

Classification and Compensation Study for Grand Rapids Public Schools

FINAL REPORT



Evergreen Solutions, LLC

October 11, 2021

Table of Contents

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	i
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Study Methodology.....	1-2
1.2 Report Organization.....	1-4
2.0 SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE OUTREACH	3-1
2.1 Compensation.....	2-1
2.2 Classification.....	2-4
2.3 Benefits	2-6
2.4 Summary.....	2-8
3.0 ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT CONDITIONS	3-1
3.1 Analysis of Pay Plans.....	3-1
3.2 Salary Placement Analysis	3-6
3.3 Quartile Analysis	3-9
3.4 Compression Analysis	3-13
3.5 Department/Location Distribution	3-16
3.6 Summary.....	3-18
4.0 SALARY SURVEY SUMMARY	4-1
4.1 Survey Data Sources	4-1
4.2 Public Sector Data.....	4-3
4.3 Private Sector Data	4-7
4.4 Summary.....	4-11
5.0 BENEFITS SURVEY SUMMARY	5-1
5.1 Insurance Coverages.....	5-1
5.2 Retirement	5-5
5.3 Leave	5-6
5.4 Other Benefits.....	5-7
5.5 Summary.....	5-9
6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS	6-1
6.1 Introduction	6-1
6.2 Compensation and Classification Findings and Recommendations.....	6-1
6.3 System Maintenance and Administration Policies	6-9
6.4 Summary.....	6-10



Executive Summary

In May 2021, Evergreen Solutions was retained by Grand Rapids Public Schools to conduct a Limited Classification and Compensation Study for exempt and support non-exempt, union employees. This study was primarily designed to focus on internal and external equity of both the structure by which employees are compensated as well as the way positions relate and compare to one another across the District.

As part of the study, Evergreen Solutions was tasked with:

- collecting and reviewing current environmental data present in Grand Rapids Public Schools;
- conducting a salary and benefits surveys, and providing feedback to Grand Rapids Public Schools regarding current market competitiveness;
- conducting a classification analysis to assess internal equity and the efficiency of the current classification plan;
- developing strategic positioning recommendations using market data and best practices;
- developing a compensation structure and implementation cost plan for Grand Rapids Public Schools;
- developing and submitting draft and final reports summarizing findings and recommendations; and
- reviewing job descriptions and obtaining job analysis questionnaires from employees.

INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS

These sessions were designed to brief employees and supervisors on the purpose and major processes of the study. These sessions was intended to address any questions and resolve any misconceptions about the study and relevant tasks. During focus groups, employees are asked about their experience with Grand Rapids Public Schools and to identify any concerns they have about compensation or classification. This information provided some basic perceptual background as well as a starting point for the research process. A summary of these comments is found in **Chapter 2** of the full report.



ANALYSIS OF CURRENT CONDITIONS

The information contained in **Chapter 3** identifies features of the overall structure of the compensation system, as well as the administration of it at the individual employee level. Notably, the following was found at the time of the study was initiated:

- **Pay Plans** – The compensation structure utilized by the District is somewhat disorganized: the non-exempt support step plan features varying number of steps among its ranges and the other step plans feature inconsistent range spreads. Best practice suggests having a structure with more uniformity.
- **Salary Distribution** – There is a clustering of salaries below their respective pay range midpoints (70 percent overall). This is particularly pronounced among public safety and security (PSS) and exempt employees—each with more than half of employee salaries in the first quartile alone.

This analysis served as a starting point for the development of recommendations in this report. These observations were reviewed and considered in more detail throughout the course of the study.

SALARY AND BENEFITS SURVEYS

The external market is defined as identified peers that have similar characteristics, demographics, and service offerings as Grand Rapid Public Schools. Benchmark positions are identified from each area and level of the District and typically include a large cross-section of positions. Survey tools were created to solicit salary and benefits information from each of the peer organizations. When the results are received, the data were analyzed, cleaned, and entered to provide aggregate findings.

Salary Survey

As stated in **Chapter 4**, From the analysis of the data gathered in the external labor market assessment, it can be concluded that the District's salary scale, was, at the time of the study:

- approximately 1.3 percent below the overall public sector market minimum, 2.1 percent below the market midpoint, and 2.8 percent below the market maximum of pay ranges of surveyed positions;
- slightly below the public sector market average range spread—with an average across all surveyed positions of 25.3 percent, compared with the 25.0 percent spread found among the District's pay ranges; and
- approximately 10.5 percent above the overall private sector market minimum, 4.7 percent above the midpoint, and 0.4 percent above the maximum of pay ranges of surveyed positions.



Information gained from the salary survey was used, along with current environmental factors (such as budget and discretionary benefit contributions), to develop a recommended compensation system that places the District in a strong position to stay competitive in today's market.

Benefits Survey

Based on the comparison of benefits shown in **Chapter 5**, Grand Rapids Public Schools was found to offer a similar benefits package to that of its peers. In particular, the District was found to excel in its dental and vision insurance benefits and provision of benefits to retirees.

The District should continue to maintain any competitive advantages, while seeking to bolster areas of weakness. By so doing, it will ensure that it is able to recruit and retain quality employees.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Evergreen's assessment found that the current compensation structure was somewhat disorganized, with step plans featuring varying number of steps and range spreads. Best practice suggests having a structure with more uniformity. It was also found that the majority of employee salaries are clustered below their respective pay range midpoint, particularly among the support non-exempt public safety and security (PSS) and exempt employees. In particular, principals and assistant principals were substantially below market period.

From the market salary survey, the District's pay ranges were, overall, found to be below the market, but particularly so among exempt classifications.

Given these findings, Evergreen is proposing retaining the current Exempt Pay Plan and having the Support Non-Exempt Pay Plan absorb the support non-exempt PSS classifications. Details of these plans are displayed in **Exhibits 6A** and **6B** in the full report.

The proposed Exempt Pay Plan (see **Exhibit 6A**) has the following features:

- 17 pay grades, with ten levels in each (employees spend three years on each level);
- a constant increase between steps of three percent;
- a constant range spread (the distance between the minimum and maximum of a pay range) of approximately 30.5 percent; and
- a constant six percent progression (separation/increase) between Grades 100 and 110 and a constant eight percent progression between Grades 111 and 116.

The proposed Support Non-Exempt Pay Plan, displayed in **Exhibits 6B**, has the following features:

- 11 pay grades, with ten levels in each (employees spend three years on each level);



- a constant increase between steps of 3.5 percent;
- a constant range spread (the distance between the minimum and maximum of a pay range) of approximately 36.3 percent; and
- a constant five percent progression pay grades.

The proposed step plans incorporate common industry practices, while using the existing pay plans as a framework. The proposed pay plans will allow the District to slot classifications at or near market value now and moving forward as positions are created or revised, as well as ensure external equity across all positions.

The report contains the following six recommendations as described in **Chapter 6**.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Adopt the proposed pay plans displayed in Exhibits 6A and 6B to simplify and bring consistency to the compensation system.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Adopt the proposed pay ranges displayed in Exhibits 6C and 6D to simplify and bring consistency to the classified compensation system, as well as improve the District's market competitiveness.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Transition employee salaries into the proposed pay plans utilizing an option described above.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Update current job descriptions and corresponding FLSA status to align with the selected classification structure and be reflective of the employee-provided JAT information.

RECOMMENDATION 5: Conduct small-scale salary surveys as needed to assess the market competitiveness of hard-to-fill classifications and/or classifications with retention issues and make changes to pay grade assignments, if necessary.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study every five to seven years, subject to budget constraints and market conditions.



Chapter 1 – Introduction

In May 2021, Evergreen Solutions was retained by Grand Rapids Public Schools to conduct a Limited Classification and Compensation Study for exempt and non-exempt, union employees. This study was primarily designed to focus on internal and external equity of both the structure by which employees are compensated as well as the way positions relate and compare to one another across the organization.

Internal equity relates to the fairness of an organization's compensation practices among its current employees. Specifically, by reviewing the skills, capabilities, and duties of each position, it can be determined whether similar positions are being compensated in a similar manner within the organization. The classification component of this study is aimed at resolving any inconsistencies related to job requirements and providing some clarity to the plan in place.

External equity deals with the differences between how an organization's classifications are valued and what compensation is available in the market place for the same skills, capabilities, and duties.

As part of the study, Evergreen Solutions was tasked with:

- collecting and reviewing current environmental data present in Grand Rapids Public Schools;
- reviewing job descriptions and obtaining job analysis questionnaires from employees;
- conducting a salary and benefits surveys, and providing feedback to Grand Rapids Public Schools regarding current market competitiveness;
- conducting a classification analysis to assess internal equity and the efficiency of the current classification plan;
- developing strategic positioning recommendations using market data and best practices;
- developing a compensation structure and implementation cost plan for Grand Rapids Public Schools; and
- developing and submitting draft and final reports summarizing findings and recommendations.



1.1 STUDY METHODOLOGY

Evergreen Solutions combines qualitative as well as quantitative data analysis to produce an equitable solution in order to maximize the fairness and competitiveness of an organization's compensation structure and practices. Project activities included:

- conducting a project kick-off meeting;
- conducting orientation sessions with employees;
- facilitating employee focus group sessions;
- conducting salary and benefits surveys;
- developing recommendations for compensation management;
- developing detailed implementation plans; and
- creating the draft and final reports.

Kickoff Meeting

The kickoff meeting provides an opportunity to discuss the history of the organization, finalize the work plan, and begin the data collection process. Data collection of relevant background material (including existing pay plans, organization charts, policies, procedures, training materials, job descriptions, and other pertinent material) is part of this process.

Interviews and Focus Groups

These sessions are designed to brief employees and supervisors on the purpose and major processes of the study. These sessions are intended to address any questions and resolve any misconceptions about the study and relevant tasks. During focus groups, employees are asked about their experience with Grand Rapids Public Schools and to identify any concerns they have about compensation or classification. This information provides some basic perceptual background as well as a starting point for the research process.

Salary and Benefits Surveys

The external market is defined as identified peers that have similar characteristics, demographics, and service offerings as the target organization. Benchmark positions are identified from each area and level of the organization and typically include a large cross-section of positions in the District. Once the target and benchmark information is finalized, survey tools are created to solicit salary and benefits information from each of the peer organizations. When the results are received, the data are analyzed, cleaned, and entered to provide aggregate findings.



Job Questionnaire and Regression

Although market data are imperative for determining pay grade value for all job titles, it is not the only factor that contributes to recommended placement. In addition to collecting market data, job questionnaire data were used to slot positions. Evergreen’s Job Assessment Tool (JAT) was administered to all employees during the study, and provided a score for each District job title. This score is used to determine hierarchy and value of all job titles based on each ones complexities.

Paired with market data through regression analysis, JAT scores normalize market classification values within the context of the District’s existing hierarchy and value of positions. The process of regression analysis essentially determines the market dollar value associated with every JAT point. At the most basic level, multiplying each classification’s JAT score by this market dollar value produces a predicted midpoint value which provides the best estimate for each position’s midpoint value. This process can result in both positive and negative gaps between the raw market value of a position and its recommended placement; and in some cases the variance is significant. This analysis provides direction for preliminarily slotting positions only.

Additional adjustments are generally made to account for positions with high turnover—to maintain existing hierarchy, as appropriate, and to account for the District’s understanding and knowledge of each position which cannot be captured using the JAT or through market data.

Solution Creation – Salary Schedule and Transition Costing

Solution creation follows agreement on the structure of the compensation and classification system. During this phase, desired range spreads (distance from minimum to maximum) and midpoint progressions (distance from the midpoint of one pay grade to the next) are established. In addition, job titles are determined that best reflect the roles and responsibilities of each position. With the pay tables and job titles established, jobs can be slotted into the proposed pay grade structure using market data and feedback from Human Resources staff in Grand Rapids Public Schools.

As part of the study, the District identifies its desired market position and compensation philosophy. Subsequently, the pay plan and job slotting within the system can be adjusted to account for this desired position in the market.

The final step in the creation of the solution is to identify the costs associated with each step of the analysis. The data from the job slotting are applied to the individual incumbents in the organization. This allows the District to view the total costs associated with the structural changes. Information is then provided to the District on various ways to implement the proposed structure and possible adjustments that can be made to address any remaining issues.

1.2 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report includes the following six chapters:

- Chapter 1 – Introduction
- Chapter 2 – Summary of Employee Outreach
- Chapter 3 - Assessment of Current Conditions
- Chapter 4 – Salary Survey Results
- Chapter 5 – Benefits Survey Results
- Chapter 6 – Recommendations



Chapter 2 – Summary of Employee Outreach

The Evergreen Team conducted 12 focus group sessions, and two individual interviews over the four-day period of May 31 through June 2 (in person), and June 16 (via Zoom). Prior to these outreach sessions, exempt and non-exempt, non-union Grand Rapids Public Schools (GRPS) employees were asked to complete a Job Assessment Tool (JAT) online to provide Evergreen specific information regarding each employee's job duties and responsibilities. Approximately 100 individuals, representing employees from throughout GRPS, attended Evergreen's focus group sessions and during each session employees were encouraged to complete the JAT.

The objective of the focus groups was to collect feedback on strengths and weaknesses of the current compensation and classification plan directly from the employees. Focus groups lasted for approximately 45-55 minutes.

The remainder of this chapter summarizes the comments made by focus group participants. It is important to note that the views shared in this summary are not necessarily supported by Evergreen Solutions nor GRPS. Evergreen, however, used the information as a basis for further investigation throughout the course of the study. In all instances, Evergreen has removed any information that may identify the commenter.

Comments and feedback have been organized into the following four sections:

- 2.1 Compensation
- 2.2 Classification
- 2.3 Benefits
- 2.4 Summary

2.1 COMPENSATION

Specific comments shared by employees related to GRPS compensation practices, policies, and procedures included the following:

- Most participating employees indicated that they did not understand the current salary schedules, the manner in which salary increases are given, or the policies and procedures for placing people on the pay scales at the time of hire. A number of employees pointed out instances where newly hired employees or the hiring supervisor were able to negotiate higher starting salaries while others were not. With few exceptions, employees and supervisory level staff said the salary schedule and how an employee moved from the minimum to the maximum salary levels was controlled by Human Resources and remained a mystery.



- Nearly all participating employees stated that the annual increases offered by the Board were not keeping pace with inflation or the increases given by other school districts in the area.
- Contracts and employment agreements were brought up in multiple sessions as being untimely and inaccurate in some cases. Several groups said that the contracts/employment agreements were not distributed to the employees until after the beginning of the new school year. Individuals noted instances where the begin and end dates of the contract/agreement did not agree with the calendars for the year, and when the differences resulted in extra workdays, no extra compensation was offered or given, but they were expected/required to work the extra days.
- Staff said that extra duty pay was only provided in limited circumstances and there were no clear guidelines for how to apply for extra duty pay. Examples of uncompensated extra duties associated with the covering of supervisory or management roles during long-term leave or vacancies, as well as extra days, nights, weekends and other responsibilities that the employees felt were well outside of their normal job duties. When they inquired, they said they were told that these were all duties covered in their job description as “other duties as assigned.”
- Salary compression, meaning that tenured and newly hired employees are all making approximately the same amount, was brought up as a major issue in almost every session. In some instances, the positions have no salary range, and tenured employees said that they are asked to train and assist the new employees who are technically making the same amount. There are no step increases being given that the employees were aware of, but some felt that some managers/supervisors advocated for better pay for their employees. Only a very few examples were provided of individuals receiving a pay raise above the Board approved increases each year.
- Education and experience beyond the minimum requirements of the job are, according to the employees interviewed, not taken into consideration when setting salaries. Employees said this is true at time of hire and when employees get additional certifications or degrees while employed by GRPS. Employees gave examples of how other area school districts provide education or certification stipends similar to those provided to teachers and expressed their desire for GRPS to follow suit.
- Annualized salaries do not take into account the number of days and hours worked. When reduced to an hourly rate, employee gave examples where a “promotion” was actually a reduction in pay. Employees said that a promotion should consistently result in an increase in pay, not just a higher annual salary as a result of more workdays.
- Employees working less than 12 months are paid for the months that they work. Some hourly employees said they work and are paid for 38 weeks. They can apply for summer work, but it is paid at a lower rate. They are not paid over spring break or Christmas or when there are snow days. Consequently, their paycheck during these times is significantly reduced—requiring them to take part time or piecemeal jobs in order to pay ongoing bills during these periods. Employees said they keep their



benefits throughout, but payroll deductions for premiums are compressed to fit the number of paychecks—meaning more is taken out of the checks each pay period. Some said they would like GRPS to adopt the practice used by some neighboring districts where hourly employees were allowed the option of having their base pay allocated out over 12 months to reduce major gaps in employee pay.

