

# Salary & Benefits Survey 2006

*of Greater Kansas City Area Nonprofit Organizations*

*Published Fall 2006*

*A Model in Nonprofit Collaboration*



# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	3
Highlights and Trends .....	7
Important Definitions for Using This Survey .....	15
Salary and Wage Data .....	16
Guide to Interpreting the Data .....	17
<i>Key Executive Positions</i>	
Top Executive Positions .....	18
Executive Director/President .....	18
Executive Director .....	19
Agency Administrator/Executive Director/ Executive Administrator .....	20
Associate Executive Director/Executive Vice President .....	21
Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer .....	22
Vice President/Director of Development .....	23
Vice President/Director of Administration .....	24
Vice President or Director of Programs/Operations .....	25
<i>Employee Positions</i>	
Administrative Manager/Office Manager .....	26
Executive Secretary/Executive Assistant .....	27
Secretary/Administrative Assistant .....	28
Clerk .....	29
Receptionist .....	30
Accountant .....	31
Controller .....	32
Accounting Clerk/Bookkeeper .....	33
Director/Manager of Communications/Marketing/Public Relations .....	34
Major Gifts/Planned Giving Manager .....	35
Special Events Manager/Coordinator .....	36
Development Specialist/Associate .....	37
Grant Proposal Manager .....	38
Grant Proposal Writer .....	39
Director/Manager of Volunteers .....	40
Director/Vice President of Human Resources .....	41
Human Resources Professional .....	42
Director/Vice President of Management Information Systems/Technology .....	43
Computer Programmer .....	44
Computer Network (LAN/WAN) Administrator .....	45
Computer Operator/Technology/Computer Support Specialist .....	46
Database Specialist .....	47
Program Manager .....	48
Social Worker I - Case Worker .....	49
Social Worker II - Case Worker (Certified/Licensed) .....	50
Social Worker III - Counselor .....	51
Social Worker VI - Counselor (Certified/Licensed) .....	52
Program Specialist/ Case Aide .....	53
Outreach Worker .....	54
Registered Nurse .....	55
Licensed Practical Nurse .....	56
Aide .....	57
Certified Aide .....	58
Day Care Worker .....	59
Teacher .....	60
Teacher Aide .....	61
Facilities Manager .....	62
Cook .....	63
Custodian/Maintenance Worker .....	64
Driver .....	65
Benefits Practices .....	66
All Agencies .....	66
Very Large Agencies (Budgets of greater than \$5 million per year) .....	80
Large Agencies (Budgets of \$1 million to \$5 million per year) .....	91
Medium Agencies (Budgets of \$250,000 to \$999,000 per year) .....	102
Small Agencies (Budgets of Less than \$250,000 per year) .....	113
Survey Methodology .....	122
Methodology .....	122
Participating Organizations .....	123
Human Resources Management Resources .....	125

# Introduction

This report provides the Kansas City nonprofit community with the results and findings from the 2006 Kansas City Salary and Benefits Survey, which was conducted during the summer and early fall of 2006 by a collaborative of Kansas City nonprofit support organizations, including:

- The Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership of the University of Missouri – Kansas City;
- The local chapter of the Association of Fund Raising Professionals (AFP),
- The Community Association of Nonprofit Business Executives (CANBE),
- The Council on Philanthropy (COP), and
- The Executive Service Corps (ESC).

These five organizations all contributed time and support to the development, implementation, and production of this important resource document.

This report has been prepared in the recognition that nonprofit organizations in our community must have the most current and valid information possible as they go about the process of making their decisions regarding compensation, benefits, and associated human resources practices. Nonprofits, often to an even greater degree than other organizations, are exceptionally reliant upon the people of their organizations to be successful and effective, and equitable and appropriate compensation and benefits are essential to recruiting and retaining the people that nonprofits need to meet the needs of their clients and the community. This report provides information that will help inform nonprofit organizations as they establish compensation and other human resources policies and plans for the coming year, and our goal is to help ensure that those decisions are based on valid information from this community.

