

Classification and Compensation Study 2018 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Q Why did we do the Ewing Study?

A Over the past few years, CSEA has expressed a desire to have an outside consultant conduct a unit-wide classification study and compensation study.

Q What was the goal of doing the study?

A The goal of conducting a classification and compensation study is to ensure that employees are appropriately compensated so that the employer can retain and attract its workforce. Additionally, the study sought to ensure fairness and parity amongst classifications in the district.

Q What is a Classification and Total Compensation Study?

A The Classification/Total Compensation study aligns job descriptions with the current roles and responsibilities of classified employees and conducts a market analysis of total compensation in similar or like jobs in other comparable districts.

Q What is a reclassification?

A A reclassification is the upgrading of a position to a higher classification as a result of the gradual increase of the duties being performed by the incumbent in such position. A reclassification occurs when due to the such gradual changes, the majority of job duties for a position are determined to be at a higher (or lower) classification than the current level of the position. Importantly, changes in assigned duties or percentages of time do not always warrant a reclassification. For instance, more of the same type or level of duties does not constitute grounds for a reclassification to a higher level.

Changes in the nature, variety, and complexity of one's job duties, the supervision received or supervision exercised, or the responsibility for staff and/or resources may justify a classification review. Changes in the volume of the assigned work, or an employee's performance are not considered justification for a reclassification.

Q Is getting a "reclass" the same as getting a raise?

A No. A raise is simply an increase in compensation, whereas a reclassification means that the position is moved to another classification based on a change in the duties performed.

Q What is a "participant", "comparable", or "comparison" district?

A A participant, comparable or comparison district is one that is comparable to LUSD in reference to various factors which may include demographics, size (number of students), type of funding, location, etc.

Q What districts were compared with LUSD?

A Chula Vista Elementary School District, Escondido School District, Cajon Valley School District, La Mesa/Spring Valley School District, South Bay Union School District, Santee School District, National School District, Fallbrook Union School District, Escondido School District, San Ysidro Elementary School District, Lemon Grove School District, and Alpine Union School District.

Q Does this mean we will get a raise as a result of the Classification and Salary Study?

A The salary study provides a market analysis for every classification. The data may show some classifications are below market, above market or at market. Implementation of any salary increases is subject to negotiations with the CSEA.

Q If my position was found to be “above market,” will there be cuts to my pay?

A No. No reductions in pay have been proposed.

Q Is this a performance review?

A No. The classification study and the information you provided on your questionnaire is not a performance review.

Q Will there be layoffs?

A The goal of the study is to update job descriptions and have accurate information about the work being performed. The salary/benefits study is to research the market median to districts we compare with. It is not the intent of this study to layoff employees.

Q If the Ewing study identified a job classification that is paid lower in LUSD than in comparison districts, will that classification automatically get a raise?

A The Ewing study compared each classification’s total compensation (salary and benefits) to the total compensation of comparable districts. The District has proposed increasing eight (8) classifications identified as having total compensation that is below market.

Q What is “total compensation”?

A “Total compensation” is the gross salary plus the District’s cost for all fringe benefits, including health benefits, dental benefits, and life insurance.

Q Why did the study include total compensation and not just my salary?

A Employees and perspective employees evaluate the monetary aspects of employment based not only on the salary schedule for a position, but also based on the employer's contribution for health, dental, and life insurance benefits which would otherwise be borne by the employee.

Q Is it true that classified managers were also included in the study? Will they be getting raises?

A Yes, classified managers were also included in the classification and compensation study. The District has not proposed implementing any recommended salary increases for management employees. However, implementation of recommendations relating to management employees are not tied to negotiations with the collective bargaining units, and as such, may be done at the Board's discretion.

Q If my position is not eligible for benefits, will the District consider my salary only?

A No, employees are eligible for benefits based on their hours worked, not their classification. For instance, an employee may currently be assigned 2 hours per day, but with additional shifts, could be assigned 6 hours per day and eligible for benefits.

Q Isn't this really about trying to pay us less for doing the same work?

A If most of the job duties associated with a position have changed, reclassification of the position is recommended. No salary decreases are recommended. If the study indicates that the classification to which your position is assigned is compensated at a rate that is above the market median, your position is not recommended for a salary decrease. However, your position would be considered for an increase if market median calls for it.

Q When will the recommendations from the study be implemented?

A The District's Governing Board fulfilled the public notice requirements so that negotiations with the CSEA to implement the proposals could begin. The parties met Monday, December 17, 2018, but implementation of the Ewing study was not resolved. The District anticipates CSEA will present its proposal at the parties' next negotiating session on Wednesday, January 23, 2019.

Q The District's proposal states it is prepared to implement by January 1, 2019. Will the CSEA and the District be able to negotiate the job descriptions in that timeframe?

A The parties are required to negotiate the decision and the impacts and effects of the assignment of new duties or qualifications to an existing position, but not changes to job descriptions that merely clarify existing duties. The job descriptions reflect employees' current duties, and where the duties have expanded, or are compensated at a higher rate when compared to the benchmark districts, an increase is included in the District's proposal.

Q How do we know if this is really going to happen for us on January 1st?

A When the recommendations are implemented depends on negotiations between the District and the CSEA. The parties met to negotiate Monday, December 17, 2018, but were unable to resolve implementation of the Ewing study. The District has proposed that the changes be effective the first day of the month following ratification of an agreement addressing the reclassification study, and the parties are scheduled to negotiate on Wednesday, January 23, 2019.

Q How was the Study conducted?

A Ewing Consulting Services (ECS) was hired to conduct the study. ECS has provided consulting services to over 160 school districts, 40 community college districts, 30 county offices of education and a number of other organizations during their 28+ years of providing human resource consulting services.

Q Was there a committee of employees that monitored the process of the classification study?

A Yes. A Classification Advisory Committee was formed. On the committee was Rick Klain, Maintenance III/CSEA President, Kit Buettgenbach, School Secretary, Jessica Capoocia, Special Ed. Assistant III, Loren Davis, Custodian II (Day), Samantha Orahood, Clerk Typist III, Cathy Montgomery, Food Service Assistant I, Tiffany Melville, ESS Director, Lisa Ford, School Clerk II/CSEA President, Brian Beisigl, Technology Manager and Stacy Coble, Director, Human Resources

Every employee in the classified service was asked to fill out a Position Information Questionnaire (PIQ). Five Informational meetings for classified employees were scheduled on Tuesday, January 16, 2018: 8:30 a.m. to 9:15 a.m. at the Transportation Department; 10:30 to 11:15 a.m.; 12:30 to 1:15 p.m.; 3:00 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.; and 5:00 p.m. to 5:45 p.m. at the District Office. Each employee received a copy of the Position Information Questionnaire at the meeting.

Ultimately, 205 employees participated in the study, representing 68.79% participation from the classified service. ECS reviewed all questionnaires and

interviewed at least one incumbent in each classification. 111 group and individual interviews were held, which represents 54% of the classified staff. Based on the information gathered through this process, the consultants prepared 66 preliminary class descriptions, which were submitted to incumbents for review and feedback. Suggested changes from incumbents and supervisors were received and considered.

ECS used their expertise and this information to prepare an allocation listing and class descriptions. The revised class and position descriptions represent the current duties and responsibilities assigned to incumbents. Based on incumbents' current duties and responsibilities, ECS suggested several title changes, reclassifications, eliminations of existing classes and establishment of new classes.

Q What if someone was unable to attend one of the employee information meetings?

A If employees were unable to attend one of the meetings they were sent a PIQ with their name on it through District mail. Interviews were conducted with anyone, or any group, that requested an interview.