- Merit pay was discussed in several groups, with many voicing their desire to go to a merit-based system rather than receiving across the board pay raises. One obstacle to this would be creating a fair and equitable evaluation system so that raises were actually tied to performance. At this time, employees and management-level staff said there are many evaluation instruments and processes, and unless they are state-mandated, the quality of the evaluation is dependent on the evaluator.
- Employees stated that GRPS has noticeable recruitment and retention issues in the following areas/positions:
 - Principals
 - Assistant Principals
 - Deans
 - Entry Level Clerical Support Positions
 - Human Resource Generalists
 - Financial Specialists
 - Youth Advocate Specialists/Coordinators
 - Behavior Specialists
 - Network and PC Technicians
 - Network and Systems Technicians
 - Entry-level Public Safety & Security Officer
 - Executive Director of Operations
 - HR Director with Attorney Combination

In addition, employees said key positions that may soon be vacated due to retirements may also be particularly hard to fill because the positions wear many unique hats. For example, the employees filling the Data Management and Shared Time Coordinator (Student System) positions will soon retire and both positions are performing a wide array of duties not normally included in similarly titled positions.

- Employees identified the biggest competitors for positions in GRPS are:
 - Allegan Public Schools
 - Ann Arbor Public Schools
 - Battle Creek Public Schools
 - Byron Center Public Schools
 - Caledonia Community Schools
 - Cedar Springs Public Schools
 - Cedar Springs Public Schools
 - City of Grand Rapids
 - Comstock Park Public Schools
 - Coopersville Public Schools
 - Coopersville Public Schools
 - Dearborn Public Schools
 - Detroit Public Schools
 - East Grand Rapids Public Schools
 - Forest Hills Public Schools
 - Godfrey-Lee Public Schools
 - Godwin Heights Public Schools



- Grandville Public Schools
- Greenville Public Schools
- Hudsonville Public Schools
- Holland Public Schools
- Kalamazoo Public Schools
- Kalamazoo Regional Educational Services Association
- Kelloggsville Public Schools
- Kenowa Hills Public Schools
- Kent ISD
- Kent Schools Service Network
- Kentwood Public Schools
- Lansing Public Schools
- Lowell Area Schools
- Muskegon Public Schools
- Novi Community School District
- Oakland Community Schools
- Plymouth Canton Community Schools
- Rockford Public Schools
- Sparta Area Schools
- Spring Lake Public Schools
- Utica Community Schools
- Walled Lake Consolidated Schools
- Wyoming Public Schools
- Charter Schools (did not provide names)
- Grand Rapids Community College
- Post-Secondary Schools (for Native American related positions)
- Private Contractors (Trades)
- Spectrum Health
- Small IT Firms (unidentified)
- Tableau (data analytics)

2.2 CLASSIFICATION

General comments provided by employees related to classification included the following:

- **Job Descriptions** – Employees indicated that the job descriptions are fairly current, but there are additional duties that need to be added. Reductions in force and departmental reorganizations, some of which are ongoing, need to be considered when updating the job duties.
- **Classification Consistency** – For the most part, employees said that GRPS has not done a good job of maintaining consistency among classifications. Employees gave examples where two classifications performed similar jobs—but had different titles and pay scales. In some instances, new positions are added and the rationale for the placement within the current salary structure is unknown.
- **Career Ladder** – For the most part, employees said there are no natural progressions through the classifications. For example, there is no Coordinator I, Coordinator II, etc. that would allow employees with advanced degrees or certifications or who are assigned additional duties to progress through the ranks. Employees also said that GRPS does not have formal programs to groom or mentor employees to take on the next higher position. At the campus level, there is no programs for grooming teachers to become Deans or Assistant Principals or for Deans and Assistant Principals to become Principals. In the past, employees said that GRPS used a “grown your own” approach for filling such positions, with many of the current campus and central office leaders having started their careers in the classroom and progressing through the



ranks. Some said that today people are hired into a position and may have no way to progress without changing careers.

- **Exempt vs Non-Exempt Status** – Employees said there were hourly waged employees currently classified as non-exempt that work long hours and are not always being paid overtime or given compensatory time for the hours worked. In some instances, hourly employees supervise and evaluate staff and have salary ranges that could potentially move the employee into an exempt status.

In addition to the general comments, employees identified specific positions and titles needing attention during the study:

- **Principals and Assistant Principals** – Some stated that recruitment for these positions is hampered because salaries are, in some cases, lower than that of tenured teachers and do not differentiate sufficiently between the grade levels and type of school served or the size of the school. Employees felt that more differentiation based on workload, number of students, and number of programs or schools served was needed.
- **Assistant Principal vs School Improvement Facilitator and Dean of Students** – These classifications have similar salary ranges but different responsibilities. Staff said the Assistant Principal evaluates employees along with the Principal and is considered an instructional leader. It is not clear whether the requirements for these positions are correctly stated or consistently applied.
- **Coordinators/Directors in all categories** – Employees said the coordinator title was originally differentiated from that of a director or supervisor as they were to coordinate programs as opposed to directing people. At this time, they said there are coordinators and directors with many direct reports and others with no direct reports and the two titles is inconsistently applied.
- **Student Data & Quality & Research Manager** – Staff said the title is not indicative of the work that is actually performed.
- **Manager Software Architect** – Staff said the title is not indicative of the work that is actually performed.
- **Youth Advocate Specialists and Behavior Specialists** – These employees perform approximately the same type of work but are paid differently. Campuses also use these positions for different purposes, based on the needs of the principal. A consistent title with graduated levels such as Youth Advocate I and II, etc. is desirable.
- **Network and PC Technicians and Network and Systems Technicians** – These titles are generic that are used for positions that perform a variety of tasks. While the title of Network and Systems Technician is in some places referred to as an administrator, there are two salary ranges for that title, which may indicate that these individuals are assigned additional duties. These titles need to reflect the type of work performed and potentially be aligned with titles generally used in the industry today.



- **Human Resources Generalists, Coordinators, Supervisors and Managers** – Staff said the titles are not indicative of the work performed. In addition, salary ranges vary within a title with no formal differentiation to show that a different range is applied because one is a senior level position with additional duties and requirements.

2.3 **BENEFITS**

General comments provided by employees related to benefits included the following:

- In general, employees are pleased with their overall benefits. Benefits were cited by many as the primary reason they came to GRPS.
- Employees at all levels noted that benefits are inconsistent among employee groups; a number of participants expressed concern about the additional benefits given to specific leadership positions and the breakpoint used to determine if an employee's classification qualifies them for those extra benefits.
- Employees voiced some displeasure with the assistance and information they received from Human Resources regarding benefits. Most said Human Resources directed them to the provider for assistance and felt that internally it would be helpful if there was someone they could go to for general help. Some said that benefit information during the onboarding process for new employees was also limited.

2.3.1 **HEALTHCARE, DENTAL AND VISION INSURANCE**

- The majority of employees said they appreciated the fact that GRPS offered multiple plan options for health coverage and paid a significant portion of the employee premiums. Most said the dollar amount of the premiums paid by the employee is rising, but recognized that they were still getting affordable coverage for them and their families.
- Employees were pleased that GRPS paid a monthly opt-out amount to employees who elected not to take the GRPS coverages as they were covered through their spouse's employer or another entity. Those that had opted out and those that had insurance through GRPS said they felt this was a fair and equitable way to treat their employees.
- Many said the dental and vision coverage was poor, providing examples where coverage was denied or non-existent or instances when the employee had to pay large sums out of pocket and wait long periods for reimbursement from the provider.
- Inconsistencies among the coverages provided to various employee groups were mentioned in several focus groups sessions. In particular, the teacher coverages were thought to be significantly better than those offered to non-teachers. All said that they felt the coverages provided to all groups should be consistent.



- Employees who work less than 40 hours per week said GRPS reduced some of their benefits and they are now required to pay a higher percent of their total premiums.

2.3.2 FRINGE BENEFITS

- Tuition assistance/reimbursement was a major factor for many employees when considering a job with GRPS. Employees said they came to the district to hone their skills and the tuition reimbursement program helped them to get additional training and degrees that they would never have been able to accomplish without the GRPS assistance.
- On the downside, some supervisory level employees said that they felt that the tuition reimbursement program contributed to the fact that GRPS was a training ground for area employers—employees come to GRPS, get their education paid for and then leave for higher paying jobs elsewhere.
- The rollover and eventual loss of accumulated vacation leave was a major issue of concern for many employees. Many said that the workload makes it nearly impossible to use the accumulated vacation leave, and unlike personal leave that rolls over to sick leave, they lose the time if it is not used. Employees stated that allowing vacation to roll into sick leave would make the fact that they are working so hard more tolerable. Some voiced concern that executive-level administrators could cash out their vacation at the end of the year—having the lower-level employee's vacation roll into sick leave seemed fair.
- Employees who receive an annual stipend for cell phone use and/or mileage said the amount was cut in half last year with no consideration for the actual amount of mileage driven for work or the cost or percentage of time that their cell phone was being used. Some employees are reimbursed for mileage based on miles driven, but maintaining all the records is time-consuming.
- GRPS pays an annuity into a separate retirement account on behalf of executive-level positions. Employees said that, in some instances, the amount contributed by GRPS is \$10,000 or more lower than amounts contributed by other school districts in the area for similar positions. Further, it is their understanding that some schools in the area are making similar contributions for lower-level management positions as well. Ensuring the total compensation package for GRPS is competitive is critical to retaining highly qualified leadership.
- Employees expressed concern that, although longevity pay was grandfathered for those already eligible, any increases for employees moving from one level to the next were withheld this year. The Board promised that for those that were eligible, their increase would be restored next year, but many were skeptical that this would actually happen.



2.4 SUMMARY

Employee feedback reported above represents both common issues that exist in many organizations as well as issues that are unique to GRPS. Employees believe that GRPS is a good place to work—attributed to the hometown atmosphere and the overall comradery among employees. However, as with any organization, employees perceive weaknesses in certain areas related to the current compensation, classification, and benefit systems and the need to address these concerns.



Chapter 3 – Assessment of Current Conditions

Chapter 3 provides an overall assessment of the compensation system in place for non-exempt support and non-bargaining exempt employees at Grand Rapids Public Schools. Data included here reflect the demographics in place at the time of the study and should be considered a snapshot in time. The data provide the baseline for analysis throughout the course of this study, but are not sufficient cause for recommendations in isolation. By conducting this review, Evergreen gained a better understanding of the structure and associated salary practices in place and identified issues for both further review and potential revision.

3.1 ANALYSIS OF PAY PLANS

Included in this study are the three pay plans that the District administers for the two employee groups included in the study—non-exempt support staff and non-bargaining exempt. **Exhibits 3A through 3F** provide details related to the value of each pay plan’s pay ranges at the minimum, the midpoint, and the maximum; the range spread for each (the distance between the pay range minimum and maximum) the number of filled position titles in each grade; and the number of employees in each pay grade.

Exhibit 3A displays the step plan administered for 72 regular non-exempt support employees. As shown, the plan features 15 pay grades, with anywhere from one to seven steps in each range. Range spreads are inconsistent and range from 5.4 to 47.6 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3A
NON-EXEMPT SUPPORT STEP PLAN**

Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
H606	\$16.61	-	-	-	-	-	-
H607	\$28.65	-	-	-	-	-	-
H608	\$26.04	-	-	-	-	-	-
H609	\$22.67	-	-	-	-	-	-
H613	\$30.36	\$41.13	-	-	-	-	-
H614	\$25.89	-	-	-	-	-	-
H615	\$17.79	\$18.03	\$21.06	\$26.25	-	-	-
H621	\$16.55	\$16.80	\$17.06	\$17.37	\$17.67	\$17.96	\$23.24
H622	\$21.03	\$21.69	\$22.89	\$23.57	\$24.37	\$25.04	-
H630	\$26.65	\$27.59	\$28.53	\$29.46	\$30.95	\$31.99	-
H641	\$20.26	\$20.51	\$20.81	\$21.07	\$21.37	\$21.67	-
H643	\$26.26	\$26.53	\$26.79	\$27.08	\$27.36	\$27.68	-
H644	\$23.69	\$23.95	\$24.24	\$24.50	\$24.80	\$25.10	-
H646	\$29.37	\$29.93	\$30.53	\$31.11	\$31.71	\$32.29	-
H649	\$21.93	-	-	-	-	-	-



**EXHIBIT 3B
SUMMARIZED NON-EXEMPT SUPPORT PAY PLAN**

Grade	Minimum	Calculated Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	# of Filled Position Titles	Employees
H606	\$16.61	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3
H607	\$28.65	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2
H608	\$26.04	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	3
H609	\$22.67	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1
H613	\$30.36	\$35.75	\$41.13	35.5%	2	2
H614	\$25.89	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1
H615	\$17.79	\$22.02	\$26.25	47.6%	5	39
H621	\$16.55	\$19.90	\$23.24	40.4%	3	3
H622	\$21.03	\$23.04	\$25.04	19.1%	3	3
H630	\$26.65	\$29.32	\$31.99	20.0%	0	0
H641	\$20.26	\$20.97	\$21.67	7.0%	2	2
H643	\$26.26	\$26.97	\$27.68	5.4%	4	5
H644	\$23.69	\$24.40	\$25.10	6.0%	2	4
H646	\$29.37	\$30.83	\$32.29	9.9%	3	4
H649	\$21.93	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0
Overall				21.2%	32	72

As shown in **Exhibit 3C**, the District administers a second plan for public safety and security (PSS) (security staff) employees. This employee subgroup was previously its own bargaining unit. Upon transitioning to non-bargaining status and joining the non-exempt support employee group, the District has maintained this group in a separate pay plan. The plan features ten grades, each with eight steps. The plan is summarized in **Exhibit 3D** and shows that range spreads are constant at 36.7 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3C
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY (PSS) STEP PLAN**

Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
H702	\$17.41	\$17.93	\$18.64	\$19.58	\$20.55	\$21.59	\$22.66	\$23.79
H703	\$23.13	\$23.83	\$24.78	\$26.02	\$27.32	\$28.69	\$30.13	\$31.64
H711	\$23.52	\$24.23	\$25.20	\$26.45	\$27.78	\$29.17	\$30.62	\$32.15
H712	\$20.01	\$20.60	\$21.43	\$22.51	\$23.63	\$24.81	\$26.05	\$27.35
H713	\$21.41	\$22.05	\$22.93	\$24.09	\$25.29	\$26.55	\$27.88	\$29.27
H714	\$17.57	\$18.09	\$18.81	\$19.75	\$20.75	\$21.78	\$22.87	\$24.01
H715	\$20.56	\$21.18	\$22.03	\$23.13	\$24.29	\$25.50	\$26.78	\$28.11
H716	\$30.32	\$31.23	\$32.49	\$34.10	\$35.81	\$37.61	\$39.49	\$41.46
H717	\$19.26	\$19.84	\$20.63	\$21.67	\$22.75	\$23.88	\$25.08	\$26.33
H718	\$22.74	\$23.43	\$24.36	\$25.58	\$26.86	\$28.20	\$29.61	\$31.09



**EXHIBIT 3D
SUMMARIZED PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY (PSS) PAY PLAN**

Grade	Minimum	Calculated Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	# of Filled Position Titles	Employees
H702	\$17.41	\$20.60	\$23.79	36.7%	1	16
H703	\$23.13	\$27.39	\$31.64	36.7%	0	0
H711	\$23.52	\$27.84	\$32.15	36.7%	1	2
H712	\$20.01	\$23.68	\$27.35	36.7%	1	5
H713	\$21.41	\$25.34	\$29.27	36.7%	1	5
H714	\$17.57	\$20.79	\$24.01	36.7%	1	1
H715	\$20.56	\$24.34	\$28.11	36.7%	0	0
H716	\$30.32	\$35.89	\$41.46	36.7%	1	1
H717	\$19.26	\$22.80	\$26.33	36.7%	0	0
H718	\$22.74	\$26.92	\$31.09	36.7%	0	0
Overall				36.7%	6	30

Exhibit 3E displays the step plan for 85 exempt employees. As shown, the plan features 28 pay grades, each with four steps; in the vast majority of ranges, increases between steps are a constant 6.5 percent. For each range, there are four additional longevity steps that add a flat dollar amount to the employee's base salary:

- **L1** - \$792 for employees with eight to 11 years of service;
- **L2** - \$1,622 for employees with 12 to 15 years of service;
- **L3** - \$2,379 for employees with 16 to 19 years of service;
- **L4** - \$2,689 for employees with 20 to 23 years of service; and
- **L5** - \$3,010 for employees with 24 or more years of service.

