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Dear Colleagues,

Last fall, APAP began a venture to shift the paradigm for performing arts professionals. When we first announced the APAP Arts Compensation Project, our stated goal was to increase transparency, parity, and equity. By creating a new industry practice and norm of sharing salary and compensation data, our aim is to promote fair pay for today's arts workers. Our aim is also to create a pathway for those professionals for whom an arts administration career has been financially out of reach. By supporting arts workers of today we are incentivizing the arts workers of tomorrow and making the performing arts ecosystem more sustainable.

This salary and compensation study comes at a critical time in our industry. The pandemic forced many organizations to downsize staff that are only just now beginning to be rightsized. The great resignation and reshuffle resulted in an unprecedented number of open positions in our field. Additionally, the pandemic made us more aware than ever of the inequities within our field, that only together we can address.

For organizations, the resulting data will help guide decision-making and inform hiring. For individuals, the data will empower them to make more informed career decisions and negotiations.

This report is the result of the first step in this journey.

In the following pages, you will learn about the initial cohort of presenting organizations and venues across the U.S. that input their data on the salaries and compensation of workers in principal roles.

Hundreds of other organizations-we hope yours is among them-will follow, each taking a step toward the goal of transparency, parity, and equity. APAP invites organizations to subscribe to the platform, contribute data, access this powerful data tool, and join a community of leaders who will transform the field.

We gratefully acknowledge and thank the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, the Mellon Foundation, and the Wallace Foundation. This project would not be possible without their generous support.

Sincerely,


Lisa Richards Coney
President and CEO


Director, Programs and Resources
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## ABOUT THE PILOT



- $\mathbf{N}$ an important step toward promoting greater pay transparency and equity in the sector, APAP launched the pilot phase of its Arts Compensation Project in the fall of 2022. APAP partnered with AMS Analytics to conduct a comparative study of salary and employee compensation at performing arts presenters across the U.S. Using an analytics platform customized for the pilot, participating organizations entered compensation and demographic data from fiscal years 2021 and 2022 and received access to charts
and visualizations representing the entire cohort.

This report presents results from that preliminary study, highlighting some of the big-picture findings in our sample of 67 organizations and what they suggest about current industry norms. Using feedback from the pilot cohort, we hope to extend and expand the APAP Arts Compensation Project, continuing to adapt the platform to its needs, in order to develop an ongoing resource that will provide year-over-year insight into industry trends.

# METHODOLOGY 



## COHORT SELECTION

September 2022

October 2022

November 2022

Announcement sent to APAP member organizations, inviting performing arts presenters to enroll in the pilot

118 organizations expressed interest; 87 were selected to form a diverse but comparable cohort, based on geographic distribution, operating model, and budget size

67 organizations contributed data for 1,023 roles to the pilot

## DATA SUBMISSION

Using Performance Analytics by AMS, a data collection and analytics platform designed for presenting arts organizations, participants submitted compensation and demographic data for filled and open roles in the following Departments:

- Administration
- Box Office
- Building, Facility, Engineering
- Communications
- Community Engagement
- Development
- Education
- Events
- Finance
- Food \& Beverage
- Front of House
- Housekeeping
- HR
- IT
- Marketing
- Operations
- Production
- Programming
- Security
- Volunteer Management


Within each department, participants also placed each role into one of 5 Management Levels, with Level 1 reserved for the Principal Administrator (e.g. an Executive Director, President, or CEO), and each Level below representing a level of responsibility within that organization's own hierarchical structure (see image).

Compensation data was then analyzed in terms of placement within both Department and Level, rather than by role title. This allowed us to compare the data across a wide variety of organization sizes and structures.

While the role titles submitted were diverse, these were some of the most frequent usages in each organization Level:

- Level 1 Executive Director (55\%), Director (11\%), President \& CEO (7\%)
- Level 2 Vice Presidents, Directorsevel 3 - Associate Directors, Managers
- Level 3 Associate Directors, Managers
- Level 4 Managers, Coordinators
- Level 5 Coordinators, Crew

In the case that an organization had more than five levels within their management structure, they were instructed to enter roles in the first five levels, counting from the top, and omit the rest. Total employee counts, including those omitted from the compensation data, were submitted separately.

