example offer family health coverage, life insurance, transit benefits, etc.

COST OF BENEFITS PACKAGE
(Cost as \% of total Salaries)


## Reflecting Values in Benefits Packages

In terms of how benefits reflect their values, more than half of groups report that they have "family friendly" packages (59\%), forty-nine percent consider their benefits to be generous, and almost half (47\%) feel they are comparable to other groups.

| HOW STRONGLY <br> DO BENEFITS <br> POLCIES REFLECT <br> YOUR VALUES? | STRONGLY | SOMEWHAT | WANT TO <br> STRENGTHEN <br> THIS <br> ELEMENT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family friendly ${ }^{2}$ | $59 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Generous <br> Benefits | $49 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $13 \%$ |

Benefits for Part-time Employees: Survey findings indicate significant support for part-time employees: On average 70 percent of groups provide vacation, holidays and sick time to part-time employees on a pro-rated basis, i.e., if they work half-time they earn paid time off at half time. Given high unemployment in the wider economy, and the strains of staff cutbacks, generous benefits for part-time workers can help with retention, and reflects social justice values of honoring all roles in the workplace.

Comments make it clear that a great deal of thought goes into how to make policies reflect values. Thirteen percent want to increase benefits packages and 9\% want to make benefits more family-friendly.
"There is some difference of opinion as to whether adding paid parental leave would advance our values. Some Board members have felt it does not, others that it does. Similarly, there is a difference of opinion about whether an employee should receive anything if they elect to have health insurance coverage elsewhere."
"[We recently] added nondiscrimination based on gender orientation/identity."
"Our benefits might be skewed towards part-time right now-we offer full benefits for part-time workers."

## BENEFITS PROVIDED TO PART-TIME EMPLOYEES

(pro-rated to proportion of time worked)


[^1]
# Types of Insurance Benefits <br> Health, Life, Workers Compensation, and Unemployment 

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

- Most groups do offer unemployment insurance and workers compensation insurance (required in many states). Both of these are critical resources for worker's security, and particularly important in the recession when any layoffs or injuries can place a huge burden on the individual.


## HEALTH INSURANCE AND ALTERNATIVE CARE BENEFITS

- Ninety-two percent of groups offer health insurance coverage (details below).
- Thirty four percent provide flexible spending accounts and 26 percent provide for alternative care such as chiropractic or acupuncture (which is sometimes part of standard insurance providers and sometimes provided through separate policies or flexible spending accounts).

Dental and Vision Insurance: Eighty two percent of respondents provide dental insurance to employees, and 53 percent provide vision insurance to employees.

Life Insurance: Thirty-eight percent offer life insurance.

## TRENDS IN INSURANCE COVERAGE

The ability to provide a robust and comprehensive benefits package to employees is strongly correlated with organizational budget size. Almost all organizations surveyed ( $92 \%$ ) offer health insurance to employees many cover the full premiums for the employee.

Eighty-two percent of those with budgets under $\$ 500,000$ provide health insurance, but only 57 percent of those also provide dental and 32 percent provide vision coverage, compared to 82 percent of groups in the national sample that provide dental insurance, and 53 percent that provide vision coverage in the national sample.

## COST SHARING FOR FAMILY COVERAGE AND CO-PAY LEVELS FOR HEALTH PLANS

Of the national sample, only three percent of organizations cover 100 percent of family insurance

## PERCENT OF GROUPS THAT PROVIDE THIS BENEFIT

| BENEFITS PACKAGE BY BUDGET SIZE | UNDER \$500K | \$500K-\$1MILLION | \$1-\$2 MILLION | OVER \$2 MILLION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Health Coverage | $82.5 \%$ | $91.7 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Workers Compensation Insurance | $72.5 \%$ | $97.2 \%$ | $96.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Unemployment Insurance | $67.5 \%$ | $88.9 \%$ | $88.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Dental insurance | $57.5 \%$ | $91.7 \%$ | $92.0 \%$ | $94.4 \%$ |
| Pension contribution by employer | $35.0 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| Vision | $32.5 \%$ | $58.3 \%$ | $72.0 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| Pension plan voluntary contributions | $27.5 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ | $68.0 \%$ | $83.3 \%$ |
| Life insurance | $25.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $72.2 \%$ |
| Health Savings or Flexible Spending plan | $25.0 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $61.1 \%$ |
| Sabbatical | $25.0 \%$ | $30.6 \%$ | $44.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ |
| Long-term Disability Insurance | $15.0 \%$ | $27.8 \%$ | $44.0 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| Alternative Medicine (chiropractic, <br> acupuncture, etc.) | $12.5 \%$ | $27.8 \%$ | $36.0 \%$ | $44.4 \%$ |
| Severance Pay for long-term employees | $12.5 \%$ | $27.8 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | 20 |