The plan is summarized in **Exhibit 3F** (includes longevity) and shows that range spreads vary slightly from 20.9 to 27.7 percent, with an average of 24.8 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3E
EXEMPT STEP PLAN**

Grade	1	2	3	4
4008	\$55,859.00	\$59,491.00	\$63,358.00	\$67,476.00
4009	\$63,358.00	\$67,477.00	\$71,863.00	\$76,534.00
4010	\$69,055.00	\$73,545.00	\$78,325.00	\$83,416.00
4111	\$78,580.00	\$82,344.00	\$87,697.00	\$92,491.00
4112	\$71,182.00	\$75,672.00	\$80,452.00	\$85,543.00
4206	\$52,064.00	\$55,447.00	\$59,052.00	\$62,890.00
4211	\$78,382.00	\$83,477.00	\$88,903.00	\$94,683.00
4212	\$77,315.00	\$82,339.00	\$87,693.00	\$93,392.00
4309	\$66,941.00	\$71,292.00	\$75,926.00	\$80,861.00
4311	\$82,304.00	\$86,247.00	\$91,855.00	\$96,874.00
4409	\$66,355.00	\$70,668.00	\$75,262.00	\$80,153.00
4410	\$69,689.00	\$74,219.00	\$79,042.00	\$84,181.00
4411	\$82,011.00	\$87,342.00	\$93,020.00	\$99,067.00
4511	\$84,551.00	\$90,048.00	\$95,901.00	\$102,133.00
4809	\$73,672.00	\$78,460.00	\$83,561.00	\$88,992.00
4810	\$75,855.00	\$80,787.00	\$86,037.00	\$91,630.00



**EXHIBIT 3E (Continued)
EXEMPT STEP PLAN**

Grade	1	2	3	4
4811	\$79,230.00	\$84,380.00	\$89,865.00	\$95,706.00
5202	\$43,701.00	\$46,542.00	\$49,567.00	\$52,787.00
5203	\$46,467.00	\$49,488.00	\$52,704.00	\$56,130.00
5204	\$55,869.00	\$59,504.00	\$63,369.00	\$67,488.00
5206	\$64,168.00	\$68,339.00	\$72,781.00	\$77,512.00
5207	\$69,147.00	\$73,642.00	\$78,429.00	\$83,525.00
5208	\$72,189.00	\$76,882.00	\$81,879.00	\$87,201.00
5209	\$78,163.00	\$83,244.00	\$88,656.00	\$94,418.00
5210	\$82,091.00	\$87,426.00	\$93,110.00	\$99,163.00
5211	\$85,742.00	\$91,317.00	\$97,251.00	\$103,572.00
5212	\$93,349.00	\$97,821.00	\$104,179.00	\$109,873.00
5213	\$87,847.00	\$93,422.00	\$99,356.00	\$105,678.00

**EXHIBIT 3F
SUMMARIZED EXEMPT PAY PLAN**

Grade	Minimum	Calculated Midpoint	Maximum	Range Spread	# of Filled Position Titles	Employees
4008	\$55,859.00	\$63,172.50	\$70,486.00	26.2%	1	1
4009	\$63,358.00	\$71,451.00	\$79,544.00	25.5%	5	12
4010	\$69,055.00	\$77,740.50	\$86,426.00	25.2%	4	19
4111	\$78,580.00	\$87,040.50	\$95,501.00	21.5%	1	15
4112	\$71,182.00	\$79,867.50	\$88,553.00	24.4%	2	8
4206	\$52,064.00	\$58,982.00	\$65,900.00	26.6%	0	0
4211	\$78,382.00	\$88,037.50	\$97,693.00	24.6%	0	0
4212	\$77,315.00	\$86,858.50	\$96,402.00	24.7%	0	0
4309	\$66,941.00	\$75,406.00	\$83,871.00	25.3%	0	0
4311	\$82,304.00	\$91,094.00	\$99,884.00	21.4%	4	18
4409	\$66,355.00	\$74,759.00	\$83,163.00	25.3%	0	0
4410	\$69,689.00	\$78,440.00	\$87,191.00	25.1%	0	0
4411	\$82,011.00	\$92,044.00	\$102,077.00	24.5%	0	0
4511	\$84,551.00	\$94,847.00	\$105,143.00	24.4%	0	0
4809	\$73,672.00	\$82,837.00	\$92,002.00	24.9%	2	3
4810	\$75,855.00	\$85,247.50	\$94,640.00	24.8%	0	0
4811	\$79,230.00	\$88,973.00	\$98,716.00	24.6%	0	0
5202	\$43,701.00	\$49,749.00	\$55,797.00	27.7%	0	0
5203	\$46,467.00	\$52,803.50	\$59,140.00	27.3%	1	1
5204	\$55,869.00	\$63,183.50	\$70,498.00	26.2%	11	16
5206	\$64,168.00	\$72,345.00	\$80,522.00	25.5%	8	15
5207	\$69,147.00	\$77,841.00	\$86,535.00	25.1%	3	4
5208	\$72,189.00	\$81,200.00	\$90,211.00	25.0%	4	6
5209	\$78,163.00	\$87,795.50	\$97,428.00	24.6%	9	13
5210	\$82,091.00	\$92,132.00	\$102,173.00	24.5%	5	12
5211	\$85,742.00	\$96,162.00	\$106,582.00	24.3%	2	3
5212	\$93,349.00	\$103,116.00	\$112,883.00	20.9%	2	10
5213	\$87,847.00	\$98,267.50	\$108,688.00	23.7%	5	5
Overall				24.8%	50	85



Exhibit 3G shows that the District utilizes 102 unique classification titles for these group of employees.

EXHIBIT 3G CLASSIFICATIONS

Classification Title	Classification Title
Admission Specialist	Challenge Scholars College and Career Coordinator
Assessment and Evaluation Specialist	Coordinator of Special Program and Population
Assistant Legal and Employee Relations Manager	Counselor Coordinator
Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources	Curriculum Specialist
Athletic Director	Curriculum Supervisor
Attendance Outreach Specialist	Director - Business Office
Behavior Specialist	Director - Community and Student Services
Behavior Support Consultant	Director - Curriculum
Behavioral Health Supervisor	Director - Early Childhood
Benefit Coordinator	Director - Fine Arts and Shared Time
Director - Food and Nutrition	Migrant Recruiter and EI
Director - HBCU	MIS Coordinator
Director - Human Resources and Labor Relations	Multimedia Designer
Director - Nursing Services	Native American
Director - OEL	Network and System Administrator
Director - Payroll and Retirement	Network and System Technician
Director - Professional Development	Office of Extended Learning Program Coordinator
Director - Purchasing	Operations Coordinator
Director - Special Education	Parent Liaison
Director - Student Data Services	Payroll Coordinator
District EL Coordinator	PC and Network Technician
Elementary and Middle School Assistant Principal	PC Asset Recovery
Executive Assistant	Post Graduate Success Coordinator
Executive Assistant to Superintendent	Project Coordinator
Extended Day Title I Academic Coordinator	Project Coordinator-PI
Facilities, Planning, and Management Director	Project Coordinator-Pd
Family and Community Engagement Coordinator	Public Safety Communication Specialist (Dispatcher)
Family and Community Engagement Supervisor	Public Safety Lieutenant (H716)
Financial Services Specialist	Public Safety Officer (H712)
Fine Arts Coordinator	Public Safety Officer (H717)
General Counsel	Public Safety Sergeant (H711)
Grand Rapids Museum Assistant Principal	Public Safety Sergeant (H718)
Grant Specialist Assessment and Evaluation	School Improvement Facilitator
GRASP Coordinator	Security Officer (H702)
Hearing Officer	Security Officer (H714)
Help Desk Tech	Security Sergeant (H713)
High School Assistant Principal	Security Sergeant (H715)
High School Dean of Students	Shared Time Principal
High School Principals	Special Education Supervisor
Home School	Staffing Coordinator
Human Resources Generalist	Student Accountability Deans
IB Coordinator	Student Data Quality and Research Manager
In-House Specialist	Supervisor of Food and Nutrition
K-5 Elementary Principal	Supervisor of HVAC, Electricity, and Plumbing
K-8 and Middle School Principal	Supervisor of Maintenance
Learning Experience Coordinator	Systems Analyst
Library	Talent Coordinators
Loop Site Coordinator	Tech Training Facilitator
Manager Software Architect	Training and Compliance Sergeant (H703)
Middle School Athletic Coordinator	Video Technician
Middle School Dean of Students	Webmaster



3.2 SALARY PLACEMENT ANALYSIS

When assessing the effectiveness of a pay plan and associated policies, it is helpful to analyze where employee salaries stand in comparison to their classification’s pay range. Identifying areas where there are clusters of employee salaries can illuminate potential pay progression concerns within a pay plan. It should be noted that employee salaries, and the progression of the same, is associated with an organization’s compensation philosophy—specifically, the method of salary progression and the availability of resources. Therefore, the placement of employee salaries should be viewed with this context in mind.

Below or At Minimum and At or Above Maximum

In general, the placement of an employee’s salary at a classification’s pay range minimum would generally indicate a newer employee or an employee that was recently promoted into a classification who has not had the opportunity or experience needed to progress through the range. In contrast, an employee with a salary at or near the maximum of their pay range is generally an employee with longer tenure who has had the opportunity, experience, and/or performance to progress their salary toward the top of the pay range.

Exhibits 3H through 3J display the percentage of employees whose salaries are at or below their respective pay range minimum and at or above the pay range maximum of their respective pay range maximum for non-exempt support, public safety and security (PSS) employees, and exempt employees, respectively. Employees not included in these charts are compensated somewhere between the upper and lower thresholds. The percentages presented are based on the total number of employees in that pay grade.

As shown in Exhibit 3H, no non-exempt support staff have salaries below their respective pay range minimum, seven (11.7 percent) have salaries at the minimum, eight (13.3 percent) have salaries at the maximum and none have salaries above the maximum.

**EXHIBIT 3H
BELOW OR AT MINIMUM AND AT OR ABOVE MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE
NON-EXEMPT SUPPORT**

Grade	Employees	Below Min		At Min		At Max		Above Max	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
H615	39	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	10.3%	0	0.0%
H621	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%
H622	3	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H641	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
H643	5	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H644	4	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H646	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
Overall	60	0	0.0%	7	11.7%	8	13.3%	0	0.0%

Exhibit 3I shows that no public safety and security (PSS) employees had a salary below their respective pay range minimum, and 16 (53.3 percent) had salaries at the minimum, and none have salaries at or above the maximum.

**EXHIBIT 3I
BELOW OR AT MINIMUM AND AT OR ABOVE MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY (PSS) EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	Below Min		At Min		At Max		Above Max	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
H702	16	0	0.0%	12	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H711	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H712	5	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H713	5	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H714	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H716	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Overall	30	0	0.0%	16	53.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

As displayed in Exhibit 3J, no exempt employees have salaries below their respective pay range minimum, 49 (30.4 percent) have salaries at the minimum, ten (6.2 percent) have salaries at the maximum, and none have salaries above the maximum.

**EXHIBIT 3J
BELOW OR AT MINIMUM AND AT OR ABOVE MAXIMUM BY PAY GRADE
EXEMPT EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	Below Min		At Min		At Max		Above Max	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
4008	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4009	12	0	0.0%	8	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4010	19	0	0.0%	6	31.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4111	15	0	0.0%	8	53.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4112	8	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4311	18	0	0.0%	4	22.2%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%
4809	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5203	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5204	15	0	0.0%	6	40.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%
5206	15	0	0.0%	5	33.3%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%
5207	4	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
5208	6	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5209	13	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	23.1%	0	0.0%
5210	13	0	0.0%	5	38.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5211	3	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5212	10	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%
5213	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%
Overall	161	0	0.0%	49	30.4%	10	6.2%	0	0.0%

Below and Above Midpoint

In addition to assessing the number of employee salaries at minimum and maximum, an analysis was conducted to determine the number of employees with salaries below and above pay range midpoint. Employees with salaries close to the midpoint of a pay range typically would be fully proficient in their classification and require minimal supervision to complete their job duties while performing satisfactorily. Within this framework, pay range midpoint is commonly considered to be the salary an individual could reasonably expect for similar work in the market. Therefore, it is important to examine the percentage and number of employees with salaries above and below the calculated midpoint.

Exhibits 3K through 3M display the percentage of employees whose salaries are below or above their respective pay range midpoint for non-exempt support, public safety and security (PSS) employees, and exempt employees, respectively. The percentages presented are based on the total number of employees in that pay grade.

As can be seen in **Exhibit 3K**, 47 (78.3 percent) non-exempt support staff are compensated below their pay range midpoint and 13 (21.7 percent) are compensated above.

**EXHIBIT 3K
BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE
NON-EXEMPT SUPPORT**

Grade	Employees	< Mid		> Mid	
		#	%	#	%
H615	39	35	89.7%	4	10.3%
H621	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
H622	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
H641	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
H643	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
H644	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%
H646	4	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Overall	60	47	78.3%	13	21.7%

Exhibit 3L shows that 21 (70.0 percent) public safety and security (PSS) employees are compensated below their pay range midpoint and nine (30.0 percent) are compensated above.

**EXHIBIT 3L
BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY (PSS) EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	Below Min		At Min	
		#	%	#	%
H702	16	13	81.3%	3	18.8%
H711	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%
H712	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
H713	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
H714	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
H716	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Overall	30	21	70.0%	9	30.0%

As displayed in Exhibit 3M, 110 (68.3 percent) exempt employees are compensated below their pay range midpoint and 51 (31.7 percent) are compensated above.

