INTRODUCTION

Salary negotiations are often fraught and befuddling experiences for employees and employers. The stress of negotiating is compounded when accurate salary data is unavailable, either because existing data is not readily available to individuals, or if it is available, because it is often aggregated by broad categories of job types. There is a vacuum of salary information for specializations within academic librarianship such as copyright and information policy work.

Emerging in the early 2000s, the copyright and information policy specialization has grown organically and piecemeal in response to the recognition of an urgent need for dedicated copyright and information policy support, as well as strategic legal guidance distinct from the role of a general counsel’s office. This area of expertise crosses into museums, archives, and other cultural institutions. These positions and responsibilities often fall alongside or within scholarly communication programs or offices, and it is through scholarly communication that many copyright and information policy professionals come to this specialization, at least within libraries. Nascent core competencies help clarify expectations for these positions. Titles tend to include variations on scholarly communication, copyright, or information policy, with information policy more likely to be paired with “officer” than “librarian.” Regardless of the exact title, any permutation typically signals significant responsibility for copyright and information policy work.

Individuals in these positions are often the only people at their institutions doing this work, complicating efforts to fairly benchmark salaries with peers within the institution and in the profession. Additionally, these positions encompass an array of responsibilities and may require additional qualifications. This absence of data specific to our work is what prompted us to undertake a salary and additional compensation benefits survey of copyright and information policy professionals. In this paper, we share findings from our survey, discuss what the data does–and does not–show, and offer suggestions for how this data may be used to support individuals during negotiations. We also discuss how the survey may be adapted for use by those working in other niche specializations to conduct their own salary survey assessments.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Salary Surveys

Annual salary data for librarians is available in various places, with varying degrees of specificity and accessibility. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics provides annual compensation data that is aggregated for all librarians, regardless of whether they work in public, academic,
school, or special libraries. While this data is helpful in a general sense, particularly as it is broken down regionally, it is not granular enough for use in assessing salary equity or providing guidance for salary negotiations.

The American Library Association–Allied Professional Association (ALA-APA) conducts salary surveys that offer deeper insight into salaries by different library types; the most recent was conducted in 2019. ALA-APA also maintains the Pay Equity Bibliography. Smaller library organizations, such as the American Association of Law Librarians, the Society of American Archivists, and the Association of Moving Image Archivists, and regional organizations such as the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries, also conduct salary studies.

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) annual salary survey comes the closest to providing data that is applicable to copyright and information policy positions within libraries and related institutions. However, these positions are grouped under scholarly communication, which as noted above is inclusive of copyright and information policy yet is a broader area of academic librarianship. Furthermore, this survey is limited to research libraries that qualify for ARL membership, but copyright and information policy professionals work in many institutions that are not part of ARL.

**Negotiation**

There are many articles on how to negotiate in business and popular literature, but historically there were fewer directly focused on librarianship. Fortunately, that is changing, as librarians are filling this gap through their own research. There are also publications offering tips on negotiating, and identifying questions to consider when negotiating during interviews and job offers. While our research focuses on providing data to enable successful negotiation and not on negotiation strategies, we are encouraged to see others in our field addressing the how’s and whys of negotiation with respect to librarians and libraries and hope that readers can combine that expertise with our data to be better positioned when negotiating.

**METHODOLOGY**

We designed and distributed our survey via Qualtrics. Our survey consists of 30 questions. The survey was organized into three sections, each ending with an open-field comment question. The survey concludes with a final open-field question for additional comments. Personal demographic questions ask participants their gender identity, race and ethnicity, age (in 5-year ranges), degree(s) held, years in the profession (in 5-year ranges), and years as practicing attorney (in 5-year ranges, if applicable). Position and institutional demographic questions ask institution type, institution size by student body (if applicable), number of people working in their department or unit, years in current position (in 5-year ranges), position classification and terms, degree requirements for position, percentage of time spent on copyright, reporting structure, and supervisory responsibilities. In the section on compensation benefits, participants are asked their salary (in $5,000 range increments), to identify whether they have received merit raises or other salary increases, if they receive institutional funding for membership dues and travel, and if they are offered and use human resources benefits such as paid leave, medical and dental plans, and retirement programs. The section concludes with two questions on compensation fairness relative to institutional peers and to professional peers. Our survey was submitted to the Wake Forest University Institutional Review Board (IRB) in November 2021, which determined that the survey did not require IRB approval to proceed.