The report is divided into four key sections:

- A) Highlights and Trends** presents a brief overview of major themes and some comparisons of Kansas City compensation and benefits practices to those of other parts of the United States. This section includes information on some of the notable changes in compensation and benefits since 2004, the last year for which a similar survey was conducted in Kansas City, and provides some trend information about the relative compensation of men and women in the sector.
- B) Salary and Wage Data** is the section that provides the core of the information on salaries and wages that Kansas City nonprofits reported paying in the summer of 2006. Following a brief orientation with key definitions and a brief guide for using the various kinds of data presented in the report's tables, this section provides compensation information on the 45 most common jobs in the region's sector, including separate reports according to agency size (both by budget and employee numbers) and agency mission (e.g., environment, arts).
- C) Benefits Practices** section presents the information on benefits and associated human resources practices (e.g., paid time off) and is organized into five subsections to help agencies find the most appropriate comparative information relevant to their own size. The first subsection reports practices for the entire population of nonprofits, including separate information on top executive benefits, and is followed by subsections on each of four size categories. The four size categories by which this document reports benefits practices are:
  - a. Very large agencies: agencies with annual budgets in excess of \$5 million per year;
  - b. Large agencies: agencies with annual budgets of \$1 million to \$5 million;
  - c. Medium agencies: agencies with annual budgets of \$250,000 to \$1 million; and
  - d. Small agencies: agencies with annual budgets of less than \$250,000.
- D) Survey Methodology** is a brief section that provides greater explanation of the methods used to gather this report's information, and also lists all of the organizations from which data were gathered for this study.
- E) Human Resources Management Resources** is the final section of the report. This brief section identifies a number of human resources web sites and other resources that nonprofits may wish to consult as they develop their human resource policies and practices.

# Introduction

This report presents the salary and human resources practices information from 262 nonprofit agencies in the Kansas City metropolitan region (11 county metro region). The list of participants is provided in the Survey Methodology section of this report. The data for this report was collected in the summer and fall of 2006, and agencies reported their salaries and practices as of June 30, 2006. The report includes information from all kinds of agencies, and the nature, size, and locations of participating agencies are generally comparable to the entire sector of nonprofit public charities that employ staff in the Kansas City metro region. However, it should be noted that, for purposes of this report, care has been taken to ensure that the data reflect only the practices of 501 c (3) nonprofit public charity agencies (and excludes, for example, data from foundations and governmental agencies, both of which have human resources practices that are somewhat different from those of typical charitable nonprofits). The following tables and graphics explain the nature and types of agencies included in this report's data base.

The set of agencies that participated in this survey reflects the broad range of agency sizes, by both budget and numbers of employees that are present in the Kansas City metropolitan region. The tables below report the characteristics of the surveyed agency population for budget size (the percentages are rounded to nearest full percentage).

Agency size (annual budget)	Number in survey	% of survey population
Under \$250,000	82	31%
\$250,000 to \$499,999	36	14%
\$500,000 to \$999,999	30	12%
\$1 million to \$2.49 million	51	20%
\$2.5 million to \$4.99 million	23	9%
\$5 million to \$9.99 million	16	6%
\$10 million to \$24.99 million	11	4%
Greater than \$25 million	6	2%
Total for survey population	262	100%

For purposes of producing aggregate tables, this population was aggregated into four key categories with the following size characteristics.

Agency Size (annual budget)	Number in survey	% of Survey Population
Small: Under \$250,000	82	31%
Medium: \$250,000 to \$999,999	66	25%
Large: \$1 million to \$4.999 million	74	28%
Very Large: Greater than \$5 million	33	13%
Total for survey population	262	100%

Another way to consider the diversity and representativeness of the population of surveyed agencies is to look at the geographic scope of these organizations -- the scope of their service territories or service ranges. The following table describes the surveyed population from the perspective of geographic scope of service.

Agency Scope of Operations	Number in survey	% of Survey Population
Local/county level	63	24%
Metropolitan Kansas City	109	42%
State	13	5%
Multi-State/Regional	31	12%
National	15	6%
International	23	9%
Other	5	2%
Total for Survey Population	262	100%

Also very useful as a basis for comparison is the category of mission or agency purpose. The following table describes the survey population in terms of mission focus (percentages rounded to nearest percent).

