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## CONSULTANT EARNINGS

The information which follows is a compilation of the results from almost 800 firms who responded to our survey representing over 4,300 revenue-producing consultants. This is a slightly larger number of respondents than last year. Almost $20 \%$ of the respondents were solo practitioners.

The recruiting profession, at least according to this polled group, attests to the fact that our business continues to progress in income. This snapshot of the recruiting industry has demonstrated amazing accuracy over the 20+ years in which we have conducted this survey and TFL readers tend to be longer tenured and more successful than non-readers. The increase in earnings seems not to be because those surveyed worked harder, but because salaries increased as did fee percentages charged.

As always, we asked for results from only those people who have been in the business for a year or more. While there are occasional superstars who demonstrate exceptional performance during that critical first year, this is an easy entry, easy exit business and including neophytes skews the results in such a way as to distort the results.

We also deleted those few responses where the Cash In figures were outrageously high (well over $\$ 1$ million and probably a pooling of revenues from a number of 'team' members) or too low (only worked part time during the polled year).

Only $6 \%$ of the respondents identified themselves as purely retained. The balance were contingency practitioners with about $17 \%$ of these indicating that they occasionally charged upfront commitment or engagement fees and about $4 \%$ of the contingency group said they sporadically worked a fully retained assignment.

Approximately $20 \%$ of the respondents were solo practitioners, a percentage that is reflective of the proportional distribution of our readership in general. Franchised offices comprised $29 \%$ of the survey respondents, down somewhat from last year.

Here is a thumbnail look at those things that seem to matter most to readers. More detailed information will follow in subsequent issues for those whose eyes have not yet glazed over.

## CATEGORY <br> PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENT FIRMS

Solo practitioners ..... 20\%
Non-Solo Independent Firms ..... 48\%
Franchised Firms ..... 29\%
Other Modalities ..... 3\%

## AVERAGE FEE COLLECTED

| Solo | 46 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Non-Solo Independent | \$19,856.60 |
| Franchised Firms | \$19,227.20 |

Global Executive Solutions Group - Fairlawn, OH \$31,224.11
NOTE: The previous year's average fee was $\$ 17,863$. Average fees have jumped almost $10 \%$ from the previous year, due primarily to increasing salaries and more $30 \%$ fees being charged. Another factor, according to many, is the fact that they are more selective in the assignments they accept. One told us, "I'm well aware that most companies will attempt to fill the run-of-the-mill jobs on their own and the ones they offer me are more difficult. Even so, I only take those where the odds of filling them are heavily weighted in my favor. I turn down 4 out of every 5 openings and almost always require some type of commitment fee as well as a $30 \%$ fee. That's what my time is worth and I have no desire to waste it on sub-par or needle-in-a-haystack exercises."

A higher than average number of solo practitioners are still charging from $20-25 \%$. We suppose they do so because they have a lower overhead component.

## AVERAGE CASH IN - Annually

Solo practitioners................................... \$230,565.12
Non-Solo Independents .......................... $\$ 234,885.50$
Franchised Firms .................................... \$239,068.30
Global Executive Solutions Group Fairlawn, OH \$282,000.00

# AVERAGE CONSULTANT Compensation 

Non-Solo Independents .......... \$105,698.25<br>Franchised Firms \$95,627.20<br>Global Executive Solutions Group (80 \% of recruiters) \$ 117,000 to \$ 530,000

NOTE: Non-solo independent firms tended to pay out an average of $44 \%$ of Cash In while franchised firms paid about $40 \%$. Although some firms pay a fixed salary plus a smaller percentage of the Cash In, the vast majority of firms still compensate their consulting staffs based on performance (commission vs. salary). Another variable is the commission percentage paid. Some firms pay no draws or salaries, but pay from 50-70\% of Cash In as a tradeoff. Although the IRS deems it illegal to treat your consultants as Independent Contractors, the large number of people working as virtual consultants from their homes rather than chained to a desk in a typical office environment rather blurs the ability of the 'revenooers' to make the determination regarding the I/C status.

## AVERAGE \% OF CASH IN PAID TO CONSULTANTS


Global Executive Solutions Group: $35 \%$ to $50 \%$ based on accumulative cash-in plus benefits package.

NOTE: Very little change from previous years. Some firms pay as little as $20 \%$ and a few dozen of those in this survey indicated that they pay as much as $70 \%$. Much depends upon the architecture of the firm, benefits offered, types of placements, draw/salary components, etc. Percentages very often "step up" based upon Cash In (gross fee) results. Thresholds will differ from firm to firm but it is almost universal that the more a consultant bills, the higher the payout will be as a percentage of the additional Cash In.

## MONTHLY DRAW

The average draw (where paid) is $\$ 2,000$ - not much different than last year.
Global Executive Solutions Group: \$ 1,500 to \$ 9,000 depending on metrics attained weekly.

## Average Tenure of Respondents . 6.14 years

NOTE: Average tenure of recruiters dropped from 9.17 years in 2004 to 6.14 years today. This reflects the fact that many firms increased their staff size during the past couple of years creating more respondents with less tenure. A large number of "old-timers" continue to retire. Even so, the tenure of practitioners in this survey points to the fact that a large majority were able to stay afloat and survive despite the economic circumstances.