For each role, participating organizations submitted data about both the compensation and the demographics of the employee holding the position. In cases where more than one employee held a position at the same Management Level within a department, participants were instructed to average their compensation numbers together. In those cases, and in cases in which a role was open (its compensation was budgeted, but it was not filled), demographics were omitted. As the project continues past this pilot, the platform will be updated to gather demographic data on multiple employees holding the same role.

Compensation data requested for each role included Base Salary, Bonus \& Incentives, Deferred Compensation, Other Reportable Compensation, and Non Taxed Benefits. All references to "compensation" in the analyses in this report refer to the sum of these values.

Due to the large differences in operating budgets between FY21 and FY22 caused by the pandemic, and the fact that two years are insufficient to show recovery trends, the majority of the analyses in this report will refer only to data from FY22.

## PARTICIPANTS



- 67 organizations contributed data to the pilot study
- In Fiscal Year 2022, their budgets ranged from $\$ 250 \mathrm{~K}$ to $\$ 15 \mathrm{M}$
- Participating organizations were divided into 4 Budget Groups (based on total operating expenses) for analysis

- Pilot participants represented 27 states across the contiguous U.S.
- $21 \%$ in the West, $31 \%$ in the Midwest, $18 \%$ in the South, and $30 \%$ in the Northeast


Budget Groups
$\square$ Group $1(\sim \$ 250 \mathrm{~K}-\$ 1 \mathrm{M}) \square$ Group $2(\sim \$ 1 \mathrm{M}-\$ 2 \mathrm{M}) \square$ Group $3(\sim \$ 2 \mathrm{M}-\$ 5 \mathrm{M}) \square$ Group $4(\sim \$ 5 \mathrm{M}-\$ 15 \mathrm{M})$

- Participants were predominantly independent not-for-profit organizations - the others were municipal or university/college-based presenters



In the framework of this study, the Principal Administrator refers to the leader of the organization (the most common title for this role in this sample, used by 55\% of participants, was Executive Director). As expected, the larger the organization's budget, the more the Principal Administrator was paid (not shown). As budgets went up, the percentage of an organization's total budget that was spent compensating the Principal Administrator went down. For Group 1 organizations, with smaller budgets, this ranged from 6\% to 48\%.

## TYPICALLY, PRINCIPAL ADMINISTRATORS MADE CLOSE TO TWICE AS MUCH AS THEIR SECONDS-IN-COMMAND



Level 1
Principal Administrators ( $\mathrm{n}=67$ )

Level 2
e.g. VPs, Directors ( $\mathrm{n}=271$ )

Level 3 e.g. Assoc. Directors, Managers ( $\mathrm{n}=306$ )

Level 4
e.g. Managers, Coordinators ( $\mathrm{n}=240$ )

Average Compensation
Median Compensation


The study analyzed employee compensation for 1,023 roles by Management Level, placing Principal Administrators on Level 1, their seconds-in-command at Level 2, and so on. The difference in both average and median compensation was the largest between Levels 1 and 2, with the average dropping 47\% from $\$ 164 \mathrm{~K}$ to $\$ 87 \mathrm{~K}$ and the median $50 \%$ from $\$ 157 \mathrm{~K}$ to $\$ 78 \mathrm{~K}$. Those differences were smaller between each of the following Management Levels, with only a $20 \%$ decrease in both average and median compensation from Level 4 to Level 5, down to an average of $\$ 40 \mathrm{~K}$ and a median of $\$ 42$

Levels 1 and 2 in the pilot organizations included more highly compensated roles (bringing the average up above the median), while Levels 3 - $\mathbf{5}$ had a more consistent distribution (the average and the median are very close together).


Breaking the previous chart down by Budget Group shows that compensation across Management Level did correlate with budget size. For example, Group 4 organizations - those with the largest budgets had the highest compensation across all Management Levels. However, the range was largest in Level 1, where the median compensation of Principal Administrators at Group 4 organizations ( $\$ 271 \mathrm{~K}$ ) was $42 \%$ higher than those at Group 3 organizations and $171 \%$ higher than those at Group 1 organizations.

In contrast, the median compensation of Level 3 roles (e.g., Managers) - at Group 4 organizations (\$68K) was only 10\% higher than at Group 3 organizations and 55\% higher than the lowest, Group 2.

The data suggests that middle management roles were more likely to be compensated similarly at organizations of different sizes than upper management roles were.