premiums (spouse and dependents). But of the larger nonprofits with budgets of $\$ 1-2$ million annually, 64 percent pay full cost of dependent coverage and 53 pay full cost of spouse. While groups with budgets under $\$ 500,000,32$ percent cover dependent health care and 29 percent cover spouse health insurance.

The majority of organizations cover full cost for the employee, with about one-third also covering full cost for family members.

- Eighty percent of organizations pay the full cost of health insurance premiums for employees, 38 percent pay the full cost of dependents, 34 percent pay the full cost of spouse and 30 percent pay the full cost for domestic partners.
About 30-40 percent of organizations require employees to cover all costs for family members, and several have cost-sharing formulas for family member coverage, with employees paying $20 \%-40 \%$ of monthly premiums.
- The employee pays full cost for their dependents in 29 percent of organizations, full cost of spouse in 36 percent, and full cost of domestic partners in 40 percent of organizations
- Co-pay levels vary from $\$ 0$ to $\$ 100$ but the median was $\$ 20$, and 63 percent of groups have co-pays between $\$ 20-40$ per medical visit.


## INSURANCE BENEFITS

(\% of groups that offer each benefit)

| $\checkmark$ | Health Coverage | 92.10\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | Workers Compensation Insurance | 89.70\% |
| $\checkmark$ | Unemployment Insurance (Via State Or Self-Insured) | 84.10\% |
| $\checkmark$ | Dental | 81.70\% |
| $\checkmark$ | Vision | 53.20\% |
| $\checkmark$ | Life Insurance | 38.10\% |
| $\checkmark$ | Long-Term Disability Insurance | 34.10\% |
| $\checkmark$ | Health Savings Plan Or Flexible Spending Plan | 34.10\% |
| $\checkmark$ | Alternative Medicine (Chiropractic, Acupuncture, Etc.) | 26.20\% |

CO-PAY RANGES
\% OF GROUPS

| Co-pay level under \$20 | $26 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Co-pay level \$20-\$40 | $63 \%$ |
| Co-pay level over \$40 | $11 \%$ |

COST OF CO-PAYS
COST PER VISIT

| Lowest co-pay level | $\$ 0$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Highest co-pay | $\$ 100$ |
| Median co-pay | $\$ 20$ |

Shifts in benefits packages: While 50 percent reported reducing their benefits package in the last 2-3 years, 61 percent indicated they had added benefits, implying that groups are experimenting with new combinations of benefits. Specifically, 70 percent say their level health benefits has stayed the same, but 47 percent changed insurance providers in some way, and another 13 percent are planning to make changes to their policy providers this coming year.
Comments illustrate trends in how groups are managing cost increases:
> "We started asking part-time folks to contribute to insurance premiums recently, and those who want a different plan within our health insurance exchange must make up the difference."

"Costs are increasing and we are trying to figure out how to sustain staff but cut costs of our benefit package."
"Given the rising costs of health care, we may explore going to a different plan this year."

## OTHER FAMILY-FRIENDLY BENEFITS

In addition of offering medical coverage to dependents and spouse, many groups offer other family-friendly policies such as paid parental leave and domestic partners coverage.

## DOMESTIC PARTNERS COVERAGE

Fifty-seven percent of groups offer the same package to Domestic Partners of employees as they do for spouses, and another 3 percent offer a similar package

## EMPLOYEE COSTS FOR HEALTH COVERAGE


with some modifications. There are barriers posed by insurance providers and tax laws to offering fully equivalent benefits to same sex couples, so even where an employer wishes to extend such benefits in an equal form, external factors might stand in the way. The survey indicates ways that groups have created policies to cover tax obligations or out of pocket costs to make these benefits more comparable to what is offered to married opposite sex couples.
"Our insurance carrier will not cover domestic partners but we provide coverage through an individual plan or through the DP's employer. We "gross up" the employee's salary to help offset the additional tax liability incurred with domestic partner coverage."
> "The employee does have to pay imputed income on benefits to domestic partners as per legal guidelines."
> "We work to contract with providers that allow for DP coverage. In the event we are unable to, we offer reimbursement for out of pocket expenses or premiums for DPs."