**EXHIBIT 3M
BELOW AND ABOVE MIDPOINT BY PAY GRADE
EXEMPT EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	Below Min		At Min	
		#	%	#	%
4008	1	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
4009	12	12	100.0%	0	0.0%
4010	19	16	84.2%	3	15.8%
4111	15	15	100.0%	0	0.0%
4112	8	6	75.0%	2	25.0%
4311	18	14	77.8%	4	22.2%
4809	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%
5203	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
5204	15	11	73.3%	4	26.7%
5206	15	9	60.0%	6	40.0%
5207	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%
5208	6	4	66.7%	2	33.3%
5209	13	4	30.8%	9	69.2%
5210	13	7	53.8%	6	46.2%
5211	3	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
5212	10	5	50.0%	5	50.0%
5213	5	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Overall	161	110	68.3%	51	31.7%

3.3 QUARTILE ANALYSIS

In a quartile analysis, each pay range is divided into four equal segments (quartiles) and employees are assigned a quartile based on where their current salary falls. While there is no best practice for what average tenure should be for each quartile, and other factors outside of the breadth of this analysis can impact placement (e.g. promotional and hiring practices), this analysis is useful in revealing areas of compression within a compensation system when paired with tenure data. Generally, a strong correlation between tenure and quartile is desired, where higher tenure would be experienced in higher quartiles.

Exhibits 3N through 3P show the number of employee salaries that are in each quartile of each pay range for non-exempt support, public safety and security (PSS) employees, and exempt employees, respectively. Also, the average overall tenure (i.e. how long an employee has been at the District) by quartile is shown.

Exhibit 3N shows that 15.0 percent of non-exempt support staff have salaries in the first quartile of their respective range, 63.3 percent have salaries in the second quartile, 5.0 percent have salaries in the third quartile, and 16.7 percent have salaries in the fourth quartile. Additionally, tenure is inconsistent through the quartiles: average tenure in the first quartile is 8.8 years, decreases to 8.5 years in the second quartile, increases to 26.5 years in the third quartile, and decreases to 11.0 years in the fourth quartile.

As shown in **Exhibit 30**, 63.3 percent of public safety and security (PSS) employees have salaries in the first quartile of their respective pay range, 6.7 percent have salaries in the second quartile, 26.7 percent have salaries in the third quartile, and 3.3 percent have salaries in the fourth quartile. Additionally, tenure is inconsistent through the quartiles: average tenure in the first quartile is 7.0 years, increases to 24.8 years in the second quartile, decreases to 24.1 years in the third quartile, and decreases to 6.1 years in the fourth quartile.

Exhibit 3P displays the quartile analysis for exempt employees and indicates that 55.3 percent have salaries in the first quartile of their respective pay range, 13.0 percent have salaries in the second quartile, 14.9 percent have salaries in the third quartile, and 16.8 percent have salaries in the fourth quartile. Additionally, tenure steadily increases through the quartiles: average tenure in the first quartile is 10.0 years, increases to 17.1 years in the second quartile, increases to 18.0 years in the third quartile, and increases to 23.6 years in the fourth quartile.



**EXHIBIT 3N
QUARTILE ANALYSIS
NON-EXEMPT SUPPORT**

Grade	Employees	Avg. Tenure	1st Quartile			2nd Quartile			3rd Quartile			4th Quartile		
			#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure
H615	39	9.2	0	0.0%	N/A	35	89.7%	8.3	0	0.0%	N/A	4	10.3%	17.7
H621	3	4.1	1	33.3%	2.3	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	2	66.7%	5.1
H622	3	17.0	2	66.7%	11.3	1	33.3%	28.3	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
H641	2	2.4	0	0.0%	N/A	1	50.0%	0.4	0	0.0%	N/A	1	50.0%	4.4
H643	5	8.6	2	40.0%	7.1	1	20.0%	4.7	0	0.0%	N/A	2	40.0%	11.9
H644	4	10.3	4	100.0%	10.3	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
H646	4	22.0	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	3	75.0%	26.5	1	25.0%	8.4
Overall	60	10.1	9	15.0%	8.8	38	63.3%	8.5	3	5.0%	26.5	10	16.7%	11.0

**EXHIBIT 3O
QUARTILE ANALYSIS
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY (PSS) EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	Avg. Tenure	1st Quartile			2nd Quartile			3rd Quartile			4th Quartile		
			#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure
H702	16	6.6	13	81.3%	3.7	0	0.0%	N/A	3	18.8%	19.1	0	0.0%	N/A
H711	2	28.1	0	0.0%	N/A	1	50.0%	33.8	1	50.0%	22.3	0	0.0%	N/A
H712	5	13.3	2	40.0%	3.0	1	20.0%	15.8	2	40.0%	22.4	0	0.0%	N/A
H713	5	22.3	3	60.0%	14.4	0	0.0%	N/A	2	40.0%	34.3	0	0.0%	N/A
H714	1	6.1	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	1	100.0%	6.1
H716	1	34.8	1	100.0%	34.8	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
Overall	30	12.7	19	63.3%	7.0	2	6.7%	24.8	8	26.7%	24.1	1	3.3%	6.1

**EXHIBIT 3P
QUARTILE ANALYSIS
EXEMPT**

Grade	Employees	Avg. Tenure	1st Quartile			2nd Quartile			3rd Quartile			4th Quartile		
			#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure	#	%	Avg. Tenure
4008	1	5.9	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	1	100.0%	5.9	0	0.0%	N/A
4009	12	7.1	12	100.0%	7.1	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
4010	19	13.2	14	73.7%	11.3	2	10.5%	19.2	2	10.5%	19.4	1	5.3%	14.7
4111	15	14.5	12	80.0%	12.2	3	20.0%	23.7	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
4112	8	11.3	5	62.5%	10.1	1	12.5%	13.5	2	25.0%	13.2	0	0.0%	N/A
4311	18	15.6	11	61.1%	10.7	3	16.7%	19.1	1	5.6%	25.8	3	16.7%	26.6
4809	3	18.4	1	33.3%	17.6	2	66.7%	18.8	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
5203	1	0.4	1	100.0%	0.4	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A
5204	15	11.8	11	73.3%	9.9	0	0.0%	N/A	3	20.0%	13.1	1	6.7%	28.7
5206	15	14.7	7	46.7%	11.5	2	13.3%	3.9	4	26.7%	18.6	2	13.3%	29.1
5207	4	21.6	2	50.0%	8.4	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	2	50.0%	34.8
5208	6	11.7	2	33.3%	3.3	2	33.3%	18.3	1	16.7%	16.6	1	16.7%	10.8
5209	13	21.0	1	7.7%	24.6	3	23.1%	12.3	2	15.4%	27.4	7	53.8%	22.4
5210	13	12.9	6	46.2%	7.5	1	7.7%	29.7	2	15.4%	4.6	4	30.8%	20.8
5211	3	25.5	1	33.3%	1.7	0	0.0%	N/A	2	66.7%	37.3	0	0.0%	N/A
5212	10	16.6	3	30.0%	10.3	2	20.0%	14.7	3	30.0%	16.9	2	20.0%	27.3
5213	5	18.9	0	0.0%	N/A	0	0.0%	N/A	1	20.0%	14.6	4	80.0%	19.9
Overall	161	14.4	89	55.3%	10.0	21	13.0%	17.1	24	14.9%	18.0	27	16.8%	23.6



3.4 COMPRESSION ANALYSIS

Comparison with Supervisor Salaries

Compression (when pay differentials are too small to be considered equitable) can be seen as a threat to internal equity and morale. One common form of pay compression can be defined as the lack of variation in salaries between employees with significantly different levels of experience and responsibility. An example of this can be observed when the pay of supervisors and their subordinates are too similar. The following analysis attempts to determine if such compression can be observed in the District.

Employee salary data were utilized to determine if the employee’s salary was either less than 80 percent, less than 95 percent, or more than 95 percent of their supervisor’s salary. **Exhibits 3Q through 3S** display the results of this analysis for non-exempt support, public safety and security (PSS) employees, and exempt employees, respectively. The percentages presented are based on the total number of employees in that pay grade.

Exhibit 3Q shows that 56 (93.3 percent) non-exempt support staff have salaries that fall below 80 percent of their supervisor’s salary, three (5.0 percent) have salaries that fall below 95 percent, and one (1.7 percent) has a salary above 95 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3Q
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE
NON-EXEMPT SUPPORT**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
H615	39	39	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H621	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H622	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H641	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H643	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
H644	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H646	4	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%
Overall	60	56	93.3%	3	5.0%	1	1.7%

As shown in **Exhibit 3R**, all 30 public safety and security (PSS) employees have salaries less than 80 percent of their respective supervisor’s salary, with none less than or more than 95 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3R
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY (PSS) EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
H702	16	16	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H711	2	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H712	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H713	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H714	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H716	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Overall	30	30	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Exhibit 3S shows that 130 (80.7 percent) exempt employees have salaries that are less than 80 percent of their respective supervisor’s salary, 25 (15.5 percent) have salaries less than 95 percent, and six (3.7 percent) have salaries above 95 percent.

**EXHIBIT 3S
EMPLOYEE TO SUPERVISOR SALARY RATIO BY PAY GRADE
EXEMPT EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< 80%		< 95%		> 95%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
4008	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4009	12	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4010	19	19	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4111	15	15	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4112	8	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4311	18	14	77.8%	4	22.2%	0	0.0%
4809	3	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5203	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5204	15	15	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5206	15	14	93.3%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%
5207	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
5208	6	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5209	13	4	30.8%	7	53.8%	2	15.4%
5210	13	9	69.2%	3	23.1%	1	7.7%
5211	3	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%
5212	10	2	20.0%	6	60.0%	2	20.0%
5213	5	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%
Overall	161	130	80.7%	25	15.5%	6	3.7%

Actual Versus Expected Salary Placement

Another form of pay compression can occur when employees have not progressed through their pay range as their years of experience increase. The following analysis examines how far employees has penetrated into their current pay range and compares it with their expected placement—assuming a 30-year period between minimum and maximum. Generally, the only source of concern would be employees that are more than ten percent below expected

placement. Simply having employees in this group does not necessarily mean there are corresponding compression issues, assuming there is a reason for these placements. It is also acknowledged that the District’s compensation practices may differ from progressing employee salaries based upon tenure.

Exhibits 3T through 3V display the number and percentage of employees whose actual salary placement varies from their expected placement for non-exempt support, public safety and security (PSS) employees, and public safety and security (PSS) employees, respectively. **Note:** This analysis considers an employee years of service in their current classification, unlike the quartile analysis, which considers overall years of experience.

As can be seen in Exhibit 3T, 27 (45.0 percent) non-exempt support have salaries that are within ten percent of their expected salary placement, whereas 33 (55.0 percent) have salaries that are more than ten percent above.

**EXHIBIT 3T
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT BY PAY GRADE
NON-EXEMPT SUPPORT**

Grade	Employees	< -10%		0 to -10%		0 to 10%		> 10%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
H615	39	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	7	17.9%	31	79.5%
H621	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%
H622	3	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
H641	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%
H643	5	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%
H644	4	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H646	4	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%
Overall	60	0	0.0%	10	16.7%	17	28.3%	33	55.0%

Exhibit 3U shows that 27 (90.0 percent) public safety and security (PSS) employees have salaries that are within ten percent of their expected placement within their respective pay ranges, while two (6.7 percent) have salaries more than ten percent below and one (3.3 percent) has a salary more than ten percent above.

**EXHIBIT 3U
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT BY PAY GRADE
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY (PSS) EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< -10%		0 to -10%		0 to 10%		> 10%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
H702	16	0	0.0%	14	87.5%	2	12.5%	0	0.0%
H711	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H712	5	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%
H713	5	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
H714	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
H716	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Overall	30	2	6.7%	24	80.0%	3	10.0%	1	3.3%

As can be seen in **Exhibit 3V**, 140 (87.0 percent) exempt employees have salaries that are within ten percent of their expected salary placement, whereas 21 (13.0 percent) have salaries that are more than ten percent above.

**EXHIBIT 3V
ACTUAL VERSUS EXPECTED PLACEMENT BY PAY GRADE
EXEMPT EMPLOYEES**

Grade	Employees	< -10%		0 to -10%		0 to 10%		> 10%	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
4008	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
4009	12	0	0.0%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4010	19	0	0.0%	14	73.7%	4	21.1%	1	5.3%
4111	15	0	0.0%	11	73.3%	4	26.7%	0	0.0%
4112	8	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%
4311	18	0	0.0%	8	44.4%	7	38.9%	3	16.7%
4809	3	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5203	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
5204	15	0	0.0%	9	60.0%	3	20.0%	3	20.0%
5206	15	0	0.0%	7	46.7%	8	53.3%	0	0.0%
5207	4	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%
5208	6	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	3	50.0%	1	16.7%
5209	13	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	61.5%	5	38.5%
5210	13	0	0.0%	7	53.8%	2	15.4%	4	30.8%
5211	3	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5212	10	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	7	70.0%	1	10.0%
5213	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
Overall	161	0	0.0%	84	52.2%	56	34.8%	21	13.0%

3.5 DEPARTMENT/LOCATION DISTRIBUTION

This limited study includes 278 employees (as of May 2021) employed across 46 different departments and locations. The following analysis was intended to provide basic information regarding how employees are distributed among departments and locations.

Exhibit 3W depicts the number of classifications that are present in each department or location, along with the number and overall percentage of total employees by department or location. As illustrated, the largest department or location (in terms of employees) is Franklin Campus, with 132 employees.

EXHIBIT 3W
EMPLOYEES AND CLASSIFICATIONS BY DEPARTMENT AND LOCATION

Department/Location	Employees	Classifications	% of Total
Aberdeen Academy	1	1	0.4%
Alger Middle	9	6	3.2%
Brookside Elementary	1	1	0.4%
Buchanan Elementary	2	2	0.7%
Burton Elementary	3	3	1.1%
Burton Middle	4	4	1.4%
CA Frost Environmental	3	3	1.1%
CA Frost Middle/High	3	3	1.1%
Campus Elementary	4	4	1.4%
Cesar E Chavez Elementary	3	3	1.1%
City High/Middle	5	5	1.8%
Coit Academy of Arts and Science	3	3	1.1%
Congress Elementary	1	1	0.4%
Dickinson Elementary	2	2	0.7%
East Leonard Elementary	1	1	0.4%
Facilities Planning and Management	5	5	1.8%
Food and Nutrition	4	2	1.4%
Franklin Campus	132	68	47.5%
Gerald R Ford Academy	1	1	0.4%
GR Montessori Academy	4	4	1.4%
GR Public Museum High School	3	3	1.1%
GR University Prep Academy	7	5	2.5%
Grand Rapids Learning Center	2	2	0.7%
Grand Rapids Public Schools University	1	1	0.4%
Grasp	1	1	0.4%
Harrison Park	4	4	1.4%
Innovation Central High School	8	6	2.9%
Kenosha Park Elementary	1	1	0.4%
Kent Hills Elementary	1	1	0.4%
Martin Luther King Jr Leadership Academy	4	4	1.4%
Mulick Park	1	1	0.4%
North Park Montessori	2	2	0.7%
Ottawa Hills High School	8	7	2.9%
Palmer Elementary	1	1	0.4%
Ridgemoor Park Montessori	1	1	0.4%
Riverside Middle	2	2	0.7%
SECP Student Success Center	1	1	0.4%
Shawmut Hills Elementary	2	2	0.7%
Sherwood Park	3	3	1.1%
Sibley Elementary	2	2	0.7%
Sigsbee Park Elementary	10	5	3.6%
Southwest Community Campus	3	3	1.1%
Stocking Elementary	1	1	0.4%
Straight Elementary	4	2	1.4%
Union High	9	7	3.2%
Westwood Middle	5	5	1.8%
Overall	278	177*	100.0%

* The District utilizes 102 unique classification titles. The total displayed here differs due to duplicate classifications across departments, as well as vacant positions.