# COMPENSATION BY DEPARTMENT 

HIGHEST COMPENSATION WAS SEEN IN FINANCE, OPERATIONS, DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAMMING, AND HR


Excluding Principal Administrators, the departments with the highest average compensation in FY22 were Finance (\$80K), Development (\$77K), Operations (\$76K), Programming (\$73K), and HR (\$73K). The departments with the highest numbers of roles reported across the pilot cohort were Production (130), Box Office (97), Marketing (94), Development (88), and Finance (75).

At pilot organizations, only Development and Finance ranked among both the departments with the most roles reported and the most highly paid departments. RANGES


The largest difference between minimum and maximum compensation within a department for the entire cohort in FY22 was $\$ 287 \mathrm{~K}$ in Development, followed by spreads of $\$ 210 \mathrm{~K}$ in Finance and $\$ 193 \mathrm{~K}$ in Programming. Roles in Food \& Beverage and Housekeeping had the most constrained compensation ranges.

The pilot data suggest that employees in Development, Finance, and Programming have the highest ceilings for potential compensation in the industry.


## COMPOSITION

## ACROSS ORGANIZATION TYPES, TEMPORARY WORKERS MADE UP THE MAJORITY OF TOTAL EMPLOYEES IN BOTH FISCAL YEARS

In addition to submitting compensation data for up to 5 Management Levels, participating organizations reported their total number of employees by type in each fiscal year. The significant growth in the number of employees between FY21 and FY22, driven primarily by increases in temporary/ contract workers, can be attributed to the beginning of pandemic recovery.


## DEMOGRAPHICS // REPORTED POSITIONS

OF 960 EMPLOYEES REPORTED, 15\% WERE BIPOC,


Race/Ethnicity
■ White / Caucasian (77\%)

- Not Disclosed (8\%)

Hispanic / Latino (5\%)

- Black / African American (4\%)
- Asian / Pacific Islander (3\%)
- Multiracial / Interracial (2\%)

A race not listed here (1\%)

- American Indian / Alaskan Native (0\%)

54\% WERE WOMEN,


Gender Identity

- Woman (54\%)

Man (32\%)
Not Disclosed (11\%)
A gender not listed (1\%

- Non-binary / Two-spirit
- Transgender (0\%)


## // NEW HIRES...

## 72\% HAD AT LEAST A BACHELOR'S DEGREE,



AND 51\% WERE UNDER 45.


## DEMOGRAPHICS // PRINCIPAL ADMINS

OF THE 67 PRINCIPAL ADMINISTRATORS, 9\% WERE BIPOC,


[^0]48\% WERE WOMEN,


## // PRINCIPAL ADMINS...

## 59\% HAD AT LEAST A MASTER'S DEGREE,



Education Level

- Masters Degree (55\%)
- Bachelors Degree (36\%)

Doctorate (4\%)
Not Disclosed (1\%)
High School Graduate (or less) (1\%)
Some College (1\%)

## Age Cohort



## DEMOGRAPHICS // NEW HIRES IN FY22

FY22 HIRES WERE YOUNGER AND MORE DIVERSE; OF 216 NEW HIRES, 22\% WERE BIPOC,


[^1]AND 69\% WERE UNDER 45;


## // NEW HIRES...

## 21\% WERE HIRED INTO NEW ROLES FROM WITHIN



Education Level

- Bachelors Degree (55\%)
- Masters Degree (21\%)
- Not Disclosed (10\%)
- Some College (6\%)
- Associates Degree (4\%)
- High School Graduate (or less) (4\%)


Gender Identity
$\square$ Woman (53\%)

- Man (34\%)
- Not Disclosed (10\%)

A gender not listed (1\%)

- Non-binary / Two-spirit (1\%)

Transgender (0\%)

## EQUITY \& DEMOGRAPHICS

## THE PERCENTAGE OF BIPOC EMPLOYEES INCREASES AT EACH SUBSEQUENT MANAGEMENT LEVEL BELOW PRINCIPAL ADMINISTRATOR

Only $15 \%$ of the reported employees in the pilot identified as BIPOC, and that percentage was smaller at higher Management Levels, leading to very small sample sizes.


The pilot suggests that pipelines for employees of color are significantly smaller than those for their white arts administrator counterparts.