# Introduction

Agency Mission Type	Number in survey	% of Survey Population
Aging & Senior Care	7	3%
Alcohol & Substance Abuse/Mental Health & Crisis Intervention	10	4%
Arts & Culture	22	8%
Civil Rights & Social Action	3	1%
Community Development/Housing	8	3%
Developmental Disabilities	10	4%
Economic Development	5	2%
Education: Early Childhood	7	3%
Education: K-12	14	5%
Education: Colleges & Universities	5	2%
Environment & Conservation/ Animal & Animal Welfare	6	2%
Volunteerism & Philanthropy	18	7%
Health & Rehabilitation	18	7%
Human Services/Multi-Purpose	38	15%
Jobs Employment & Training	5	2%
Public Benefit/Social Action	1	0%
Public Safety/Disaster Relief	4	2%
Recreation & Leisure & Sports	1	0%
Rehab & Physical Disabilities	4	2%
Religion & Spirituality	5	2%
Youth Development	10	4%
Miscellaneous Other	56	21%
Total Number of Organizations	262	100%

## Suggestions for Using This Report

When an agency uses the information in this report as a basis for making its own decisions regarding compensation and benefits, it is important to consider the information from several perspectives. Obviously, it is useful to look at information that is directly relevant to your budget size and mission type. Sometimes this data will be present in the table. In many cases, however, the number of unique cases in a particular category is too small for the report to provide general statistics (average or mean, median, etc.). It often is necessary to “triangulate” advice for your organization by inferring a given practice or salary from a combination of factors. Often it will be useful to consider budget as one of the first factors, followed by geographic scope and then mission type. To the extent that information is lacking, it will be necessary to look to the general information for all agencies and ground and adapt your decisions based on this information. Organizational size is very significant, especially for management positions, because it reflects a level of complexity and role sophistication that must be reflected in the compensation decision. It also reflects the level of risk that a given senior manager must manage, another factor in the compensation decision. To help assess this, the tables also report the number of people supervised for positions for which this would be relevant and data is available.

These survey findings are reflective of the practices of the agencies whose information is included in this report. While we consider this information to be reasonably accurate in reflecting the conditions of the Kansas City nonprofit sector, it certainly has its limitations. This is not a purely scientific sample from which clear inferences may be drawn about the practices of the entire Kansas City nonprofit community. Use the information as a guide and resource, not as a mandate or requirement. Further, these results reflect current practice and should not in any way be construed to reflect an “ideal” compensation and benefits system. Planning for a rewards system must reflect comparable practices in the field but, even more importantly, such systems need to reflect the values and core operating principles of your agency. Human resource systems are most effective when they reflect and put into action the ideals and values of the agency. As will be gleaned from the narrative later in this report, there are many aspects of current practice in the region’s sector that warrant change or improvement. This report describes what generally is being implemented in the community, and what these agencies tell us they think they will implement in the coming year.

# Introduction

When using this report to evaluate and compare compensation for a particular position, it is essential to look beyond the job title to identify a match for the entire description – titles vary widely for similar positions. This is especially relevant for the top executive positions. You will note that there are three different categories that might be applicable for a given agency's top executive position. You will need to consider the broader nature and scope of your organization's positions when you determine the comparable position.

In addition, be sure that you use the information in this report as appropriate to your situation. Average data, for example, is useful but also may be skewed if there are some exceptionally high or low levels among the surveyed agencies. Therefore, consider the average or "mean" value only in tandem with median value (which tells you the practice or amount for the agencies at the mid-point or 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of all agencies that reported a number). At times, this information will need to be tempered with the information about the "mode," which is the single most typical or common practice or amount for a particular category.

We also encourage users of this report to consider the larger context for their human resources policies and practices. The final section of this report offers a number of resources that may be consulted by agency leaders as they make their human resources decisions. And we also encourage users to consult the staff members who produced this report if they have specific questions or wish clarification of any information provided herein. Such calls may be directed to the staff of the Nonprofit Resource Center that is operated by the Council on Philanthropy and the Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership at UMKC, as well as to the consultants of the Executive Service Corps of Kansas City. Their contact information is presented in the Resources section of this report.

For specific information about the research content of this report, please feel free to contact the research staff of the Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership at UMKC. The three resource people to contact about this report are:

Mark Culver	816-235-5720	<a href="mailto:culverm@umkc.edu">culverm@umkc.edu</a>
Scott Helm	816-235-6055	<a href="mailto:helmsc@umkc.edu">helmsc@umkc.edu</a>
David Renz	816-234-2342	<a href="mailto:renzd@umkc.edu">renzd@umkc.edu</a>

## Acknowledgments

Every report of this type is a major undertaking, and this one is no exception. It takes the cooperation and support of many people to complete a project of this magnitude. We express appreciation to the dedicated team of people that comprised the project's leadership task force, including Susan Dell St. Clair and Brent Caswell of AFP, Larry Lee and Cindy Worthy of Executive Service Corps, Mark Shuster and Darel Packard of CANBE, Michelle Davis and Trudi Galblum of the Council on Philanthropy, and Scott Helm, Mark Culver and David Renz from the Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership at UMKC. A special note of thanks and recognition must go to Scott Helm and Mark Culver of the Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership for their project leadership, and to research assistants Carolina Mayorga-Perry, Fredrik Andersson and Benjamin Nemenoff for their data analysis support. It is through their dedicated attention and work on the research elements of this project that this initiative has been successfully completed.