3.6 SUMMARY

The information contained in this chapter identifies features of the overall structure of the compensation system, as well as the administration of it at the individual employee level. Notably, the following was found:

- **Pay Plans** – The compensation structure utilized by the District is somewhat disorganized: the non-exempt support step plan features varying number of steps among its ranges and the other step plans feature inconsistent range spreads. Best practice suggests having a structure with more uniformity.
- **Salary Distribution** – There is a clustering of salaries below their respective pay range midpoints (70 percent overall). This is particularly pronounced among public safety and security (PSS) and exempt employees, each with more than half of employee salaries in the first quartile alone. However, almost no employees (only two) were found to have salaries more than ten percent below expected placement.

This analysis serves as a starting point for the development of recommendations in this report. These observations were reviewed and considered in more detail throughout the course of the study. Paired with market data, Evergreen was able to make recommendations that will ensure that the compensation system at the District is structurally sound, competitive with the market, and equitable.



Chapter 4 – Salary Survey Summary

Chapter 4 focuses on the external salary survey conducted by Evergreen. Conducting a salary comparison analysis such as this determines the relative competitive market position of the District's compensation system. This was accomplished by examining the pay ranges of peers in the respective labor market. Data collected were used to analyze overall market competitiveness, as well as to develop compensation recommendations that will assist in recruiting and retaining talented employees. This was not used for evaluating salaries at the individual level—as individual pay is determined through a combination of factors, which can include demand for the type of job, prior related experience, a candidate's negotiation skills, and budgetary concerns.

Salary comparisons should be considered a snapshot of current market conditions, as the data collected are reflective of market information at the time of the study. Market conditions can change quickly and surveys should be completed at regular intervals to ensure the District's compensation structure remains up to date with the current market.

4.1 SURVEY DATA SOURCES

Evergreen collected pay range information from target organizations in the District's competitive market using a customized market survey tool. Each benchmarked classification title, a description of assigned duties, and the education and experience requirements were provided to the peers in the survey tool. Peers were asked to provide the classification title in their organization that best matched the given essential job functions and education/experience requirements of each benchmarked title; Evergreen's goal was to ensure at least a 70 percent match of responsibilities.

Data were collected from organizations that were selected based on several factors including similar service offerings and location. Salary data were obtained from 26 peers, as shown in **Exhibit 4A**. Data were adjusted for cost-of-living using index factors, which allow for salary dollars from entities outside of the District's area to be compared in spending power. The cost-of-living for each peer organization is determined at the County level. Evergreen utilizes data from the Council for Community and Economic Research (C2ER) as the source for the COLI (Cost-of-Living Index).

**EXHIBIT 4A
PEER ORGANIZATIONS AND COST-OF-LIVING INDEX**

Market Peers	Cost of Living Index	COL Factor
Grand Rapids Public Schools	94.6	-
Ann Arbor Public Schools	98.4	0.9613
Byron Center Public Schools	94.6	1.0000
Cedar Springs Public Schools	94.6	1.0000
Chippewa Valley Schools	94.6	1.0002
City of Grand Rapids	94.6	1.0000
Coopersville Public Schools*	93.4	1.0128
Dearborn Public Schools	95.9	0.9864
Detroit Public Schools*	95.9	0.9864
East Grand Rapids Public Schools*	94.6	1.0000
Forest Hills Public Schools	94.6	1.0000
Godfrey-Lee Public Schools*	94.6	1.0000
Godwin Heights Public Schools	94.6	1.0000
Grand Rapids Community College	94.6	1.0000
Grandville Public Schools	94.6	1.0000
Greenville Public Schools	87.7	1.0787
Holland Public Schools	91.1	1.0384
Kalamazoo Public Schools	92.2	1.0264
Kelloggsville Public Schools	94.6	1.0000
Kenowa Hills Public Schools*	94.6	1.0000
Kent Independent School District	94.6	1.0000
Kentwood Public Schools	94.6	1.0000
Lansing School District*	89.4	1.0579
Livonia Public Schools	95.9	0.9864
Lowell Area Schools	94.6	1.0000
Muskegon Public Schools	87.6	1.0799
Oakland Community Schools	105.3	0.8984
Plymouth Canton Community Schools	95.9	0.9864
Rochester Community School District	105.3	0.8984
Rockford Public Schools*	94.6	1.0000
Spring Lake Public Schools*	93.4	1.0128
Utica Community Schools	94.6	1.0002
Walled Lake Consolidated Schools	105.3	0.8984
Warren Consolidated Schools*	94.6	1.0002
Wayne-Westland Community School District	95.9	0.9864
Wyoming Public Schools	94.6	1.0000

* Data not obtained



4.2 PUBLIC SECTOR DATA

Evergreen was able to compare the ranges of the District's classifications to the pay ranges collected from the target organizations identified in **Exhibit 4A**. The market differentials and the percentage difference between the District and the market are shown in **Exhibit 4B** for survey market range minimum, midpoint, and maximum. A positive differential indicates the District was above market for that classification at the range minimum, midpoint, or maximum; a negative differential indicates that it is below market for that classification at that range position. The differentials do not necessarily mean incumbents are overpaid or underpaid in their classifications, but simply display the difference between the pay range and the average of the pay range data collected from the market peers.

Exhibit 4B provides a summary of the results at the market average for each comparison point. The exhibit contains the following information:

- each of the classifications (36) that received four or more peer pay range responses;
- the resulting market pay range information for each, including the average of the peer responses for the pay range minimum, midpoint, and maximum;
- a percentage differential between current pay ranges and average market ranges;
- the survey average range spread (the difference between the pay range minimum and maximum);
- the overall average percent differential for pay range minimum, midpoint, and maximum; and
- the total number of survey responses for each classification and the average number of responses for all classifications.

**EXHIBIT 4B
AVERAGE PUBLIC SECTOR MARKET PAY RANGES**

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Avg. Range Spread	Number of Responses
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Assistant Principal – Elementary	\$84,615.22	-20.3%	\$90,747.16	-15.4%	\$96,879.10	-11.4%	14.5%	11
Assistant Principal – Secondary	\$88,605.80	-21.8%	\$95,822.55	-18.2%	\$103,039.29	-15.1%	16.3%	17
Athletic Director– High School	\$88,404.05	-18.2%	\$97,916.35	-16.7%	\$107,428.65	-15.5%	21.5%	14
Benefits Coordinator*	\$41,530.79	1.8%	\$49,362.78	-12.0%	\$57,194.76	-22.9%	37.7%	9
Benefits Manager	\$68,822.97	4.8%	\$77,904.61	4.1%	\$86,986.26	3.6%	26.4%	5
Chief Financial Officer†	\$112,562.14	N/A	\$123,443.89	N/A	\$134,325.64	N/A	19.3%	11
Communications Coordinator	\$58,132.96	-4.0%	\$67,236.42	-6.2%	\$76,339.89	-8.0%	31.3%	4
Dean of Students	\$59,820.10	5.7%	\$67,848.46	5.2%	\$75,876.83	4.7%	26.8%	9
Director of Community and Student Affairs	\$89,814.62	-9.0%	\$100,102.54	-8.3%	\$110,390.46	-7.7%	22.9%	8
Director of Curriculum	\$99,671.00	-12.6%	\$109,566.92	-10.9%	\$119,462.83	-9.4%	19.9%	8
Director of Equity and Inclusion	\$90,534.29	-9.8%	\$102,467.91	-10.6%	\$114,401.53	-11.3%	26.4%	6
Director of Facilities Management, Planning, Design, Construction and Renovation	\$89,124.99	-3.9%	\$99,796.08	-3.7%	\$110,467.17	-3.6%	23.9%	14
Director of Human Resources and Labor Relations	\$99,149.66	-12.1%	\$110,856.22	-12.0%	\$122,562.78	-12.0%	23.6%	11
Director of Purchasing	\$88,538.89	-7.6%	\$101,908.63	-10.1%	\$115,278.37	-12.1%	30.2%	6
Director of Student Data Services	\$84,073.89	4.4%	\$97,123.08	1.2%	\$110,172.27	-1.4%	31.0%	6
Executive Assistant*	\$48,391.46	23.6%	\$56,911.15	12.3%	\$65,430.85	3.0%	35.2%	10
Executive Director of Communications and External Affairs†	\$94,781.59	N/A	\$109,967.45	N/A	\$125,153.31	N/A	32.0%	6
Executive Director of Facilities and Operations†	\$99,331.79	N/A	\$113,826.48	N/A	\$128,321.18	N/A	29.2%	7
Executive Director of Instruction and School Leadership†	\$103,258.31	N/A	\$113,239.71	N/A	\$123,221.11	N/A	19.3%	9
Executive Director of K-12 Athletics, Physical Education/Health and Student Activities†	\$96,656.64	N/A	\$106,683.06	N/A	\$116,709.49	N/A	20.7%	4
Executive Director of Professional Learning†	\$105,848.65	N/A	\$118,985.32	N/A	\$132,121.98	N/A	24.8%	6
Executive Director of Special Education, Early Intervention Services, and Section 504†	\$99,525.91	N/A	\$108,271.78	N/A	\$117,017.64	N/A	17.6%	10
Financial Services Coordinator	\$69,500.40	-21.7%	\$77,086.71	-19.8%	\$84,673.02	-18.3%	21.8%	6
Generalist - Human Resources	\$49,350.71	26.1%	\$56,083.42	25.3%	\$62,816.13	24.7%	27.3%	7

* Hourly position

† Classification features a flat salary and not a pay range. Therefore, no differentials are displayed.

EXHIBIT 4B (Continued)
AVERAGE PUBLIC SECTOR MARKET PAY RANGES

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Avg. Range Spread	Number of Responses
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff		
Network and PC Technician	\$44,962.23	21.6%	\$52,325.97	18.8%	\$59,689.71	16.6%	32.8%	9
Network and Systems Technician	\$60,721.99	5.5%	\$67,548.77	6.9%	\$74,375.54	7.9%	22.5%	8
Principal - Elementary	\$92,281.19	-16.0%	\$99,949.47	-13.8%	\$107,617.75	-11.9%	16.6%	18
Principal - Secondary	\$100,690.44	-20.1%	\$111,278.60	-19.9%	\$121,866.77	-19.8%	21.0%	22
Public Safety and Security Officer	\$29,609.52	7.3%	\$37,000.47	1.9%	\$44,391.43	-1.9%	49.9%	4
Supervisor - Food and Nutrition Services	\$58,366.88	9.5%	\$66,032.06	9.1%	\$73,697.24	8.9%	26.3%	6
Supervisor - Grounds and Operations	\$61,691.47	11.4%	\$69,304.83	11.6%	\$76,918.20	11.8%	24.7%	7
Supervisor - Human Resources	\$74,749.52	4.5%	\$85,018.60	3.2%	\$95,287.68	2.2%	27.5%	4
Supervisor - Maintenance	\$62,501.94	10.1%	\$70,028.28	10.6%	\$77,554.61	10.9%	24.1%	7
Supervisor - Special Education Services	\$89,276.67	-8.1%	\$97,535.75	-6.8%	\$105,794.84	-5.7%	18.5%	7
Systems Analyst	\$70,426.84	-9.3%	\$79,249.60	-9.1%	\$88,072.35	-9.0%	25.1%	8
Webmaster and Multimedia Designer	\$58,369.17	21.2%	\$65,149.00	21.9%	\$71,928.83	22.6%	23.2%	7
Overall Average		-1.3%		-2.1%		-2.8%	25.3%	8.6

Market Minimums

A starting point of the analysis is to compare the average market minimum for each classification to the District's pay range minimums. Market minimums are generally considered as an entry-level salary for employees who meet the minimum qualifications of a classification. Employees with salaries at or near the range minimums are less likely to have mastered the job and would have not acquired the skills and experience necessary to be fully proficient in their classification.

Exhibit 4B illustrates that the District was, overall, approximately 1.3 percent below the market at the minimum of their respective pay ranges for all surveyed classifications. Based on the data, it can be seen that:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 21.8 percent below market minimum for the Assistant Secondary Principal classification to 26.1 percent above market for the Human Resources Generalist classification.
- Of the 29 classifications with market minimum percentage differentials, 15 (51.7 percent) are below market at the minimum, while the remaining 14 (48.3 percent) were above market at the minimum of surveyed pay ranges.

Market Midpoints

Market midpoints explore the comparison between average peer midpoints and the midpoints for classifications in the District. Market midpoints are important to consider as they are commonly recognized as the salary point at which employees have achieved full proficiency, and are performing satisfactorily in their classification.

Exhibit 4B illustrates that the District was, overall, approximately 2.1 percent below market at the midpoint of the respective pay ranges for all surveyed classifications. The following observations can be made:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 19.9 percent below market midpoint for the Secondary Principal classification to 25.3 percent above market for the Human Resources Generalist classification.
- Of the 29 classifications with market midpoint percentage differentials, 16 (55.2 percent) were below market at the midpoint, while the remaining 13 (44.8 percent) were above market at the midpoint of surveyed pay ranges.

Market Maximums

The peer pay range maximums are compared to the District's range maximums for each surveyed classification. The market maximum is significant as it represents the upper limit salary that an organization might provide to retain and/or reward experienced and high performing incumbents. Additionally, being competitive at the maximum allows organizations to retain highly qualified employees in classifications that are difficult to fill.

Exhibit 4B illustrates that the District was, overall, approximately 2.8 percent below market at the maximum of the respective pay ranges for all surveyed classifications. Based on the collected data, the following observations can be made:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 22.9 percent below market maximum for the Benefits Coordinator classification to 24.7 percent above market for the Human Resources Generalist classification.
- Of the 29 classifications with market maximum percentage differentials, 18 (62.1 percent) were below market at the maximum and 11 (37.9 percent) were above market at the midpoint of surveyed pay ranges.

Range Spreads

Range spreads (the width of pay ranges) allow for flexibility when determining hiring salaries, indicate the room for growth within a classification, and provide a metric for which the District can compare its current compensation structure to the rest of the market.

Exhibit 4B shows the average market range spreads (the difference between the pay range minimum and maximum) for each of the surveyed positions. The average market range spread across the pay ranges of all surveyed positions was 25.3 percent and ranged between 14.5 for the Elementary Assistant Principal classification and 49.9 percent for the Public Safety and Security Officer classification. Overall, the District has very similar range spreads—overall average of 25.0 percent across surveyed classifications—compared to the market.

4.3 PRIVATE SECTOR DATA

To supplement the public sector data, aggregate private sector salary data from Economic Research Institute (ERI) were analyzed for easily transferable positions. There are inherent differences between private and public-sector classifications which made it difficult to draw conclusions about public sector salary ranges entirely from private sector data. However, the data were considered when making pay grade recommendations.

A summary of the results of the private sector market average is shown in **Exhibit 4C** and the following are displayed:

- each of the classifications (41) that had a private sector match;
- the resulting private sector market pay range information for each, including the aggregate average for the pay range minimum, midpoint, and maximum;
- a percentage differential between current District pay ranges and average market ranges;
- the aggregate average range spread for each matched classification; and
- the overall average percent differential for pay range minimum, midpoint, and maximum.