## THERE WERE MORE WOMEN THAN MEN AT ALL MANAGEMENT LEVELS, BUT

 THEIR MEDIAN COMPENSATION AS PRINCIPAL ADMINISTRATORS WAS 27\% LOWERThe median compensation for employees who identified as female was the same or within $8 \%$ as that of employees who identified as male at Management Levels $2-5$, but was $27 \%$ lower at Level 1 . The sample sizes for other gender identities were too small to be compared.


The data suggests that women are advancing through the pipelines at performing arts presenters, but there are pay disparities at the executive level.

## KEY TAKEAWAYS



11
Analyzing industry compensation data is an important step toward identifying equity issues in the field. This sample of performing arts presenters of varying sizes from across the U.S. showed a significant lack of racial diversity among employees, particularly in upper management, and suggested a gendered wage gap at the executive level. By examining data annually, it is our hope that the APAP Arts Compensation Project will help presenters identify issues within their own organizations and provide an indication of what progress is being made within the industry.

2As seen in this pilot, the majority of the employees at performing arts presenters are temporary workers. Going forward, it is our goal to gather more detailed data on their wage structures, hours worked, and benefit opportunities as a part of this project, to bring more transparency to the complex compensation of the largest segment of the industry's workforce.


The value of the APAP Arts Compensation Project lies in participation and repetition. The more organizations that contribute data each year, the more accurate these aggregations will become. With a large enough cohort, we also plan to segment analyses by other important factors, such as geography, in the future. If you don't see organizations like yours represented in this pilot - please, join us!


Dominic Cheli

This pilot was generously supported in part by the Wallace Foundation, the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, and the Mellon Foundation.

Wallace ${ }^{5}$ $\cdots$

THANK YOU to the 67 participating organizations who made this pilot possible!

Appalachian Theatre of the High Country
Appell Center for the Performing Arts
Arts Center at Iowa Western
BlackRock Center for the Arts
Cache Valley Center for the Arts
Caramoor Center for Music \& the Arts
Carolina Performing Arts
Celebrity Series of Boston
Centre College's Norton Center for the Arts
Charles W. Eisemann Center for Performing Arts
Clark Center for the Performing Arts
Clayton Center for the Arts
Collins Center for the Arts
DANCECleveland
Davis Arts Council
Dominican University Performing Arts Center
Dumbarton Arts and Education
Egyptian Theatre
Elgin Community College
Elon University Cultural Programs
Fairfield Arts \& Convention Center
Florida Theatre
Fort Hill Performing Arts Center
Gorton Center
GPAC
High Point Theatre
Hopkins Center for the Arts
Jasper Community Arts
KU Presents! at Kutztown University
Lake Placid Center for the Arts
Lied Center for Performing Arts
Livermore Valley Performing Arts Center
Lower Manhattan Cultural Council
Luckman Fine Arts Complex

Luther Burbank Center for the Arts
Macomb Center for the Performing Arts
Mahaiwe Performing Arts Center
Mahaney Arts Center
Marathon Center for the Performing Arts
McAninch Arts Center
McCallum Theatre
Meany Center for the Performing Arts
Michael C. Rockefeller Arts Center
Midland Center for the Arts
Moss Arts Center
Mount Baker Theatre
National Sawdust
Newman Center for the Performing Arts Northrop
Ogunquit Playhouse
Performing Arts Foundation
Performing Arts Houston
Reif Arts Council
Renaissance Performing Arts Association
Rozsa Center for the Performing Arts
The Cabaret
The Carson Center for the Performing Arts
The Clarice
The Englert Theatre
The Hanover Theatre
The Lincoln Center
The Music Hall
The Noorda at UVU
Tower Theatre Foundation
Weis Center for the Performing Arts
Wisconsin Union Theater
Yerba Buena Gardens Festival


[^0]:    Race/Ethnicity
    ■ White / Caucasian (88\%)

    - Hispanic / Latino (4\%)
    - Multiracial / Interracial (3\%)
    - Not Disclosed (3\%)
    - Asian / Pacific Islander (1\%)

[^1]:    Race/Ethnicity
    ■ White / Caucasian (72\%)

    - Hispanic / Latino (7\%)

    Black / African American (6\%)

    - Not Disclosed (6\%)
    - Asian / Pacific Islander (5\%)

    Multiracial / Interracial (2\%)
    $\square$ A race not listed here (1\%)