# GUIDE TO INTERPRETING THE DATA

Title/Position & Typical Job Duties

## Program Manager

Supervises and may participate in one professional-level program requiring contact with clients and/or the community. Participates in program (May be several positions responsible for one or more professional-level programs).

The salary data for each title/position is reported for all organizations, by organizational size based on budget, by organizational field of service, and by organizational size based on number of employees.

	Number of Organizations	Number of Employees	Annual Cash Compensation					Most Reported Education Level (Mode)	
			Actual		Range				
			Average Salary	Median Salary	# of Cases	Average Minimum	Average Maximum		
<b>Salary - All Organizations</b>									
Salary - All	104	398	\$39,695	\$39,950	45	\$35,209	\$44,493		B
<b>Budget Size</b>									
Under \$250,000	7	10	\$19,282	\$19,282	1				B
\$250,000 - 499,999	11	19	\$32,220	\$32,220	4				B
\$500,000 - 999,999	14	21			5				B
\$1,000,000 - 2,499,999	31	83			10				B
\$2,500,000 - 4,999,999	13	42			5				B
\$5,000,000 - 9,999,999	15	94			10				B
\$10,000,000 - \$24,999,999	8	53			7				B
More than \$25,000,000	4	72	\$58,055	\$53,423	3				B
<b>Field of Service</b>									
Aging and Senior Care	1	3							
Alcohol & Substance Abuse, Mental Health & Crisis Intervention	8	29	\$43,021	\$40,400					
Arts and Culture	7	13	\$36,018	\$35,360		\$33,647	\$47,413		B
Civil Rights and Social Action	1	5							
Community Development / Housing	2	2			1				
Developmental Disabilities	6	17	\$36,194	\$33,000					B
Economic Development	1	1			1				
Education: Early Childhood Education									
Education: K - 12	3	4			1				
Education: Colleges and Universities	3	14							
Environment / Conservation, Animal & Animal Welfare	4	11	\$35,583	\$35,750	1				B
Foundations, Philanthropy & Volunteerism	3	8			1				
Health and Rehabilitation	7	54	\$38,775	\$32,500	2				B
Human Services / Multipurpose	25	117	\$39,703	\$37,209	8	\$30,845	\$49,523		B
Jobs Employment and Training	4	14	\$41,527	\$41,046	3				B
Legal Services									
Public Benefit Social Action									
Public Safety and Disaster Relief	1	4							
Recreation Leisure and Sports									
Rehabilitation and Physical Disabilities	2	4			1				
Religion and Spirituality	1	5							
Youth Development	5	23	\$43,556						B
Other:	18	63	\$42,221						B
<b>Number of Employees</b>									
1 to 5	14	20	\$37,134	\$33,425	4	\$28,350	\$39,475		B
6 to 10	19	33	\$32,514	\$34,500	6	\$33,395	\$51,471		B
11 to 20	12	30	\$39,552	\$37,334	4	\$29,831	\$42,096		B
21 to 30	8	21	\$45,047	\$49,836	3				B
31 to 50	11	40	\$53,033	\$38,188	5	\$32,980	\$45,800		B
51 to 75	12	35	\$44,074	\$37,750	5	\$34,800	\$51,203		B
76 to 100	8	44	\$36,411	\$32,275	4	\$31,376	\$50,581		B
101 to 200	13	80	\$44,164	\$41,000	10	\$37,857	\$56,979		B
201 to 300	2	21			1				
301 and over	5	74	\$52,763	\$46,717	3				B

Actual refers to current salary and is presented as the average and median (midpoint) of all current salaries reported.

Range refers to formal salary range and is presented as the average minimum and maximum levels reported. The # of Cases column refers to the number of organizations that reported they use salary ranges.

Blank cells indicate there was not enough information for statistical analysis (needed a minimum of four (4) cases to report data).

Most Reported Education Level (Mode) is the most frequently occurring educational level reported for the position. H=High School; A=some college/ tech training; B=4 yr. college; M=Masters or equivalent; D=PhD/ MD/ other; NA=Not Applicable.