Our survey was distributed from March 23, 2022, to April 23, 2022, and again from May 23, 2022, to June 6, 2022, following our presentation of preliminary results at the 2022 University Information Policy Officers (UIPO) annual meeting. The survey was distributed to three groups: the UIPO membership, the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries scholarly communications listserv, and the alumni of the library-specific Harvard Copyright X course sections, with an estimated distribution to 292 people in the United States and Canada. Ninety-five people responded, with 75 surveys completing answers in all sections, for a response rate of 26%.

There are questions that we wanted to ask to bring greater specificity to the data to enable better cross-institutional comparisons. However, given the small nature of the copyright and information policy specializa-
tion, we determined that the risks of identification of respondents by collecting more granular information outweighed the benefits to our data collection. Therefore, we did not ask questions on regional location, urban versus rural communities, 4-year versus 2-year institutions, or cost of living indexes. We also did not ask for position titles, as they are often unique to an institution and can readily identify individuals; besides, position titles are less important in understanding salary equity than other position demographics.

RESULTS

Seventy-five people completed the survey: 65 during the first period and 10 during the second period. Women accounted for 58 respondents, men for 16, and one person identified as a gender not listed. Unsurprisingly, the respondents are overwhelmingly white: 69 are white, three are Black or African American, and 3 are mixed race. While the gender demographics skew more heavily toward women than we believe our specialization to be, the race and ethnicity demographics are in line with our observations of our specialization’s representations. Forty-three percent of respondents are in their 40s, with most people between ages 30 and 59. Years in the profession are more distributed, although the majority have been working in the field for 6-15 years.

An assumption persists that people working in copyright and information policy positions are required to have a Juris Doctorate (JD). While this is true at some institutions, only 7 respondents reported such a requirement for their position; 46 positions neither require nor prefer a JD. Nevertheless, 27 respondents hold a JD, most of whom also hold a Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS) or an equivalent Master of Library Science or Master of Information Science degree. Sixty-three people hold an MLIS, for 30 of whom this is their only advanced degree. The majority of those holding a JD reported spending greater than 75% of their weekly time on copyright and IP, with those not holding a JD spending 50% or less of their time on such issues.

Seventy-two percent of respondents work at public higher education institutions, 44% with student body populations exceeding 40,000. Respondents working in private higher education institutions primarily work at institutions with fewer than 25,000 students. Just over 50% of respondents hold faculty appointments, approximately half with tenure and half without. Most people with staff appointments are classified as exempt.

Our survey assessed salaries in $5,000 ranges, with Below $40,000 and $150,000+ as the minimum and maximum values. There are six outliers: two people reported salaries Below $40,000 and four at $150,000+. When looking at salaries by gender percentage, excluding the six outliers and the one a gender not listed response, minimum women’s salaries were reported at $45,000-$49,999, while men’s began at $55,000-$59,999. Salaries for both genders peaked at $75,000-$79,999. The highest reported salary range for women was $145,000-$149,999, while for men it was $130,000-$134,999 (see figure 1). Comparing salaries by race and ethnicity, again excluding the six salary outliers (all of whom are white), shows no significant difference in average salaries between white and Black or African American respondents: both average $80,000-$84,999. Those who are mixed race have higher average salaries, at $95,000-99,999, but they are people who have been in the field longer and are older than the average respondent, so we cannot say what impact, if any, their race and ethnicity may have on their salaries. If we include the outliers, rounding down to $35,000 and staying at $150,000 respectively, average salaries for white respondents rise slightly, but still fall within $80,000-84,999. When comparing salaries by institution type, public institutions had a greater distributed range of salaries, which is not surprising given that over two-thirds of respondents work at public institutions. People with JDs reported higher minimum salaries, although not significantly higher overall, apart from the four people reporting salaries above $150,000, all of whom have a JD (see figure 2).