**EXHIBIT 4C
AVERAGE PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET PAY RANGES**

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Avg. Range Spread
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	
Assistant Principal – Elementary	\$56,914.00	19.3%	\$65,769.00	16.7%	\$74,624.00	14.7%	31.1%
Assistant Principal – Secondary	\$56,914.00	22.3%	\$65,769.00	19.4%	\$74,624.00	17.1%	31.1%
Behavior Specialist	\$22.88/hr	-25.0%	\$26.65/hr	-19.0%	\$30.43/hr	-14.8%	33.0%
Behavior Support Consultant	\$27.51/hr	9.8%	\$31.45/hr	12.8%	\$35.39/hr	15.0%	28.6%
Behavioral Health Supervisor	\$80,087.00	-2.4%	\$97,166.50	-10.1%	\$114,246.00	-15.9%	42.7%
Benefits Coordinator	\$21.28/hr	-4.9%	\$24.52/hr	-15.6%	\$27.77/hr	-24.7%	30.5%
Benefits Manager	\$78,489.00	-8.4%	\$94,018.50	-14.6%	\$109,548.00	-19.4%	39.6%
Chief Financial Officer*	\$117,977.00	N/A	\$141,862.00	N/A	\$165,747.00	N/A	40.5%
College and Career Coordinator*	\$19.18/hr	N/A	\$22.15/hr	N/A	\$25.12/hr	N/A	31.0%
Communications Coordinator	\$43,922.00	23.9%	\$51,156.00	21.0%	\$58,390.00	18.8%	32.9%
Counselor Coordinator	\$59,317.00	27.4%	\$68,572.50	24.6%	\$77,828.00	22.4%	31.2%
Curriculum Specialist	\$55,948.00	12.4%	\$66,611.50	7.0%	\$77,275.00	2.9%	38.1%
Dean of Students	\$78,441.00	-21.3%	\$95,138.00	-28.4%	\$111,835.00	-33.7%	42.6%
Director of Community and Student Affairs	\$78,441.00	4.5%	\$95,138.00	-3.2%	\$111,835.00	-9.0%	42.6%
Director of Curriculum	\$77,977.00	11.9%	\$94,565.50	3.8%	\$111,154.00	-2.2%	42.5%
Director of Equity and Inclusion	\$80,748.00	1.6%	\$111,937.50	-19.4%	\$143,127.00	-33.4%	77.3%
Director of Facilities Management, Planning, Design, Construction and Renovation	\$73,701.00	15.1%	\$90,357.50	6.2%	\$107,014.00	-0.4%	45.2%
Director of Human Resources and Labor Relations	\$86,640.00	1.4%	\$120,424.00	-20.3%	\$154,208.00	-34.6%	78.0%
Director of Purchasing	\$82,218.00	-0.2%	\$98,561.00	-6.7%	\$114,904.00	-11.7%	39.8%
Executive Assistant	\$26.22/hr	11.4%	\$31.15/hr	-1.0%	\$36.08/hr	-11.1%	37.6%
Executive Director of Communications and External Affairs*	\$85,557.00	N/A	\$120,693.00	N/A	\$155,829.00	N/A	82.1%
Executive Director of Professional Learning*	\$90,158.00	N/A	\$110,928.50	N/A	\$131,699.00	N/A	46.1%
Family and Community Engagement Coordinator*	\$21.62/hr	N/A	\$25.08/hr	N/A	\$28.55/hr	N/A	32.1%
Financial Services Coordinator	\$56,438.00	-1.0%	\$65,961.00	-4.3%	\$75,484.00	-6.8%	33.7%
Generalist - Human Resources	\$52,619.00	19.8%	\$61,272.50	16.6%	\$69,926.00	14.1%	32.9%
Network and PC Technician	\$42,066.00	28.2%	\$48,308.00	26.7%	\$54,550.00	25.5%	29.7%

* Classification features a flat salary and not a pay range. Therefore, no differentials are displayed.

EXHIBIT 4C (Continued)
AVERAGE PRIVATE SECTOR MARKET PAY RANGES

Classification	Survey Minimum		Survey Midpoint		Survey Maximum		Avg. Range Spread
	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	Average	% Diff	
Network and Systems Technician	\$47,372.00	30.1%	\$55,427.00	26.5%	\$63,482.00	23.7%	34.0%
Principal - Elementary	\$70,209.00	11.3%	\$83,876.50	3.7%	\$97,544.00	-2.1%	38.9%
Principal - Secondary	\$70,209.00	15.9%	\$83,876.50	8.2%	\$97,544.00	2.4%	38.9%
Project Coordinator - Professional Learning	\$21.06/hr	22.0%	\$24.12/hr	11.2%	\$27.18/hr	1.8%	29.1%
Public Safety - Lieutenant	\$32.69/hr	-7.5%	\$38.98/hr	-8.3%	\$45.28/hr	-8.8%	38.5%
Public Safety and Security Officer	\$16.01/hr	22.2%	\$18.42/hr	25.0%	\$20.84/hr	27.0%	30.2%
Staffing Coordinator - Human Resources	\$19.41/hr	8.0%	\$22.46/hr	2.5%	\$25.50/hr	-1.8%	31.3%
Supervisor - Food and Nutrition Services	\$50,137.00	24.6%	\$58,184.50	21.7%	\$66,232.00	19.5%	32.1%
Supervisor - Grounds and Operations	\$52,187.00	28.0%	\$61,310.00	23.8%	\$70,433.00	20.5%	35.0%
Supervisor - Human Resources	\$58,971.00	28.0%	\$69,907.50	22.7%	\$80,844.00	18.6%	37.1%
Supervisor - Maintenance	\$58,316.00	17.0%	\$68,186.50	13.2%	\$78,057.00	10.3%	33.9%
Supervisor - Special Education Services	\$60,223.00	31.0%	\$71,448.00	24.2%	\$82,673.00	18.9%	37.3%
Systems Analyst	\$62,568.00	2.5%	\$73,326.50	-1.3%	\$84,085.00	-4.3%	34.4%
Talent Coordinator	\$22.07/hr	-8.6%	\$25.77/hr	-20.6%	\$29.48/hr	-30.5%	33.5%
Webmaster and Multimedia Designer	\$67,310.00	7.0%	\$76,396.00	6.1%	\$85,482.00	5.4%	27.0%
Overall Average		10.5%		4.7%		0.4%	38.6%

Market Minimums

Exhibit 4C illustrates that the District was, overall, approximately 10.5 percent above the private sector market at the minimum of their respective pay ranges for all surveyed classifications. Based on the data, it can be seen that:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 25.0 percent below market minimum for the Behavior Specialist classification to 31.0 percent above market for Special Education Services Supervisor classification.
- Of the 36 classifications with market minimum percentage differentials, nine (25.0 percent) are below market at the minimum, while the remaining 27 (75.0 percent) were above market at the minimum of surveyed pay ranges.

Market Midpoints

Exhibit 4C illustrates that the District was, overall, approximately 4.7 percent above the private sector market at the midpoint of the respective pay ranges for all surveyed classifications. The following observations can be made:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 28.4 percent below market midpoint for the Dean of Students classification to 26.7 percent above market for the Network and PC Technician classification.
- Of the 36 classifications with market midpoint percentage differentials, 14 (38.9 percent) were below market at the midpoint, while the remaining 22 (61.1 percent) were above market at the midpoint of surveyed pay ranges.

Market Maximums

Exhibit 4C illustrates that the District was, overall, approximately 0.4 percent above the private sector market at the maximum of the respective pay ranges for all surveyed classifications. Based on the collected data, the following observations can be made:

- The surveyed position differentials range from 34.6 percent below market maximum for the Director of Human Resources and Labor Relations classification to 27.0 percent above market for the Public Safety and Security Officer classification.
- Of the 36 classifications with market maximum percentage differentials, half were below market at the maximum and half were above market at the midpoint of surveyed pay ranges.

Range Spreads

Exhibit 4C shows that the average private sector market range spread across the pay ranges of all surveyed positions was 38.6 percent and ranged between 27.0 for the Webmaster and Multimedia Designer classification and 82.1 percent for the Executive Director of Communications and External Affairs classification.

4.4 SUMMARY

From the analysis of the data gathered in the external labor market assessment, it can be concluded that the District's salary scale, was, at the time of the study:

- Approximately 1.3 percent below the overall public sector market minimum, 2.1 percent below the market midpoint, and 2.8 percent below the market maximum of pay ranges of surveyed positions.
- Slightly below the public sector market average range spread—with an average across all surveyed positions of 25.3 percent, compared with the 25.0 percent spread found among the District's pay ranges.
- Approximately 10.5 percent above the overall private sector market minimum, 4.7 percent above the midpoint, and 0.4 percent above the maximum of pay ranges of surveyed positions.

Information gained from the salary survey was used, along with current environmental factors (such as budget and discretionary benefit contributions), to develop a recommended compensation system that places the District in a strong position to stay competitive in today's market. A discussion of a proposed pay system and recommendations can be found in **Chapter 6** of this report.

Chapter 5 – Benefits Survey Summary

Evergreen conducted a benefits survey concurrent with the salary survey. A benefits survey, much like a salary evaluation, represents a snapshot in time of what is available in peer organizations and can provide the organization with an understanding of the total compensation package (salary and benefits) offered by its peers. Benefits data were obtained from the same organizations identified in **Chapter 4**.

This information should be used as a cursory overview and not a line-by-line comparison, since benefits can be weighted differently depending on the importance to the organization. Also, benefits are usually negotiated and acquired through third-parties, so one-to-one comparisons can be difficult. The analysis in this chapter highlights aspects of the benefits survey that provide pertinent information that can be considered reliably representative of market conditions.

5.1 INSURANCE COVERAGES

Health

Responding peers provide an average of 4.9 health plan options (any combination of HMO, PPO, or other type of health plan) to their employees. Among responding peers, 25.0 percent provide their employees with an HMO (Health Maintenance Organization) plan, 83.3 offer a PPO (Preferred Provider Organization) plan, and 75.0 percent offer some other kind of plan—such as a High Deductible Health Plan (HDHP) or a Health Savings Account (HSA). Note: As so few peers offered a HMO plan, no HMO data are displayed in this chapter.

As shown in **Exhibit 5A**, 83.3 percent of responding peers provide their employees with a PPO plan. Employer contributions to monthly premiums range from \$571.35 (87.6 percent of total costs) for employee-only coverage to \$1,582.17 (87.1 percent of total costs) for employee-plus-family coverage. Average maximum in-network deductibles range from \$1,060.94 for employee-only coverage to \$1,863.33 for employee-plus-family coverage; average maximum out-of-network deductibles range from \$1,866.67 for employee-only coverage to \$3,563.64 for employee-plus-family coverage.

By comparison, Grand Rapids provides nine separate PPO plans to its employees; no other health plans are provided. Rather than display the details of each plan, **Exhibit 5A** shows the average premiums and deductibles for the District. As seen, the District's PPO offerings are very similar to those of its peers.



**EXHIBIT 5A
PEER PPO PLANS**

Health Plan Premiums & Deductibles	Peer Average	GRPS Average
Percentage of peers offering each plan	83.3%	9 PPO Plans
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	\$571.35	\$586.99
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	87.6%	93.1%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	\$80.97	\$43.82
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	12.4%	6.9%
Individual maximum deductible in-network	\$1,060.94	\$895.45
Individual maximum deductible out-of-network	\$1,866.67	\$1,945.45
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	\$1,186.47	\$1,227.58
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	82.5%	83.4%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	\$252.34	\$244.58
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	17.5%	16.6%
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible in-network	\$1,960.71	\$1,790.91
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible out-of-network	\$3,088.89	\$3,790.91
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	\$1,198.92	\$1,227.58
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	82.6%	83.4%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	\$252.34	\$244.58
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	17.4%	16.6%
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible in-network	\$1,960.71	\$1,790.91
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible out-of-network	\$3,355.56	\$3,745.45
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	\$1,582.17	\$1,600.89
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	87.1%	86.9%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	\$234.55	\$240.40
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	12.9%	13.1%
Employee plus family maximum deductible in-network	\$1,863.33	\$1,790.91
Employee plus family maximum deductible out-of-network	\$3,563.64	\$3,790.91



Exhibit 5B displays data on the other type of health plans offered by half of responding peers, compared with the plan offered by the District. The most common type of plans offered by peers include HSAs and HDHPs. As shown in the exhibit, employer contributions to monthly premiums range from \$587.82 (91.5 percent of total costs) for employee-only coverage to \$1,584.20 (90.9 percent of total costs) for employee-plus-family coverage. Average maximum in-network deductibles ranged from \$1,136.67 for employee-only coverage to \$2,460.00 for employee-plus-family coverage; average maximum out-of-network deductibles ranged from \$3,100.00 for employee-only coverage to \$5,622.22 for employee-plus-family coverage.

**EXHIBIT 5B
COMPARISON OF OTHER HEALTH PLANS**

Health Plan Premiums & Deductibles	Peer Average
Percentage of peers offering each plan	75.0%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	\$587.82
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employer	91.5%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	\$54.63
Percentage (monthly) of employee premium paid by employee	8.5%
Individual maximum deductible in-network	\$1,136.67
Individual maximum deductible out-of-network	\$3,100.00
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	\$200.10
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employer	14.3%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	\$1,203.76
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus dependent premium paid by employee	85.7%
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible in-network	\$2,460.00
Employee plus dependent maximum deductible out-of-network	\$5,622.22
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	\$1,203.76
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employer	85.7%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	\$200.10
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus spouse premium paid by employee	14.3%
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible in-network	\$2,460.00
Employee plus spouse maximum deductible out-of-network	\$5,622.22
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	\$1,584.20
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employer	90.9%
Dollar amount (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	\$159.11
Percentage (monthly) of employee plus family premium paid by employee	9.1%
Employee plus family maximum deductible in-network	\$2,460.00
Employee plus family maximum deductible out-of-network	\$5,622.22



Dental

Peers were also surveyed regarding other forms of insurance coverage, such as dental. **Exhibit 5C** shows that 70.0 percent of responding peers provide an average of 1.4 employer-paid plans. Average monthly employer premiums range from \$57.75 for employee-only coverage to \$110.88 for employee-plus-family coverage. The exhibit also shows that half of peers provide an average of 1.3 employee-paid plans, with employee premiums ranging from \$6.01 for employee-only coverage to \$19.58 for employee-plus-family coverage.

By comparison, the District provides a single dental plan to its employees, which costs the District up to \$6.10 per month per employee for employee-plus-family coverage.

**EXHIBIT 5C
COMPARISON OF DENTAL PLANS**

Dental Insurance	Offered?	Average Number of Plans Offered	Average Maximum Monthly Amount for Employee-Only Coverage	Average Maximum Monthly Amount for Employee-plus-Family Coverage
Employer Paid	70.0%	1.4	\$57.75	\$110.88
GRPS	Yes	1.0	\$6.10	\$6.10
Employee Paid	50.0%	1.3	\$6.01	\$19.58
GRPS	No	N/A	N/A	N/A

Vision

Exhibit 5D shows that 70.0 percent of responding peers provide an average of 1.3 employer-paid vision insurance plans. Average monthly employer premiums range from \$6.09 for employee-only coverage to \$18.95 for employee-plus-family coverage. The exhibit also shows that 40.0 percent of peers provide an average of 1.3 employee-paid plans, with employee premiums ranging from \$1.23 for employee-only coverage to \$9.03 for employee-plus-family coverage.

By comparison, the District provides a single vision plan to its employees, which costs the District up to \$15.51 per month per employee for employee-plus-family coverage.

**EXHIBIT 5D
COMPARISON OF VISION PLANS**

Vision Insurance	Offered?	Average Number of Plans Offered	Average Maximum Monthly Amount for Employee-Only Coverage	Average Maximum Monthly Amount for Employee-plus-Family Coverage
Employer Paid	70.0%	1.3	\$6.09	\$18.95
GRPS	Yes	1.0	\$5.96	\$15.51
Employee Paid	40.0%	1.3	\$1.23	\$9.03
GRPS	No	N/A	N/A	N/A



Disability

Peers were surveyed regarding short-term and long-term disability insurance. For short-term coverage, it was found that 25.0 percent of responding peers provide employer-paid plans and 55.6 percent provide employee-paid plans. For long-term coverage, 72.7 percent of responding peers provide employer-paid plans and 55.6 percent provide employee-paid plans. By comparison, Grand Rapids Public Schools provides all but employer-paid short-term coverage.