## IMPACT OF NATIONAL HEALTH CARE REFORM

With the gradual implementation of the Federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, small employers including non-profits (those with 25 or fewer employees and average wages of $\$ 50,000$ a year or less) will be eligible for a tax credit. The full credit is only for those employers with 10 or fewer employees with annual average wages below \$25,000.

Employers must pay half of health insurance premiums for employees to be eligible for the credit. However, the tax credit available to nonprofits is smaller than that of for-profits: 25 percent of the employer contribution for employer premiums until 2013, compared to 35 percent for for-profits; and 35 percent beginning in 2014, compared to 50 percent for for-profits. It's unclear what impact these reforms will have on the sector as of yet.
Some organizations will be able to begin providing employee health insurance or to increase their current contributions. Some observers say that the wage caps will threaten nonprofits that are trying to provide both adequate salaries (in most areas $\$ 25 \mathrm{k}$ is not a living wage) and health benefits. Further, the question of whether the tax credit will compensate for ongoing dramatic cost escalation in the insurance market remains.
(Source: www.wucpas.com/news/article/)

## PARENTAL LEAVE

Time off for pregnancy is required under federal discrimination protections, and additional maternity benefits apply for larger employers. Partial pay is available through state or private disability insurance. Other types of medical leave are available in organizations with more than 50 employees under the federal Family Medical Leave Act, which can apply to fathers (http://www.babycenter.com/0_paternity-leave-what-are-the-options-for-dads_8258.bc) or adoptive parents, and many groups follow similar policies for same-sex adoptive parents. See links on Federal (http:// pregnancy.familyeducation.com/postpartum/maternityleave/57441.html) and California (http://usemployees. pearson.com/EmployeeVerification/Benefits/CA_ Disability.aspx) regulations for examples of parental leaves.

Twenty-three percent of groups offer no additional time off nor extra pay other than the state mandated coverage. Sixty-two percent of groups allow the parent to use vacation and sick time. Fifty percent of groups provide additional paid time off and $51 \%$ percent of groups offer the same benefits to the non-birth parent (father or domestic partner).

Of those that offer paid time above state benefits, the policies range from 1 to 12 weeks paid time off, with the most common being 4 weeks ( $22 \%$ of groups), 6 weeks ( $22 \%$ ) or 3 weeks ( $10 \%$ ) paid time off to for the mother of a new child.

Ten percent of groups allow a combined total of pair and unpaid time of 8 weeks off, and twenty percent of groups offer up to 12 weeks off. Of the half of groups that allow these benefits for the non-birth parent, i.e. in case of adoption or paternity leave, the most common policy was 4 paid weeks off ( $26 \%$ of groups) or 6 weeks ( $22 \%$ ).
"I wish we could pay for the entire period of parental leave rather than just part and that severance was guaranteed for long-time employees."

## PARENTAL LEAVE BENEFITS



## PENSION, SABBATICAL AND SEVERANCE BENEFITS

Pension contribution plans, sabbaticals, and severance pay are benefits that can promote long-term staff tenure, combat burn out, and offer long-term financial stability to employees who want to make a career in the sector despite lower pay scales than in other fields. While these are some of the more challenging benefits for groups to offer, it is heartening to see that significant number of groups offer these types of benefits.

- Half of respondents offer a pension plan to employees such as a 403 (b) plan or IRA contributions, and most of those make employer contributions to those plans (only $21 \%$ are employee-only voluntary plans).
- For those that make employer contributions, these are often a matching program, and/or a fixed percentage of salary. Employer contributions range from $1 \%-5 \%$ of salary, with the most common being $3 \%-5 \%$ of salary.
- Thirty-five percent of groups that provide pension benefits offer them to part-time employees on a prorated basis.
- Eight percent of groups reduced pension contributions in the last 18 months, and 8\% increased their pension benefit, with $44 \%$ of groups maintaining their contribution.