In addition to requesting salary data, we also want to know how people feel about their compensation fairness relative to peers at their institutions and in the copyright and information policy specialization. Collectively, nearly two-thirds believe they are compensated fairly or extremely fairly relative to their institutional peers, but their confidence falls against peers in the specialization, with only 40% reporting that they are compensated fairly or extremely fairly. Nearly twice as many report they are unfairly compensated in the specialization versus their institution (30% versus 16.4%, respectively) (see figure 3).

Looking at additional compensation benefits, such as health and retirement benefits, travel support, and professional dues, most institutions offer standard benefits such as medical, dental, and vision plans; retire-
FIGURE 1

Salary by gender (percentage). This chart shows salary distribution among respondents based on gender, using percentage of responses instead of actual numbers. Excluding six outliers and one “a gender not listed” respondent, 55 women and 13 men responded. Men reported higher minimum salaries and women reported higher maximum salaries. Both genders peak between $75,000-$79,999.

FIGURE 2

Salary by JD status. While the minimum starting salary for respondents with a JD is higher than for those without, the overall distribution of salaries does not significantly skew in favor of those with a JD, with the exception of the four highest salaries at $150,000+.
ment savings plans; paid time off and paid holidays; tuition concessions; and wellness programs. Only 15 people reported that their institutions pay professional membership dues, either in full or in part. All but one respondent reported receiving funding from their institutions for professional travel, with most sharing costs for travel. A rough average of institutional travel support is $1,680 per year. And almost everyone has received at least one salary adjustment, be it a merit raise, promotion, market adjustment, or other additional compensation offer.

DISCUSSION

Our findings affirm our expectations and observations in several areas: we are not diverse in gender identity or race and ethnicity; not everyone doing this work holds a JD (nor needs to); and institutions offer similar additional compensation benefits, including some level of support for professional travel. We anticipated a disparity in salary based on gender, although it is not as wide as feared; that said, the small response rate by men makes it difficult to assess if these results are a true reflection of the specialization at large.

In reviewing the salary data, we are surprised and discouraged that two people report making less than $40,000 annually, both of whom have been in the profession for more than 6 years. We are also surprised by the heavy aggregation of salaries between $65,000 and $80,000; we hoped to see higher average salary ranges.

Assessment of compensation fairness yields interesting results. A majority of both women and men feel they are fairly or extremely fairly compensated relative to their institutional peers: 60% and 75%, respectively. Relative to their peers in the specialization, however, their confidence drops: 44% of women feel they are fairly or extremely fairly compensated, but only 25% of men report fair compensation in the specialization. The number of respondents who reported “I don’t know” also increased when answering relative to peers in the specialization. When comparing responses across race and ethnicity, the small number of non-white respondents made comparison more difficult, but notably these respondents feel greater uncertainty in compensation fairness relative to white respondents across the board.
Most interestingly, when looking at compensation data in aggregate, two observations stand out:

1. The range of salaries represented by people who do not know how they are compensated relative to peers in the specialization is the broadest range among all answers. This seems to indicate the need for more salary data, affirming our initiative to conduct this survey.

2. When excluding the six outliers noted above (two Below $40,000 and four $150,000+), the lowest salary of those who report being paid extremely unfairly is $20,000 more than those who report being paid unfairly, $15,000 higher than those reporting being fairly paid, and equal to those who claim to be extremely fairly compensated. While further investigation is needed to determine why there is such discrepancy in baseline salaries for fairness ranges, we posit that this might be an example where the absence of specialization-specific data hinders accurate comparisons (see figure 4).

Among the comments submitted in the open fields, one stands out for identifying a critical challenge in our field:

“While I think all of us are probably underpaid, it’s also worth noting that we are also (very often) stuck in dead-end jobs. There is no promotion path for positions like ours, except to become managers/AULs/Deans, which is akin to changing careers completely (IMO), or else for folks who have a tenure track or something like it, there is progression in rank in that sense. But those of us in [non tenure track] positions, our first job in libraries is likely to be our last.”

As noted previously, the copyright and information policy specialization is small, with often only one person at an institution holding such a position. Although nearly half of all respondents report being a supervisor (excluding those supervising student workers only), additional research is necessary to determine if they are supervising colleagues who also work in copyright and information policy or in scholarly communication, or if they are heading units or departments responsible for additional areas and they are still the sole person responsible
for copyright and information policy at their institution.

