

2006 CALL / ACBD Compensation Survey


After administering the 2003 salary survey, Lindy Stephens happily relinquished her 10-year role as the keeper of the survey to me. (I guess I had asked one too many pointed questions about the survey design). My plans were to administer the next survey online and re-work some of the questions so that there would be sufficient respondents in each category and allow more correlations. Lindy delivered me a package of the results of the salary surveys back to 1991 and I wish that I had perused the older material in depth *before* I drafted up this year's roster of questions, as I would have avoided some issues that I encountered this year.

Earlier this year, the statistical service that had administered the previous surveys declined to renew our arrangement, so while we were investigating alternatives, Elizabeth Hooper at the CALL / ACBD National Office suggested we use some of their in-house technical expertise. The programmers from the Kingston Software Factory, Mark Sloan and Frank Huntley, began development of the online survey site in late June, with the aim of administering the survey from mid-July to the end of August. However, programming and testing took more time than expected, but thanks to our team of beta-testers, Jane Taylor, Mercedes Bourgaize, Connie Crosby, Anna Holeton, Elim Wong and Lynda Roberts, we were able to iron out most of the bugs. However, this meant that the survey was only ready to go live by the last week of August, so we could either choose to run the survey immediately and conflict with the new academic year, or postpone the survey until later in the fall. With a *CLLR* publication deadline at the end of September, we decided to go ahead with the first online administration of the survey, with the idea that next year's survey would benefit from all the lessons learned this time around. .


Elizabeth informed me that there were 347 members of CALL / ACBD who were resident in Canada, not retired and not vendor representatives. Of these, 160 or 46.1% took a few minutes to complete this year's compensation survey. During the first week from August 8th to September 4th, we received 84 responses. In the second week, we received 31 responses and during the third and final week, after reminders to CALL-L and directly to the membership, we received another 42 responses. In 2003, 160 of 325 (49.2%) completed the survey. Those surveys had been emailed as an attachment by the National Office to members, and then printed off, completed and mailed back to the statistical service by the members. By going online, we were able to close the survey within 3 weeks as planned and avoided a lengthy waiting period before data processing and analysis.

Since we are no longer using a statistical service as an intermediary, and since my statistical skills are not exemplary, I have modified the format of the survey to be more graphical and hope that you will forgive me for omitting the statistical overhead. Results for correlations which had fewer than XX responses were either excluded or had their categories combined in order to preserve the anonymity of respondents.


CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey




CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey




CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey




CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey




CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey



CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey



CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey



The first set of seven figures indicate how salary is correlated with job position, education, library type, geography and years of experience. As expected, with increasing supervisory or management responsibilities, a corresponding increase in salaries is noted. Those respondents with an MLS/MIS/BLS averaged higher salaries as a group than those without this educational background. Matching the results of previous surveys, law librarians in academic libraries had higher average salaries than their counterparts in other library types, while those working in courthouse libraries had the lowest average salaries. Regionally, those of us in the territories receive higher salaries, reflecting the higher cost of living. After that Québec and Metro Toronto have the highest average salaries, with the rest of Ontario outside of Toronto and Saskatchewan / Manitoba having the lowest average salaries.

Supervisory responsibility appears to play a bigger role than type of library, while each jurisdiction has a different salary profile when comparing by library type. [Job type by jurisdiction]. There is also a positive correlation between years of experience and average salary, with those having an increased concentration of law library experience generally receiving higher average salaries.

Eight pages of raw results follow, with comparison data from the 2003, 2000 and 1998 surveys. The 1998 survey was the last one sent directly to each member in paper form while the 2000 and 2003 surveys were emailed as attachments, which appears to have been a major factor in the 20% drop in response rates. For Q2, the separation of corporate and law firms from the private category and splitting of the courthouse and law society category were both successful and allowed for more detailed correlations. For Q3, the breakout of Metro Toronto from the rest of Ontario was a successful change, but the one for the Territories might be rolled back into the other ones for future surveys. Q4 raised some concern about the definition of 'professional', so I am open to suggestions about how to re-word that. However, there appeared to be less confusion than the generic terms 'Assistant Librarian' or 'Librarian' that were used in previous surveys.