## Niche Ranking of Respondents

The top niches represented by respondents to this survey were:
Specialty Ranking
Accounting/Banking/Financial related........................ 1
Sales/Marketing........................................................... 2
Healthcare/Pharmaceutical/Medical Related............... 3
Manufacturing/QC/Production .................................... 4
Engineering/Technical/Design/R\&D/High Tech ....... 5
IT ............................................................................. 6
Legal/Paralegal......................................................... 7
Insurance ................................................................. 8
Hospitality/Food Service/Leisure/Travel ................... 9
Retail ..................................................................... 10
Real Estate/Construction ......................................... 11
General/Admin./HR/Mgmt...................................... 12
Telecommunication................................................ 13
Advertising/PR/Graphic Arts/Publishing ................. 14
Clerical/Office Support ........................................... 15

NOTE: These rankings represent the number of people who work within the named specialty according to the respondents to this survey. They closely parallel the anecdotal comments we receive on a daily basis in conversations with our readers. Being highly ranked does not necessarily mean you should flock to those specialties since specialty areas attracting a large number of recruiters often means a greater tendency for clients to insist on deep discounts, believing that the laws of supply and demand work in their favor. There are dozens of very strange specialty areas practiced by a very few people who earn a lot of money and these will be covered in future issues.

Average \# Consultants Per Non-solo Firm - 6.5

## Global Executive Solutions Group - 16 Consultants (Practice Leadrs)

NOTE: There has been a doubling in the number of consultants per firm since last year's survey. Remember, however, that we do not include consultants with less than one year of experience. Even so, we would have suspected this number to be even higher since many firms responding to last year's survey told us they planned to add staff. If they did so, perhaps the majority of them didn't last long enough to be included in this year's survey.

## FEE PERCENTAGES

## Average fee percentage billed and collected..... $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$

Global Executive Solutions Group: 25 \% to 32 \%
NOTE: When over $40 \%$ of respondents report that $25 \%$ is what they are able to charge, it almost becomes the norm by default. While most still have a 'sticker price' of $30 \%$ on their fee schedules, fact is, the real fee is almost always $25 \%$ - or lower." Retained firms typically charge from $30 \%$ to $35 \%$. This survey is highly skewed toward contingency firm data.

We have seen some significant movement back towards a $30 \%$ fee lately, but there is still reluctance on the part of some large employers unless they are desperate to alleviate their pain on certain critical openings. Also, rather than dropping their $30 \%$ fees down to $25 \%$ (which is really a $17 \%$ discount - not the $5 \%$ as many believe), many have lowered it to $27.5 \%$ or some other in between percentage outside of the ' $5 \%$ ' discount normally requested.

Here are the survey results:

| 33 | 2.8\% |
| :---: | :---: |
| $30 \%$ fees. | . $31.3 \%$ |
| 26-29\% fee | 8.4\% |
| 25\% fees. | . $42.2 \%$ |
| 21-24\% fee | 2.6\% |
| 20\% fees. | .11.7\% |
| <20\% fees | .0.12\% |
| Other (flat fe | ...0.7\% |

## GUARANTEES OFFERED

Money back guarantees ..... 20.17 \%
Replacement guarantees ..... 65.23\%
Prorated guarantees* ..... 7.63\%
No guarantee offered ..... 6.97\%
30 days ..... 41.90\%
45 days ..... 06\%
60 days ..... 33.71\%
90 days ..... 17.30\%
Other. ..... 7.03\%

THE HISTORICAL CONSULTANT Average EARNINGS SCORECARD

| 1985 | \$51,900 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1986 | \$52,848 |
| 1987 | \$53,278 |
| 1988 | \$57,184 |
| 1989 | .. \$57,592 |
| 1990 | \$52,236 |
| 1991 | \$52,914 |
| 1992 | \$50,025 |
| 1993 | .. \$63,304 |
| 1994.. | \$67,721 |
| 1995 | .. \$76,473 |
| 1996. | .. \$72,672 |
| 1997. | . \$87,294 |
| 1998. | .. \$89,178 |
| 1999 | . \$87,835 |
| 2000.. | \$93,634 |
| 2001. | . \$82,038 |
| 2002 | . \$80,624 |
| 2003. | .. \$78,604 |
| 2004.. | \$88,700 |
| 2005 | \$98,530 |
| 2006 | \$ 101,615 |
| 2007 | \$ 102,000 |
| 2008 | \$ 103,000 |
| 2009 | \$ 98,480 |
| 2010 | \$ 101,214 |

Global Executive Solutions Group (average) $\$ 117,000$
Maximum earned \$530,000

## SOME OBSERVATIONS

Perhaps only happy and productive people respond to surveys like this. But we've been conducting this survey for 20 years and the results always seem to mirror the industry in general. It is, of course, only a snapshot of the industry at one specific point in time by people who are willing to share their results. It is instructive, however, as a benchmark against which to compare your particular practice. It also gives us the pulse of the industry.

We continue to see the tendency for birds of a feather flocking together. If a firm's consultants have mediocre results, all of them generally follow that pattern. If a firm's consultant billings are above average, all the consultants usually beat the average. Maybe it's peer pressure; maybe it's higher comfort levels. Maybe it's better management; maybe it's better training. Wish we knew so we could bottle it.

A few years ago, we chronicled a practitioner who billed over $\$ 900 \mathrm{~K}$ per year with the help of two researchers. Evidently, others have followed that advice since several respondents indicated that they have successfully adopted that suggestion, One 27 year veteran in the engineering niche reported $\$ 923,000$ cash in with the help of three research assistants. Another 10 year veteran operating in the Accounting area reported $\$ 895,000$ with 2 researchers.

The most surprising was the fact that almost everyone we talk to tells us there's more business than they can handle, yet the average practitioner still only makes an average of one placement a month. Either their ringmaster skills are deficient or they have a low comfort level which prevents them from rising above the average.

Further correlations of the data are still being massaged and the results will be reported in future issues. We appreciate those who took the time to respond.