We do note, however, that there seems to be correlation between how long someone has been in the field relative to how long they have been at their institution—although not necessarily their position. Those who have been in the field longer generally have stayed with their institutions for longer. Again, further research is necessary to determine the reasons why, but this observation seems to underscore the point made in the comment above that specializing in copyright and information policy positions may narrow prospects for career advancement (see table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Profession</th>
<th>Years at Current Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several questions we did not ask but should have, and several questions we did ask but wish we could reframe. A question that we did not ask that has critical bearing on negotiating salaries is union representation. Several respondents noted that they cannot individually negotiate their salaries or additional compensation benefits as they are subject to collective bargaining agreements. This is an oversight in our survey. We hope, though, that it is still useful to these respondents to have access to the survey data, even if they cannot use it to negotiate directly. For further information on the role of unions in libraries, we recommend the Department for Professional Employees, AFL-CIO, annual library professionals fact sheet, which explores demographics, educational attainment, wages, and benefits of union membership for library employees.14
There are several one-time negotiating points when receiving a job offer that we did not explore, such as start date, relocation and housing assistance, technology package, trailing partner assistance, titles or grade change, and one time signing bonus. Other questions that we did not ask that might be of interest in a broader context relative to our current time in history include changes in flexible schedules and remote work opportunities, institutions’ inflation response (e.g., salary adjustments, one-time bonuses, etc.), and ongoing impacts of pandemic measures. And while we stand by our decision not to use cost of living indexes, we wish we had figured out how to ask about cost of living relative to salary, institution type and size, and years in the profession that would have ensured anonymity. While we did ask people to report if they hold a JD, it would have been interesting to also ask if they earned the JD before or after beginning their careers in libraries, museums, archives, or related cultural institutions. Finally, we wish that we had asked for actual salaries, not ranges, as it makes calculating average salaries less precise.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Using Our Data

Our survey results are available via Airtable for anyone to consult and use. To preserve anonymity, we have removed the gender identity and race and ethnicity response fields, as response distributions are such that someone familiar with the copyright and information policy specialization may be able to identify individual respondents when looking at all data points for a given response. We have also removed all open comment fields.

If you are unfamiliar with Airtable, we encourage you to explore its affordances in grouping data to answer specific questions. For example, if you wish to compare salaries based on years in the profession and supervisory status, you can group data by years in the profession, subgroup by supervisory status, and sort by salary. Querying this data in multiple ways is the best way to understand its richness (see figure 5).

Our foremost hope is that our colleagues will use this data to their advantage when negotiating offers for new positions or advocating for fairer compensation in their current positions. This data can also guide their

FIGURE 5

Screenshot of Airtable database. This image shows the view of the Salary and Additional Compensation Benefits Survey Results (Public) Airtable database when grouped by Years in Profession, subgrouped by Supervisor, and sorted by Salary. This is one example of how the data can be grouped and sorted to address specific questions.
thinking when deciding whether they will apply for a job, assuming that the salary range is posted. Examples for how to use this data:

- Determine average salary range based on a combination of factors specific to an individual, e.g., years in the profession + degree(s) held + supervisory responsibilities, to support salary requests during negotiations.
- Compare salary ranges or additional compensation benefits by institutions of similar size and type to advocate for fairer support for an individual or all employees.
- Assess professional development support, either by individual factors or institutional demographics, to identify areas of additional compensation that may be more readily negotiable than salary, e.g., to request an increase in annual travel funding or for membership dues to be paid by the institution.

We also hope that administrators will use this data to post competitive salaries and offer robust compensation packages when hiring copyright and information policy professionals.

**Conducting Your Own Survey**

If you undertake a salary survey for your area of specialization, our survey questions are in Appendix A to serve as a template. We recommend that you include a question about union representation, consider asking about flexible schedules and remote work options, and ask for actual salaries instead of ranges, in addition to other negotiable points identified above. Depending on the size of your specialization and anticipated response rate, you may be able to include a cost of living question without risk of identifying individuals; if so, this would yield richer data.