## PENSION PLAN CONTRIBUTIONS



## PENSION PLANS CUT DUE TO RECESSION NATIONAL TRENDS

The Listening Post Project found that retirement benefits are a nonprofit expense that was significantly affected by the recession. The vast majority of organizations report being forced to reduce retirement benefits, lower employer matches, end future benefit them from offering pension benefits at all. An in-depth discussion of escalating pension benefit costs for nonprofits and other trends from 2009 and 2010 can be found at http://ccss.jhu.edu/

See Listening Post Project—publications list, 2009 and 2010 editions

## PENSION, SABBATICAL AND SEVERENCE BENEFITS



## SEVERANCE

A limited but significant number of groups (20\%) also offer severance pay for long time employees, which is often seen as a reward for long tenure, to make transitions easier and to make up for relatively low salaries in the sector. Of these, 10 percent of groups provided severance benefits to part-time employees on a pro-rated basis.

> A typical policy example: "For employees who have worked three years or more: severance is equivalent to one month of that employee's salary for every three years of employment, with a maximum of four month's worth of severance."

In some cases, severance is only provided in extreme cases of layoffs.
> "We gave severance when we laid people off in 2009. Don't know that we'd do the same again-it seems very circumstantial and something the board would have to decide looking at a totality of circumstances."

## SABBATICAL

Another important benefit offered by some social change organizations is sabbaticals to give an opportunity for rest and exploration as an incentive for long-time employees. Thirty-three percent of groups offer some kind of paid sabbatical time.

Typically sabbaticals are paid time off of one month to three months, after several years of employment and a commitment to return to the organization. One third of groups that provide sabbaticals extend the benefit to part-time employees on a pro-rated basis.

## OTHER BENEFITS: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, TRANSPORTATION AND PHONE COSTS

Among the other fringe benefits detailed in the survey were training, transit or parking benefits, and phone costs. These are part of a comprehensive benefits package.

■ Eighty percent of groups offer professional development budget approximately $\$ 500-\$ 1000$ per employee for training, coaching or other education.

- Sixty percent pay for mobile phone costs, 30 percent pay up to $\$ 500$ per year, 15 percent pay up to $\$ 1000$, and 15 percent pay between $\$ 1000-$ $\$ 2000$ per year per employee.

■ Twenty-five percent of groups offer pre-tax transit benefits of $\$ 500-\$ 1000$ per employee per year, in the form of 'commuter checks' to cover bus and subway costs.

- Twenty percent offer parking passes valued up to $\$ 500$ per year.


## CONCLUSION

The 2012 Social Justice Compensation Survey indicates that many social justice groups are stable and even thriving. It is impressive how much the groups are reaching for fair practices even when they are restricted in doing so (cost, legal limitations, insurance policies, etc.) This speaks well for their commitment to practicing social justice values in the workplace
and their intention to support staff well-being and sustainability. We hope the survey and tools available on the RoadMap website encourage more groups to develop practices that invest in and support our most important asset-the people who are committed to working for social, economic and environmental justice.
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ROADMAP
http://www.roadmapconsulting.org/
RoadMap is a national team of seasoned capacity builders dedicated to advancing the power and promise of social justice organizations. RoadMap offers high-impact consulting and coaching services while innovating new strategies for capacity building for social change. RoadMap also serves as a forum for peer learning to promote new approaches that can help develop the social justice sector as a whole.

## 1) DataCenter RESEARCH FOR JUSTICE

## DATACENTER

http://www.datacenter.org/
For over 30 years, DataCenter has been an independent research organization for social justice movements and grassroots organizing. Rooted in progressive social movements and grounded in values of justice and self- determination for communities, we use research as a tool to centralize community power and transform society.


National Organizers Alliance

## NATIONAL ORGANIZERS ALLIANCE http://noacentral.org/

NOA's mission is to advance progressive organizing for social, economic and environmental justice and to sustain, support and nurture the people of all ages who do it. In furtherance of that goal, NOA's members are organizers who are responsible to a defined constituency and who help build that constituency through leadership development, collective action and the development of democratic structures.


[^0]:    1."Living wage" generally refers to the minimum income necessary for a worker to meet basic needs, or wages necessary to meet basic needs for a family of four. This survey did not ask groups to give benchmarks for their region, so this data is not fully documented in the survey.

[^1]:    2. "Family friendly" refers to policies such as employer-paid insurance for spouse, dependents and domestic partners; paid family leave, and other practices such as flextime or tele-commuting. The survey question allowed respondents to interpret this broadly. Some states have specific guidelines, some insurance providers create obstacles to domestic partner coverage, and some large employers must comply with federal guidelines such as family leave. See section on insurance coverage and domestic partners for additional survey findings.