Life

Exhibit 5E displays the comparisons of life insurance offerings in the District and peer organizations. Like 84.6 percent of its responding peers, the District provides employer-paid life insurance for its employees. As shown, offerings in Grand Rapids Public Schools are similar to those of its peers, albeit at a lower cost to the District.

**EXHIBIT 5E
COMPARISON OF LIFE INSURANCE**

Life Insurance	Peer Average	GRPS
Is employer-paid life insurance offered?	84.6%	Yes
Cost (monthly) to employer for individual coverage	\$6.53	\$0.14
Dollar amount of death benefit	\$41,667	40k, 50k, 2x Annual Salary
Is optional dependent coverage offered?	80.0%	Yes
Can the employee purchase additional life insurance if desired?	78.6%	Yes
Is accidental death insurance provided?	84.6%	Yes

5.2 RETIREMENT

Market peers were also surveyed regarding their retirement options. Like the majority of responding peers, the District participates in the Michigan Public School Employee Retirement System (MPERS) and, therefore, has similar benefit offerings.

Exhibit 5F also shows other retirement options provided by the District and its peers. While very few responding peers provide other options, the District sets itself apart in the provision of 403(b) and 457 plans.

**EXHIBIT 5F
COMPARISON OF OTHER RETIREMENT PLANS**

Other Retirement Options		Offered?	If so, does the employer contribute to this option?
Deferred Retirement Option Plan (DROP)	Peer Average	20.0%	0.0%
	GRPS	No	N/A
401k, 401a, 403(b), or 457	Peer Average	20.0%	0.0%
	GRPS	Yes*	No
Other	Peer Average	40.0%	0.0%
	GRPS	No	N/A

* 403(b) and 457



Exhibit 5G shows a comparison of the benefits provided to retirees between the District and its peers. Among responding peers, 12.5 percent offer their retirees health, dental, and vision insurance; none provide life insurance. By comparison, the District does not provide retirees benefits in addition to what they receive through MPERS.

**EXHIBIT 5G
RETIREE BENEFITS**

Insurance for Retirees	Peer Average	GRPS
Is health insurance offered?	12.5%	No
Is dental insurance offered?	12.5%	No
Is vision insurance offered?	12.5%	No
Is life insurance offered?	0.0%	No

* Retirees receive benefits through MPERS, but not through the District

5.3 LEAVE

Sick Leave

As displayed in **Exhibit 5H**, all responding peers provide sick leave. The average monthly accrual rate is 7.1 hours which begins immediately upon employment and peers cap sick leave at 103.2 hours per year, on average.

Vacation Leave

Exhibit 5H also shows that all responding peers provide vacation leave. The average minimum monthly accrual rate is 7.1 hours, which begins immediately upon employment and the average maximum monthly accrual rate is 13.6 hours which begins on average after 17.6 years of employment. On average, peers cap vacation leave at 189.1 hours per year.

Personal Leave

Among responding peers, an average of three days of personal leave are provided. By comparison, the District provides four days.

**EXHIBIT 5H
COMPARISON OF LEAVE ACCRUAL**

Leave Accrual		Offered?	Monthly Minimum Accrual Rate (Days)	Years of Service Required to Begin Accruing at Minimum Rate	Monthly Maximum Accrual Rate (Days)	Years of Service Required to Begin Accruing at Maximum Rate	Absolute Maximum Total Accrual for a Year (Days)
Sick Leave	Peer Average	100.0%	0.9				12.9
	GRPS	Yes	1.0*/1.1†				12*/13†
Vacation Leave	Peer Average	100.0%	0.9	0.2	1.9	15.7	23.9
	GRPS	Yes	0.6*/0.8†‡	0†/1‡/5*	0.8*/1.7‡/2.5†	10*/20‡/30†	10*/22†/23‡

* Non-52 week exempt employees

† 52-week exempt employees

‡ Support non-exempt employees



Leave Payout Upon Separation

Exhibit 5I summarizes policies regarding sick leave payout among peers and in the District. Unused sick leave is paid out by all responding peers upon voluntary separation and 83.3 percent responding positively cap payout. Among responding peers, half pay out unused sick leave upon involuntary separation and a third of those responding positively cap payout. By contrast, the District pays out unused sick leave to employees only upon separation.

Exhibit 5I also shows that unused vacation leave is paid out by all responding peers upon voluntary separation and 83.3 percent responding positively cap payout. Among responding peers, 71.4 percent pay out unused vacation leave upon involuntary separation and half of those responding positively cap payout. By comparison, the District pays out unused vacation leave in cases of voluntary and involuntary separation and does not cap payout.

**EXHIBIT 5I
COMPARISON OF PAID LEAVE POLICIES**

Paid Leave Upon Separation		Paid out upon voluntary separation?	If so, are hours capped?	Paid out upon involuntary separation?	If so, are hours capped?
Sick Leave	Peer Average	100.0%	83.3%	50.0%	33.3%
	GRPS	Yes*	N/A	No	N/A
Vacation Leave	Peer Average	100.0%	83.3%	71.4%	50.0%
	GRPS	Yes	No	Yes	No

* Each non-exempt support employee that has completed at least ten years of service shall receive, upon retirement, the amount of \$35.00 per day for each unused leave day. Each exempt employee shall receive \$45.00 per day for the first 125 unused leave days and \$60.00 per day for each day over 125 provided the employee is eligible to retire at the time of separation and has worked at least ten 10 years.

5.4 OTHER BENEFITS

Employee Assistance Program

As shown in **Exhibit 5J**, 85.7 percent of responding peers provide their employees with access to an average of 4.8 employee assistance program (EAP) visits; among those responding positively, 57.1 percent extend visits to family members. The District, by comparison, offers three visits to employees and their family members.

**EXHIBIT 5J
EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

Employee Assistance Program	Peer Average	GRPS
Is an employer-paid Employee Assistance Program offered?	85.7%	Yes
If so, are benefits available to family members, as well as the employee?	57.1%	Yes
Number of annual visits provided?	4.8	3.0



Tuition Reimbursement

Peers were surveyed regarding the provision of tuition reimbursement to their employees. It was found that 55.6 percent of responding peers do provide such a program; however insufficient data were gathered to calculate a valid market average amount that employees receive. Likewise, the District also provides tuition reimbursement.

Paid Holidays

The percentage of peers that offer various paid holidays is shown in **Exhibit 5K**. On average, responding peers offer 9.9 holidays to employees, compared with the ten offered by the District.

**EXHIBIT 5K
COMPARISON OF PAID HOLIDAYS**

Paid Holiday	Peer Average	GRPS
New Year's Day	100.0%	Yes
New Year's Eve	90.0%	Yes
Martin Luther King, Jr. Day	20.0%	Yes
Lincoln's Birthday	0.0%	No
Washington's Birthday	0.0%	No
Presidents Day	10.0%	No
Good Friday	30.0%	No
Memorial Day	100.0%	Yes
Independence Day	100.0%	Yes
Labor Day	100.0%	Yes
Veteran's Day	10.0%	No
Thanksgiving Day	100.0%	Yes
Day after Thanksgiving	100.0%	Yes
Christmas Eve	100.0%	Yes
Christmas Day	100.0%	Yes
Personal Holiday	66.7%	No
Employee Birthday	0.0%	No
Total paid holidays observed	9.9	10.0

Holiday Pay Policies

Exhibit 5L shows that 87.5 percent of responding peers provide straight time holiday pay to their employees, 12.5 percent pay time and a half if the hours worked exceed the maximum for straight time, and none pay time and a half regardless of the hours worked during the pay period. The District pays straight time for employees working the holidays, as well as time and a half if the hours worked exceed the maximum for straight time.



**EXHIBIT 5L
COMPARISON OF HOLIDAY PAY POLICIES**

Holiday Policies	Peer Average	GRPS
How are employees paid for holidays?		
Straight time	87.5%	Yes
Time and a half if hours worked exceed maximum for straight time	12.5%	Yes
Time and a half regardless of hours worked during the pay period	0.0%	No

5.5 SUMMARY

Thus far, this report has analyzed salaries and benefits in isolation. While these components of compensation impact employee recruitment and retention, employees often do not consider them in isolation, but rather as components of the total compensation plan.

Based on the comparison of benefits, Grand Rapids Public Schools was found to offer a similar benefits package to that of its peers. In particular, the District was found to excel in its dental and vision insurance benefits and provision of benefits to retirees.

The District should continue to maintain any competitive advantages, while seeking to bolster areas of weakness. By so doing, it will ensure that it is able to recruit and retain quality employees.



Chapter 6 - Recommendations

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The recommendations in this chapter seek to build on the strengths of the classification and compensation system for Exempt and Support Non-Exempt employees in Grand Rapids Public Schools and also to address the challenges observed by Evergreen consultants over the course of the study. Internal factors such as the future direction of the District, the organizational culture, and availability of resources influenced these recommendations. Each recommendation has also been developed to address a specific need based on the collected information while taking into account the external environment. Arriving at the overall solution for the District was a detailed process involving all components of the research conducted which were reviewed and discussed in previous chapters of this report.

6.2 COMPENSATION AND CLASSIFICATION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An organization's classification system establishes how the District's human resources are employed to perform its core services. The classification system consists of the titles and descriptions of the different classifications which define how work is organized and assigned. It is essential that the titles and descriptions of an organization's classifications accurately depict the work being performed by employees in order to ensure equity within the organization and to enable comparisons with positions at peer organizations. The purpose of a classification analysis is to identify such issues as incorrect titles, outdated job descriptions, and inconsistent titles across departments and levels.

In the analysis of the District's classification system, Evergreen collected classification data through the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) and Management Issues Tool (MIT) processes. The JATs, which were completed by employees and reviewed by their supervisors, provided information about the type and level of work being performed for each of the District's classifications. A total of 227 out of 283 (80.2 percent) JATs were completed. The MIT process provided supervisors an opportunity to provide specific recommendations regarding the pay or classification of positions in their areas. A total of six MITs were submitted.*

*The MIT was given to supervisors as an optional tool to recommend salary or classification change.

The compensation system analysis consisted of two parts:

- an assessment of the current compensation system; and
- an external salary survey.

Upon receiving data related to the District's pay plans and employees, an assessment was performed to examine the nature of the existing pay plans and the progression of employee salaries through pay ranges. The findings of this assessment are summarized in **Chapter 2** of this report.

During the market salary survey, the District's pay ranges were compared to the average of the identified market. Details regarding the market salary survey are provided in **Chapter 3**.

FINDING

The assessment found that the compensation structure was somewhat disorganized, with step plans featuring varying number of steps and range spreads. Best practice suggests having a structure with more uniformity. It was also found that the majority of employee salaries are clustered below their respective pay range midpoint, particularly among the support non-exempt public safety and security (PSS) and exempt employees.

From the market salary survey, the District's pay ranges were, overall, found to be below the market, but particularly so among exempt classifications.

Given these findings, Evergreen is proposing retaining the current Exempt Pay Plan and having the Support Non-Exempt Pay Plan absorb the support non-exempt PSS classifications. Details of these plans are displayed in **Exhibits 6A** and **6B**, respectively.

As shown in **Exhibit 6A**, the proposed Exempt Pay Plan has the following features:

- 17 pay grades, with ten levels in each (employees spend three years on each level);
- a constant increase between steps of three percent;
- a constant range spread (the distance between the minimum and maximum of a pay range) of approximately 30.5 percent; and
- a constant six percent progression (separation/increase) between Grades 100 and 110 and a constant eight percent progression between Grades 111 and 116.

EXHIBIT 6A
PROPOSED EXEMPT STEP PLAN

Grade	Level 1 (Years 1-3)	Level 2 (Years 4-6)	Level 3 (Years 7-9)	Level 4 (Years 10-12)	Level 5 (Years 13-15)
100	\$47,500.00	\$48,925.00	\$50,392.75	\$51,904.53	\$53,461.67
101	\$50,350.00	\$51,860.50	\$53,416.32	\$55,018.81	\$56,669.37
102	\$53,371.00	\$54,972.13	\$56,621.29	\$58,319.93	\$60,069.53
103	\$56,573.26	\$58,270.46	\$60,018.57	\$61,819.13	\$63,673.70
104	\$59,967.66	\$61,766.69	\$63,619.69	\$65,528.28	\$67,494.13
105	\$63,565.72	\$65,472.69	\$67,436.87	\$69,459.98	\$71,543.78
106	\$67,379.66	\$69,401.05	\$71,483.08	\$73,627.57	\$75,836.40
107	\$71,422.44	\$73,565.11	\$75,772.06	\$78,045.22	\$80,386.58
108	\$75,707.79	\$77,979.02	\$80,318.39	\$82,727.94	\$85,209.78
109	\$80,250.26	\$82,657.77	\$85,137.50	\$87,691.63	\$90,322.38
110	\$85,065.28	\$87,617.24	\$90,245.76	\$92,953.13	\$95,741.72
111	\$91,870.50	\$94,626.62	\$97,465.42	\$100,389.38	\$103,401.06
112	\$99,220.14	\$102,196.74	\$105,262.64	\$108,420.52	\$111,673.14
113	\$107,157.75	\$110,372.48	\$113,683.65	\$117,094.16	\$120,606.98
114	\$115,730.37	\$119,202.28	\$122,778.35	\$126,461.70	\$130,255.55
115	\$124,988.80	\$128,738.46	\$132,600.61	\$136,578.63	\$140,675.99
116	\$134,987.90	\$139,037.54	\$143,208.67	\$147,504.93	\$151,930.08

Grade	Level 6 (Years 16-18)	Level 7 (Years 19-21)	Level 8 (Years 22-24)	Level 9 (Years 25-27)	Level 10 (Years 28-30)
100	\$55,065.52	\$56,717.49	\$58,419.01	\$60,171.58	\$61,976.73
101	\$58,369.45	\$60,120.53	\$61,924.15	\$63,781.87	\$65,695.33
102	\$61,871.62	\$63,727.77	\$65,639.60	\$67,608.79	\$69,637.05
103	\$65,583.91	\$67,551.43	\$69,577.97	\$71,665.31	\$73,815.27
104	\$69,518.95	\$71,604.52	\$73,752.66	\$75,965.24	\$78,244.20
105	\$73,690.09	\$75,900.79	\$78,177.81	\$80,523.14	\$82,938.83
106	\$78,111.49	\$80,454.83	\$82,868.47	\$85,354.52	\$87,915.16
107	\$82,798.18	\$85,282.13	\$87,840.59	\$90,475.81	\$93,190.08
108	\$87,766.07	\$90,399.05	\$93,111.02	\$95,904.35	\$98,781.48
109	\$93,032.05	\$95,823.01	\$98,697.70	\$101,658.63	\$104,708.39
110	\$98,613.97	\$101,572.39	\$104,619.56	\$107,758.15	\$110,990.89
111	\$106,503.09	\$109,698.18	\$112,989.13	\$116,378.80	\$119,870.16
112	\$115,023.33	\$118,474.03	\$122,028.25	\$125,689.10	\$129,459.77
113	\$124,225.19	\$127,951.95	\$131,790.51	\$135,744.23	\$139,816.56
114	\$134,163.22	\$138,188.12	\$142,333.76	\$146,603.77	\$151,001.88
115	\$144,896.27	\$149,243.16	\$153,720.45	\$158,332.06	\$163,082.02
116	\$156,487.98	\$161,182.62	\$166,018.10	\$170,998.64	\$176,128.60

The proposed Support Non-Exempt Pay Plan is displayed in **Exhibits 6B** and has the following features:

- 11 pay grades, with ten levels in each (employees spend three years on each level);
- a constant increase between steps of 3.5 percent;
- a constant range spread (the distance between the minimum and maximum of a pay range) of approximately 36.3 percent; and
- a constant five percent progression pay grades.