Additionally, as you plan your survey, think through what you hope to accomplish. If it is to compile compensation data for your specialization, a straightforward survey like ours will work. But if you want to answer questions about the growth of the specialization, career trajectories, how people assess job offers beyond salary and additional compensation, or similar qualitative questions, you will want to plan for structured interviews. These interviews can be planned to follow a more generalized survey and submitted for IRB approval simultaneously. Regardless of how you structure your research survey, always submit it to your institution’s IRB!

**CONCLUSION**

With the general cultural taboo of openly discussing compensation, salary negotiations are pain points that undermine equitable hiring practices and may contribute to salary compression over the course of one’s career. This is a significant equity issue that should inform organizational hiring decisions, not just individuals’ negotiation strategies. Institutions need to post positions at salaries that reflect and value expectations in education and professional experience, and these salaries need to acknowledge the complexity and nuance of applying copyright law and addressing scholarly communication to support research and education. Additionally, for copyright and information policy professionals, library leadership does not always recognize the dual need for professional development in both librarianship and legal knowledge, including costly continuing legal education and bar fees for some. Institutions that habitually undervalue librarians, particularly those working in niche areas, by offering non-competitive compensation are furthering inequity in our field.

We are pleased to be able to provide more detailed salary and additional compensation benefits data to aid copyright and information policy professionals as they advocate for fair compensation. This is an important step in generating greater transparency around salaries and establishing benchmarks for our specialization. Nevertheless, there are more questions to explore. As previously noted, clear promotion paths do not always exist for people working in these positions. If pursuing administrative roles is not someone’s goal, how do they advance their career? Are there best practices for improving your salary or other benefits while staying in your organization and your position? What factors make someone stay, or leave? Whether the next stage in this research is undertaken by us or by others, we know there is more work to be done to establish benchmarks and create tools to empower copyright and information policy professionals as they negotiate for their futures.
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APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONS

Personal Demographics

1. What is your gender identity?
   a. Man
   b. Woman
   c. Transgender
   d. Non-binary / third gender
   e. A gender not listed
   f. Prefer not to answer

2. What is your race & ethnicity?
   a. American Indian, Alaska Native, or Indigenous
   b. Asian
   c. Black or African American
   d. Latino, Latina, or Latinx
   e. Middle Eastern or North African
   f. White
   g. Mixed race
   h. Prefer not to answer

3. What is your age?
   a. 20-29
   b. 30-39
   c. 40-49
   d. 50-59
   e. 60-69
   f. 70+
   g. Prefer not to answer

4. What degree(s) do you hold? Select all that apply.
   a. MLIS / MLS / MIS
   b. JD
   c. PhD
   d. Other Masters
   e. Other

5. How many years have you worked in libraries, archives, museums, or related institutions?
   a. 0-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 11-15
   d. 16-20
   e. 20+

6. If you previously worked as an attorney outside of libraries, archives, museums, or related institutions, how many years did you work in that capacity?
   a. 0-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 11-15
   d. 16-20
   e. 20+
   f. Not applicable
g. Prefer not to answer
7. Additional comments [open text field]