The results for Q5 are a bit off. During the first couple of days of the survey, the answers to this question were not being recorded, so the results for the first 32 respondents was set after the fact to 'full-time'. The instigation of a new 'Consultant / Contractor' category was not useful and will be rolled in with the 'Job Share / Other' category for future surveys. In Q6, the type of undergraduate degree (other than law degree) paired up with the MLS/MIS/BLS did not make a difference in salaries, but I am still interested in any other ways to make the categories of this question more specific. One interesting suggestion that will be implemented next year is a 'Library Tech Diploma and Law Degree' category. For Q7 and Q8, the narrowing of the category sizes to 4-year ranges provided finer detail than previous surveys with 5-year ranges and I will probably narrow them even further to 3-year ranges next year. As well, a 'Years with Current Employer' question might be useful. Q9 will not be repeated next year, but will be replaced by a more focused question about 'Major Job Responsibilities' which will have options like 'User Services / Library Operations', 'Instruction / Communications / Liaison', 'Reference / Research', 'Cataloguing / Collections', 'Management', 'Systems / Internet', and 'A Bit of Everything'.

CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey

	01-Sep	01-Jun	01-Jun	01-Jun
	2006 online	2003 email	2000 email	1998
Total Number of Surveys Sent	347	325	299	330
Total Number of Surveys Completed	160	160	135	202
Response Rate	46.1%	49.2%	45.2%	61.2%

Q1. Gender	160	100.0%	159	100.0%	127	100.0%	195	100.0%
Female	138	86.3%	136	85.5%	113	89.0%	167	85.6%
Male	22	13.8%	23	14.5%	14	11.0%	28	14.4%

Q2. Type of Library	160	100.0%	159	100.0%	134	100.0%	202	100.0%
Law Firm	75	46.9%	75	47.2%	75	56.0%	104	51.5%
Corporate	8	5.0%						
Academic	21	13.1%	23	14.5%	24	17.9%	33	16.3%
Courthouse	17	10.6%	44	27.7%	25	18.7%	39	19.3%
Law Society	17	10.6%						
Government	22	13.8%	17	10.7%	10	7.5%	26	12.9%

Q3. Geographic Area	160	100.0%	160	100.0%	135	100.0%	201	100.0%
Ontario (Metro Toronto)	39	24.4%	73	45.6%	59	43.7%	101	50.2%
Ontario (outside Toronto)	30	18.8%						
Alberta	24	15.0%	22	13.8%	18	13.3%	29	14.4%
B.C.	27	16.9%	27	16.9%	21	15.6%	23	11.4%
Quebec	7	4.4%	12	7.5%	8	5.9%	21	10.4%
Atlantic	19	11.9%	16	10.0%	17	12.6%	17	8.5%
Sask / Manitoba	11	6.9%	10	6.3%	12	8.9%	10	5.0%
Territories	3	1.9%						

CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey

Q4. Job Position	2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998	
	160	100.0%	160	100.0%	135	100.0%	202	100.0%
Director (Manage >3 Libraries)	16	10.0%		32.5%		25.9%		29.7%
Manager (Supervise Professionals)	36	22.5%	52		35		60	
Manager (Do Not Supervise Professionals)	49	30.6%	30	18.8%	24	17.8%	36	17.8%
Librarian (Supervised by Professionals; Supervise Professionals)	14	8.8%						
Librarian (Supervised by Professionals)	30	18.8%						
Assistant Librarian			22	13.8%	19	14.1%	30	14.9%
Librarian			10	6.3%	14	10.4%	21	10.4%
Librarian in a one or two person library			41	25.6%	32	23.7%	42	20.8%
Library Technician or Assistant	15	9.4%	5	3.1%	11	8.1%	13	6.4%

Q6. Education	160		100.0%		160		100.0%		135		100.0%		199		100.0%	
	160	100.0%	160	100.0%	135	100.0%	199	100.0%								
MLS/MISSt/BLS and Law Degree	17	10.6%		16	10.0%	15	11.1%	21	10.6%							
MLS/MISSt/BLS and other Masters/Ph.D.	11	6.9%		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%							
MLS/MISSt/BLS and Undergraduate Humanities/Arts	73	45.6%		102	63.8%	79	58.5%	114	57.3%							
MLS/MISSt/BLS and Undergraduate Business/Science	6	3.8%														
MLS/MISSt/BLS only	6	3.8%														
Lib. Tech. Diploma and University Degree	21	13.1%		13	8.1%	11	8.1%	23	11.6%							
Library Tech. Diploma	10	6.3%		13	8.1%	15	11.1%	15	7.5%							
Law Degree				0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	2.0%							
University Degree	8	5.0%		6	3.8%	9	6.7%	7	3.5%							
Other	8	5.0%		10	6.3%	6	4.4%	15	7.5%							

CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey

		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998		
Q7. Years of Experience in Law Libraries		160	100.0%	160	100.0%	135	100.0%	198	100.0%	
less than 4		18	11.3%	less than 1	0	0.0%	2	1.5%	4	2.0%
4 - 7		22	13.8%	1 - 5	22	13.8%	25	18.5%	33	16.7%
8 - 11		19	11.9%	6 - 10	26	16.3%	24	17.8%	49	24.7%
12 - 15		15	9.4%	11 - 15	38	23.8%	34	25.2%	46	23.2%
16 - 19		31	19.4%	16 - 20	33	20.6%	28	20.7%	34	17.2%
20 - 23		18	11.3%	21 - 25	22	13.8%	17	12.6%	24	12.1%
24 - 27		21	13.1%	26 or more	19	11.9%	5	3.7%	8	4.0%
28 or more		16	10.0%							

		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998		
Q8. Years of Experience in Any Library		160	100.0%	160	100.0%	134	100.0%	200	100.0%	
less than 4		8	5.0%	less than 1	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	2	1.0%
4 - 7		14	8.8%	1 - 5	7	4.4%	16	11.9%	23	11.5%
8 - 11		15	9.4%	6 - 10	19	11.9%	18	13.4%	30	15.0%
12 - 15		21	13.1%	11 - 15	33	20.6%	28	20.9%	39	19.5%
16 - 19		22	13.8%	16 - 20	31	19.4%	28	20.9%	47	23.5%
20 - 23		19	11.9%	21 - 25	30	18.8%	28	20.9%	37	18.5%
24 - 27		27	16.9%	26 or more	40	25.0%	15	11.2%	22	11.0%
28 or more		34	21.3%							

		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998		
Q5. Work Status		160	100.0%	160	100.0%	135	100.0%	202	100.0%	
Full-Time		136	85.0%		127	79.4%	111	82.2%	166	82.2%
Part-time		19	11.9%		30	18.8%	23	17.0%	33	16.3%
Job Share / Consultant / Contractor / Other		5	3.1%		3	1.9%	1	0.7%	3	1.5%

		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998	
Q9. Legal Patron Population Per Librarian		160	100.0%	160	100.0%	135	100.0%	200	100.0%
less than 11		6	3.8%						
11 - 20		4	2.5%						
21 - 30		4	2.5%						
31 - 40		15	9.4%						
41 - 50		14	8.8%						
51 or more		117	73.1%						

CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey

	2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998	
Q10. Salary	160	100.0%	159	100.0%	135	100.0%	201	100.0%
\$15,000 or less		1.9%		0.6%		0.0%	6	3.0%
\$15,001 - \$20,000	3		1		0			
\$20,001 - \$25,000		0.0%	3	1.9%	3	2.2%	3	1.5%
\$25,001 - \$30,000	3	1.9%	2	1.3%	5	3.7%	7	3.5%
\$30,001 - \$35,000	2	1.3%	3	1.9%	12	8.9%	13	6.5%
\$35,001 - \$40,000	9	5.6%	9	5.7%	11	8.1%	15	7.5%
\$40,001 - \$45,000	4	2.5%	7	4.4%	15	11.1%	36	17.9%
\$45,001 - \$50,000	10	6.3%	12	7.5%	18	13.3%	21	10.4%
\$50,001 - \$55,000	12	7.5%	22	13.8%	15	11.1%	31	15.4%
\$55,001 - \$60,000	17	10.6%	16	10.1%	18	13.3%	18	9.0%
\$60,001 - \$65,000	17	10.6%	17	10.7%	14	10.4%	16	8.0%
\$65,001 - \$70,000	16	10.0%	14	8.8%	8	5.9%	13	6.5%
\$70,001 - \$75,000	14	8.8%	21	13.2%	7	5.2%		10.9%
\$75,001 - \$80,000	10	6.3%	6	3.8%	2	1.5%		
\$80,001 - \$85,000	10	6.3%	5	3.1%	2	1.5%		
\$85,001 - \$90,000	9	5.6%	7	4.4%	2	1.5%		
\$90,001 - \$95,000	6	3.8%	4	2.5%	1	0.7%	22	
\$95,001 - \$100,000	7	4.4%	6	3.8%	1	0.7%		
\$100,001 - \$105,000	2	1.3%		2.5%		0.7%		
\$105,001 - \$110,000			4		1			
\$110,001 or more	9	5.6%						

CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey

		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998	
Q11. Percent of Last Salary Increase		160	100.0%	146	100.0%	134	100.0%	182	100.0%
0%		11	6.9%	11	7.5%	17	12.7%	46	25.3%
1%		9	5.6%	6	4.1%	18	13.4%	24	13.2%
2%		21	13.1%	32	21.9%	28	20.9%	31	17.0%
3%		66	41.3%	57	39.0%	32	23.9%	34	18.7%
4%		21	13.1%	17	11.6%	16	11.9%	17	9.3%
5%		14	8.8%	5	3.4%	11	8.2%	11	6.0%
6%		5	3.1%	5	3.4%	3	2.2%	3	1.6%
7%		3	1.9%	3	2.1%	2	1.5%	2	1.1%
8%		1	0.6%	5	3.4%	2	1.5%	3	1.6%
9%			5.6%	1	0.7%	3	2.2%	2	1.1%
10%		9	0.0%	1	0.7%	1	0.7%	4	2.2%
11% or more			0.0%	3	2.1%	1	0.7%	5	2.7%

		160 100.0%		153 100.0%		129 100.0%		196 100.0%	
Q12. Annual Bonus Received									
\$0		69	43.1%	59	38.6%	50	38.8%	100	51.0%
\$100 or less		6	3.8%	9	5.9%	6	4.7%	11	5.6%
\$101 - \$500		20	12.5%	20	13.1%	23	17.8%	38	19.4%
\$501 - \$1000		12	7.5%	14	9.2%	19	14.7%	14	7.1%
\$1001 - \$1500		7	4.4%	16	10.5%	14	10.9%	8	4.1%
\$1501 - \$2000		12	7.5%	9	5.9%	1	0.8%	7	3.6%
\$2001 - \$2500		3	1.9%	3	2.0%	6	4.7%	4	2.0%
\$2501 - \$3000		2	1.3%	5	3.3%	2	1.6%	4	2.0%
\$3001 - \$3500		0	0.0%	3	2.0%	2	1.6%	2	1.0%
\$3501 - \$4000		5	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%
\$4001 - \$4500		2	1.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%	1	0.5%
\$4501 or more		22	13.8%	15	9.8%	5	3.9%	6	3.1%

CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey

		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998		
Q13. Paid Vacation Days		160	100.0%	160	100.0%	133	100.0%	199	100.0%	
10 or fewer		11	6.9%		5	3.1%	5	3.8%	10	5.0%
11 - 14		3	1.9%	11 - 15	28	17.5%	19	14.3%	40	20.1%
15 - 18		24	15.0%	16 - 20	59	36.9%	58	43.6%	71	35.7%
19 - 22		66	41.3%	21 - 25	51	31.9%	39	29.3%	58	29.1%
23 - 26		41	25.6%							
27 or more		15	9.4%	26 or more	17	10.6%	12	9.0%	20	10.1%

Q14. Paid Sick Days		160	100.0%						
None		20	12.5%						
1 - 7		41	25.6%						
8 - 14		62	38.8%						
15 or more		37	23.1%						

Q15. Paid for Overtime ?		160	100.0%	159	100.0%	144	100.0%	200	100.0%
Yes		20	12.5%	20	12.6%	22	15.3%	26	13.0%
No		140	87.5%	139	87.4%	122	84.7%	174	87.0%

Q16. Time Off in Lieu of Overtime ?		160	100.0%	157	100.0%	132	100.0%	198	100.0%
Yes		65	40.6%	67	42.7%	67	50.8%	77	38.9%
No		95	59.4%	90	57.3%	65	49.2%	121	61.1%

Q17. Paid Sabbatical or Study / Research Leave ?		160	100.0%	158	100.0%	134	100.0%	196	100.0%
Yes		26	16.3%	24	15.2%	21	15.7%	33	16.8%
No		134	83.8%	134	84.8%	113	84.3%	163	83.2%

Q18. Life Insurance Benefits ?		160	100.0%	158	100.0%	126	100.0%	196	100.0%
Yes		147	91.9%	150	94.9%	116	92.1%	177	90.3%
No		13	8.1%	8	5.1%	10	7.9%	19	9.7%

CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey

		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998	
Q19. Medical Insurance Benefits ?		160	100.0%	159	100.0%	125	100.0%	200	100.0%
Yes		150	93.8%	158	99.4%	118	94.4%	188	94.0%
No		10	6.3%	1	0.6%	7	5.6%	12	6.0%
Q20. Disability Insurance Benefits ?		160	100.0%	160	100.0%	128	100.0%	194	100.0%
Yes		146	91.3%	154	96.3%	116	90.6%	180	92.8%
No		14	8.8%	6	3.8%	12	9.4%	14	7.2%
Q21. Dental Insurance Benefits ?		160	100.0%	159	100.0%	127	100.0%	197	100.0%
Yes		148	92.5%	155	97.5%	119	93.7%	179	90.9%
No		12	7.5%	4	2.5%	8	6.3%	18	9.1%
Q22. Pension Benefits (including RRSP) ?		160	100.0%	157	100.0%	128	100.0%	195	100.0%
Yes		138	86.3%	136	86.6%	106	82.8%	160	82.1%
No		22	13.8%	21	13.4%	22	17.2%	35	17.9%
Q23. Paid Parental Leave (in addition to E.I. benefits)		160	100.0%	149	100.0%	120	100.0%	173	100.0%
Yes		86	53.8%	99	66.4%	62	51.7%	109	63.0%
No		74	46.3%	50	33.6%	58	48.3%	64	37.0%
Q24. Professional / Paraprofessional Membership Dues		160	100.0%	160	100.0%	134	100.0%	200	100.0%
Complete		132	82.5%	132	82.5%	109	81.3%	152	76.0%
Partial		12	7.5%	13	8.1%	12	9.0%	16	8.0%
None		16	10.0%	15	9.4%	13	9.7%	32	16.0%
Q25. Continuing Education Fees		160	100.0%	159	100.0%	133	100.0%	199	100.0%
Complete		98	61.3%	108	67.9%	83	62.4%	124	62.3%
Partial		41	25.6%	41	25.8%	33	24.8%	55	27.6%
None		21	13.1%	10	6.3%	17	12.8%	20	10.1%



CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey

		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998			
Q26. Conference Expenses		160	100.0%	160	100.0%	133	100.0%	197	100.0%		
Complete		122	76.3%			133	83.1%	94	70.7%	127	64.5%
Partial		30	18.8%			23	14.4%	31	23.3%	58	29.4%
None		8	5.0%			4	2.5%	8	6.0%	12	6.1%


		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998			
Q27. Miscellaneous Expenses (e.g. business lunches, mileage)		160	100.0%	157	100.0%	132	100.0%	198	100.0%		
Complete		88	55.0%			91	58.0%	73	55.3%	92	46.5%
Partial		38	23.8%			42	26.8%	35	26.5%	50	25.3%
None		34	21.3%			24	15.3%	24	18.2%	56	28.3%

Type of Staff Supervised		2006 online		2003 email		2000 email		1998			
None						34	12.7%	30	15.0%	42	12.9%
Librarians						50	18.7%	28	14.0%	52	16.0%
Technicians / Assistants						103	38.6%	80	40.0%	116	35.6%
Clericals						68	25.5%	56	28.0%	103	31.6%
Other						12	4.5%	6	3.0%	13	4.0%



CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey



CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey





Percentage of Respondents



Benefits Received

CALL/ACBD Compensation Survey



Closing the results are four figures which allow more historical analysis. Caveats are that the 1991 survey had a 70.3% response rate, and the population of law librarians has changed a great deal over the last 15 years.

As in prior surveys, the gender gap between salaries earned by men and by women remained. [gender by years of experience]. Looking at the salary profiles, we can see that the concentration of salaries in 1991 in the \$40,000 range has gradually spread over the last 15 years so that there is a much wider range of salaries. This means that correlations between specific elements and salary may be less useful going forward. However, I take the fact that I will have to increase the top range of salaries next year as a positive sign. Looking at the figure for benefits received, most of the benefits have held steady over the years, with employers being increasingly reluctant to pay for overtime.

Comparing the profiles of librarian work experience between 1991 and 2006, we can see that in 1991, there was a more normal distribution of library experience among the member population, with a trailing peak of experience in law libraries in the 6-10 year range. In 2006, the peak of law library experience has moved to the 16-19 year range, while the distribution of law library experience has flattened and the distribution of all library experience has turned into an upward slope. My interpretation of this is that our most experienced law librarians were more likely to have extensive library experience prior to becoming law librarians, while more recent members tend to come directly into the field.

[sabbatical by library type] [bonus by library type] [bonus by job position] [bonus by geography] [salary survey increase by geography] [vacation days by years of law library experience] [salary by job position and geography]

Going forward, I am striving to transform the CALL / ACBD Compensation survey so that its results can display a more revealing portrait of Canadian law librarians as a community. Are people moving between jobs frequently? Are there alternative career paths that simply fall off of our radar based on the survey assumptions? Are specific types of skills or backgrounds more valued by employers when it comes to compensation? Thanks to everyone who has already provided valuable feedback and please send me any further suggestions for improvement so that I can incorporate them in the next compensation survey.