EXHIBIT 6B
PROPOSED SUPPORT NON-EXEMPT STEP PLAN

Grade	Level 1 (Years 1-3)	Level 2 (Years 4-6)	Level 3 (Years 7-9)	Level 4 (Years 10-12)	Level 5 (Years 13-15)
200	\$16.75	\$17.34	\$17.95	\$18.58	\$19.23
201	\$17.59	\$18.21	\$18.85	\$19.51	\$20.19
202	\$18.47	\$19.12	\$19.79	\$20.48	\$21.20
203	\$19.39	\$20.07	\$20.77	\$21.50	\$22.25
204	\$20.36	\$21.07	\$21.81	\$22.57	\$23.36
205	\$21.38	\$22.13	\$22.90	\$23.70	\$24.53
206	\$22.45	\$23.24	\$24.05	\$24.89	\$25.76
207	\$23.57	\$24.39	\$25.24	\$26.12	\$27.03
208	\$24.75	\$25.62	\$26.52	\$27.45	\$28.41
209	\$25.99	\$26.90	\$27.84	\$28.81	\$29.82
210	\$27.29	\$28.25	\$29.24	\$30.26	\$31.32

Grade	Level 6 (Years 16-18)	Level 7 (Years 19-21)	Level 8 (Years 22-24)	Level 9 (Years 25-27)	Level 10 (Years 28-30)
200	\$19.90	\$20.60	\$21.32	\$22.07	\$22.84
201	\$20.90	\$21.63	\$22.39	\$23.17	\$23.98
202	\$21.94	\$22.71	\$23.50	\$24.32	\$25.17
203	\$23.03	\$23.84	\$24.67	\$25.53	\$26.42
204	\$24.18	\$25.03	\$25.91	\$26.82	\$27.76
205	\$25.39	\$26.28	\$27.20	\$28.15	\$29.14
206	\$26.66	\$27.59	\$28.56	\$29.56	\$30.59
207	\$27.98	\$28.96	\$29.97	\$31.02	\$32.11
208	\$29.40	\$30.43	\$31.50	\$32.60	\$33.74
209	\$30.86	\$31.94	\$33.06	\$34.22	\$35.42
210	\$32.42	\$33.55	\$34.72	\$35.94	\$37.20

The proposed step plans incorporate common industry practices, while using the existing pay plans as a framework. The proposed pay plans will allow the District to slot classifications at or near market value now and moving forward as positions are created or revised, as well as ensure external equity across all positions.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Adopt the proposed pay plans displayed in Exhibits 6A and 6B to simplify and bring consistency to the compensation system.

FINDING

In order to ensure that classifications are being compensated competitively in comparison to the market, Evergreen determined the placement of classifications within the proposed pay plans, using the results of the market salary survey as a guide.

A regression analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between the internal data gathered by the Job Assessment Tool (JAT) process and the external data gathered by the market salary survey. The analysis essentially adjusts the market data to take internal hierarchy into consideration and determines the market dollar value associated with every JAT point. This allows Evergreen to project an approximate pay range for each classification.

Additional adjustments were made to maintain the existing hierarchy and to account for the District’s understanding and knowledge of each position which cannot be captured through the JAT or salary survey processes. Based on this process, **Exhibits 6C** and **6D** display the proposed pay grade assignment for each classification among the Exempt and Support Non-Exempt Pay Plans, respectively.

**EXHIBIT 6C
EXEMPT PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS**

Proposed Classification Title	Proposed Pay Grade	Proposed Min	Proposed Max
Athletic Coordinator - Middle School	103	\$56,573.26	\$73,815.27
Communications Coordinator	103	\$56,573.26	\$73,815.27
Financial Services Coordinator	103	\$56,573.26	\$73,815.27
Hearing Officer and Social Emotional Learning Interventionist	103	\$56,573.26	\$73,815.27
Learning Experience Coordinator	103	\$56,573.26	\$73,815.27
LOOP Program Coordinator	103	\$56,573.26	\$73,815.27
Native American Education Program Coordinator	103	\$56,573.26	\$73,815.27
Coordinator of Special Services and Programs	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
Custodial Coordinator	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
ELL Coordinator	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
Family and Community Engagement Coordinator	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
GRASP Program Manager	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
Human Resources Generalist	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
Michigan Model Coordinator	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
Payroll Coordinator	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
PC Asset Recovery Coordinator	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
Risk Manager	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
School Improvement Facilitator	104	\$59,967.66	\$78,244.20
Director of Technology Integration	105	\$63,565.72	\$82,938.83
Supervisor of Grounds and Operations	105	\$63,565.72	\$82,938.83
Systems Analyst	105	\$63,565.72	\$82,938.83
Technology Training Facilitator	105	\$63,565.72	\$82,938.83
Assistant Legal Counsel and Employee Relations Manager	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Attendance Outreach Specialist	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Dean of Students	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Dean of Students	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Instructional Technology Specialist	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
International Baccalaureate (IB) Coordinator	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
International Baccalaureate (IB) Coordinator – PYP and MYP Programs	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Coordinator	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Supervisor of Food and Nutrition Services	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Supervisor of HVAC, Electrical, Plumbing and Energy Management Systems	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Supervisor of Maintenance	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Webmaster and Multimedia Designer	106	\$67,379.66	\$87,915.16
Benefits Manager	107	\$71,422.44	\$93,190.08
Community and Student Affairs Manager	107	\$71,422.44	\$93,190.08
Financial Services Specialist	107	\$71,422.44	\$93,190.08
Financial Systems Analyst	107	\$71,422.44	\$93,190.08
Manager Software Architect	107	\$71,422.44	\$93,190.08
Nurse Supervisor	107	\$71,422.44	\$93,190.08
Assistant Principal - Elementary	108	\$75,707.79	\$98,781.48
Athletic Director/Dean of Student Accountability	108	\$75,707.79	\$98,781.48
Enrollment Equity Coordinator	108	\$75,707.79	\$98,781.48
Fine Arts Coordinator	108	\$75,707.79	\$98,781.48
Induction Program Coordinator	108	\$75,707.79	\$98,781.48
Shared Time Coordinator	108	\$75,707.79	\$98,781.48
Talent Development, Retention, Diversity Recruitment Manager	108	\$75,707.79	\$98,781.48
Assessment Specialist	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Assistant Principal - K-8	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Assistant Principal - Middle	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39



**EXHIBIT 6C (Continued)
EXEMPT PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS**

Proposed Classification Title	Proposed Pay Grade	Proposed Min	Proposed Max
Behavioral Health Manager	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Counselor Supervisor	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Family and Community Engagement Supervisor	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Grant Manager	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Literacy Curriculum Coordinator	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Mathematics Curriculum Coordinator	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Social Studies and World Languages Curriculum Coordinator	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Student Data and Quality and Research Manager	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Supervisor of Human Resources	109	\$80,250.26	\$104,708.39
Assistant Principal - High	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of Behavioral Health and Social Emotional Learning	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of Curriculum	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of Equity and Inclusion	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of Extended Learning	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of MIS	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of Payroll and Retirement	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of Professional Learning	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of Purchasing	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Principal - Elementary	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Supervisor - Special Education Services	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Supervisor of Special Education Services	110	\$85,065.28	\$110,990.89
Director of Early Childhood Programs	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Director of Facilities Mgmt., Planning, Design, Construction and Renovation	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Director of Health Services	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Director of Projects and Maintenance	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Director of School Nutrition	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Director of Special Education	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Director of State and Federal Programs	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Director of Student Data Services	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Principal - K-8	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Principal - Middle	111	\$91,870.50	\$119,870.16
Director of Community and Student Affairs	112	\$99,220.14	\$129,459.77
Director of Fine Arts and Shared Time	112	\$99,220.14	\$129,459.77
Principal - High	112	\$99,220.14	\$129,459.77
Director of Financial Services	113	\$107,157.75	\$139,816.56
Director of Human Resources and Labor Relations	113	\$107,157.75	\$139,816.56
Executive Director of Communications and External Affairs	114	\$115,730.37	\$151,001.88
Executive Director of Community and Student Affairs	114	\$115,730.37	\$151,001.88
Executive Director of Facilities and Operations	114	\$115,730.37	\$151,001.88
Executive Director of Instruction and School Leadership	114	\$115,730.37	\$151,001.88
Executive Director of K-12 Athletics, Phys. Ed./Health and Student Activities	114	\$115,730.37	\$151,001.88
Executive Director of Professional Learning	114	\$115,730.37	\$151,001.88
Executive Director of Special Ed., Early Intervention Services, and Sect. 505	114	\$115,730.37	\$151,001.88
Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources and General Counsel	115	\$124,988.80	\$163,082.02
Chief Financial Officer	115	\$124,988.80	\$163,082.02
Chief of Staff/Director of Public Safety and School Security	115	\$124,988.80	\$163,082.02
Deputy Superintendent of PreK-12 Academics and Leadership	115	\$124,988.80	\$163,082.02



EXHIBIT 6D
SUPPORT NON-EXEMPT PAY GRADE ASSIGNMENTS

Proposed Classification Title	Proposed Pay Grade	Proposed Minimum	Proposed Maximum
Public Safety Communications Specialist	200	\$16.75	\$22.84
Security Officer	201	\$17.59	\$23.98
Public Safety Officer	202	\$18.47	\$25.17
Talent Coordinator	202	\$18.47	\$25.17
Youth Advocate Specialist	203	\$19.39	\$26.42
Behavior Specialist	203	\$19.39	\$26.42
Transition Specialist	203	\$19.39	\$26.42
In House Specialist	203	\$19.39	\$26.42
Benefits Specialist	203	\$19.39	\$26.42
Migrant Recruiter and EI/Parent-Community Liaison	204	\$20.36	\$27.76
Library Video Technician	204	\$20.36	\$27.76
Community and Student Affairs Specialist	204	\$20.36	\$27.76
LOOP Program Site Coordinator	204	\$20.36	\$27.76
Security Supervisor	204	\$20.36	\$27.76
Staffing Specialist	204	\$20.36	\$27.76
Title VI Grant Program Specialist	205	\$21.38	\$29.14
Public Safety Supervisor	205	\$21.38	\$29.14
PC Technician	206	\$22.45	\$30.59
Project Coordinator - Professional Learning	206	\$22.45	\$30.59
Project Coordinator - Community and Student Affairs	206	\$22.45	\$30.59
Academic Coordinator - Extended Day Title I	206	\$22.45	\$30.59
College and Career Coordinator	207	\$23.57	\$32.11
Parent Liaison	207	\$23.57	\$32.11
College Advisor	207	\$23.57	\$32.11
Executive Assistant	208	\$24.75	\$33.74
Help Desk Technician, Lead	208	\$24.75	\$33.74
Mail Room Coordinator	209	\$25.99	\$35.42
Network and Systems Technician	210	\$27.29	\$37.20
Public Safety and Security Lieutenant	210	\$27.29	\$37.20

RECOMMENDATION 2: Adopt the proposed pay ranges displayed in Exhibits 6C and 6D to simplify and bring consistency to the classified compensation system, as well as improve the District's market competitiveness.

FINDING

Evergreen is presenting two alternate options to transition employees from the current pay structure to the proposed one. Each option has its own pros and cons and carries different annual fiscal impacts. The two options and their operational definitions are:

- **Closest Step** – A calculation is performed so that each employee's salary is adjusted to the minimum of his/her classification's proposed pay grade. If his/her salary is already within the proposed pay range, no adjustment is made. The employee is then moved to the next highest/closest step.
- **Years of Class Experience** – The employee is placed on a step within his/her proposed pay grade that corresponds with his/her years of experience in his/her current classification, unless otherwise required by the Closest Step option.



Exhibits 6E through 6G display the implementation costs (not including benefits) for each option—along with the number of employees impacted by the change and the average magnitude of the change on the impacted employees—for exempt, support non-exempt, and all employees combined, respectively.

**EXHIBIT 6E
IMPLEMENTATION OPTION COSTS
EXEMPT**

Implementation Option	Total Implementation Cost	# Employees Receiving Adjustments	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Percentage Adjustment
Closest Step	\$538,599	161	\$3,345	4.4%
Years of Class Experience	\$756,328	161	\$4,698	5.9%

**EXHIBIT 6F
IMPLEMENTATION OPTION COSTS
SUPPORT NON-EXEMPT**

Implementation Option	Total Implementation Cost	# Employees Receiving Adjustments	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Percentage Adjustment
Closest Step	\$70,641	90	\$785	2.1%
Years of Class Experience	\$80,329	90	\$893	2.4%

**EXHIBIT 6G
IMPLEMENTATION OPTION COSTS
ALL EMPLOYEES COMBINED**

Implementation Option	Total Implementation Cost	# Employees Receiving Adjustments	Average Salary Adjustment	Average Percentage Adjustment
Closest Step	\$609,240	251	\$2,427	3.5%
Years of Class Experience	\$836,657	251	\$3,333	4.7%

RECOMMENDATION 3: Transition employee salaries into the proposed pay plans utilizing an option described above.

6.3 SYSTEM MAINTENANCE AND ADMINISTRATION POLICIES

FINDING

Evergreen is providing the District with updated job descriptions, which encompass any edits or changes necessary to reflect the most current work being performed in the role. Also, included with the updated descriptions, Evergreen provides a recommendation on the FLSA status of each classification as it relates to the updated tasks and responsibilities listed in the new description. The basis for these recommendations comes from the input from employees and supervisors provided during the JAT collection process. The updated job descriptions are separate from this report and are being submitted to the District under separate cover.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Update current job descriptions and corresponding FLSA status to align with the selected classification structure and be reflective of the employee-provided JAT information.

The compensation system in the District will continue to require periodic maintenance. The recommendations provided to improve the competitiveness of compensation were developed based on conditions at the time the data were collected. Without proper upkeep, the potential for recruitment and retention issues may increase as the compensation system becomes dated and less competitive.

FINDING

While it is unlikely that the overall pay plan will need to be adjusted for several years, a small number of pay grades may need to be reassigned more frequently. If the District notices high turnover or is experiencing difficulty with recruiting one or more classifications, it should collect pay range data from peer organizations to determine whether an adjustment is needed for the pay grade of the classification(s).

RECOMMENDATION 5: Conduct small-scale salary surveys as needed to assess the market competitiveness of hard-to-fill classifications and/or classifications with retention issues and make changes to pay grade assignments, if necessary.

FINDING

Small-scale salary surveys can improve the market position of specific classifications, but it is recommended that a comprehensive classification and compensation study be conducted every five to seven years to preserve both internal and external equity. Changes to classification and compensation do occur, and while the increments of change may seem minor, they can compound over time. A failure to react to these changes quickly has the potential to place the District in a less than desirable position for recruiting and retaining quality employees.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Conduct a comprehensive classification and compensation study every five to seven years, subject to budget constraints and market conditions.



6.4 SUMMARY

The objective of this limited Classification and Compensation Study was to improve the internal and external equity of both the structure by which exempt and support non-exempt employees are compensated, as well as the way positions relate and compare to one another across the District. This was accomplished by analyzing data gathered internally and externally, which informed the recommendations made in this chapter.

The recommendations in this chapter provide a competitive compensation structure—internally aligned with the classification structure and system administration practices—that will provide Grand Rapids Public Schools with a responsive compensation and classification system for years to come. While the upkeep of this recommended system and associated pay and classification guidelines will require work, the District will find that having a competitive compensation and classification system that encourages strong recruitment and employee retention is well worth the effort.