**Position & Institutional Demographics**

8. What is your institution type?
   a. Public
   b. Private
   c. Other
   d. Prefer not to answer
9. How large is your institution's total student population?
   a. 1000 or fewer
   b. 1001-5000
   c. 5001-10,000
   d. 10,001-15,000
   e. 15,001-20,000
   f. 20,001-25,000
   g. 25,001-30,000
   h. 30,001-35,000
   i. 35,001-40,000
   j. 40,000 or more
   k. Not affiliated with a higher education institution
   l. Prefer not to answer
10. How many people work in your department (e.g., academic library, counsel's office) or institution (e.g., museum, archives, research library)? For example, if you work in a library or museum that is part of a university, please let us know how many people work in your library or museum—not the number of people working on your entire campus.
   a. 1-10
   b. 11-25
   c. 26-50
   d. 51-75
   e. 76-100
   f. 101-150
   g. 151-200
   h. 200+
11. How many years have you worked at your current institution?
   a. 0-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 11-15
   d. 16-20
   e. 20+
12. How many years have you been in your current position?
   a. 0-5
   b. 6-10
   c. 11-15
   d. 16-20
   e. 20+
13. How is your position classified?
   a. Faculty, rank with tenure
b. Faculty, rank without tenure
c. Faculty, without rank
d. Staff, exempt
e. Staff, non-exempt
f. Other
14. What are the terms of your employment?
   a. Permanent
   b. Contract / term
   c. Other
15. Is a JD required for your position?
   a. Yes
   b. No, but desired
   c. No
   d. I don’t recall
16. What percentage of your time is spent on copyright and information policy work during an average week?
   a. Less than 25%
   b. Around 50%
   c. Greater than 75%
   d. I am not responsible for copyright and information policy work
17. Who do you report to?
   a. Dean / University Librarian
   b. Associate Dean / Associate University Librarian
   c. Head of department or unit in library, archives, museum, etc.
   d. University Counsel
   e. Director / Head of Institution
   f. Other
18. Do you supervise direct reports, not including student workers?
   a. Yes
   b. No
19. If yes, how many people report to you?
   a. 1-3
   b. 4-6
   c. 6-9
   d. 10+
20. Additional comments [open text field]

**Salary & Additional Compensation Demographics**

21. What is your current salary? (Range, in USD)
   a. Below $40,000
   b. $40,000-44,999
   c. $45,000-49,999
   d. $50,000-54,999
   e. $55,000-59,999
   f. $60,000-64,999
   g. $65,000-69,999
   h. $70,000-74,999
   i. $75,000-79,999
j. $80,000-84,999
k. $85,000-89,999
l. $90,000-94,999
m. $95,000-99,999
n. $100,000-104,999
o. $105,000-109,999
p. $110,000-114,999
q. $115,000-119,999
r. $120,000-124,999
s. $125,000-129,999
t. $130,000-134,999
u. $135,000-139,999
v. $140,000-144,999
w. $145,000-149,999
x. $150,000+

22. Have you received any of the following in your current position? Select all that apply.
   a. Merit raise
   b. Bonus
   c. Cost of living raise
   d. Market adjustment
   e. Promotion in rank raise
   f. Promotion in managerial structure raise
   g. Other [open text field]
   h. None

23. Who pays your professional membership fees? Select all that apply.
   a. Paid by institution
   b. Paid by institution & paid by you
   c. Paid by you
   d. My associations do not require membership fees/dues
   e. I am not a member of associations that require membership fees/dues

24. Who pays your professional development travel expenses? Select all that apply.
   a. Paid by institution, in full at any amount
   b. Paid by institution, up to set amount
   c. Paid by institution & paid by you
   d. Paid by you
   e. Other (e.g., association, host institution, publisher, etc.)

25. If paid by institution, in full or up to a set amount, approximately what amount is funded? (Pre-pandemic levels are accepted.) [open text field]

26. What institutional employee benefits are offered to you?
   a. Paid holidays
      i. Offered, use
      ii. Offered, do not use
      iii. Not offered
   b. Paid vacation
      i. Offered, use
      ii. Offered, do not use
      iii. Not offered
   c. Medical plan
      i. Offered, use
ii. Offered, do not use
iii. Not offered
d. Dental plan
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered
e. Vision plan
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered
f. Flexible spending plan
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered
g. Sick leave
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered
h. Retirement
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered
i. Pension
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered
j. Paid parental leave
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered
k. Tuition program
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered
l. Wellness program
   i. Offered, use
   ii. Offered, do not use
   iii. Not offered

27. How do you feel you are compensated in comparison to colleagues in your department or organization?
   a. Extremely unfairly
   b. Unfairly
   c. Fairly
   d. Extremely fairly
   e. I do not know
   f. Prefer not to answer

28. How do you feel you are compensated in comparison to colleagues elsewhere?
   a. Extremely unfairly
   b. Unfairly
c. Fairly

d. Extremely fairly

e. I do not know

f. Prefer not to answer

29. Additional comments [open text field]

Conclusion

30. If you have final thoughts or comments to share, please do so. [open text field]

NOTES


15. “Not Just a Number.”