



POLICY NAME - Classification Principles Policy

POLICY DESCRIPTION

Human Resources policy on classification and compensation principles.

POLICY

Classification studies and related factors may focus on positions, classifications, incumbents, and/or salary.

Positions are established and classified based on the level and scope of assigned duties and responsibilities as documented in approved job specifications. The Employee Services Agency is authorized and responsible to analyze the duties of all positions in the classified service, group them into classes, and recommend rules for administration of the classification plan and the allocation of positions to classes.

All employees should be performing duties within the scope of their classification. In rare instances, duties may have evolved beyond the current classification or the job specification does not reflect the duties performed or employment standards required. In such rare instances, those duties outside the scope of the current classification should be reassigned to other positions in the department for whom such duties are within the scope of their classification. When such reassignment of duties is not feasible, then changes to established job specifications, classification structure, and compensation may be considered.

The following factors are guiding principles:

1. Administrative job specification revisions do not require salary review/adjustments.
2. Employment standard changes require justification derived from verifiable sources, such as information gathered from a job analysis, a review of recruitment statistics, comparable market data or changes in mandated requirements (i.e., certifications). Departments should inform Human Resources of substantive changes to occupational or departmental requirements, or of recruitment difficulties, in order for Human Resources to determine if job specification revisions are needed.
3. The intent is to have the broadest classifications possible, except where there is a significant training period or where industry practice indicates that a specialized classification is common.
4. There must be a rationale for “alternate classification” staffing structures along with justification for how the position can function at each level. Alternate staffing should not be utilized solely as a means to simplify recruitment, nor to just create a “career path.” Each level of alternately staffed positions must be related in the nature of duties and required skill

set, yet have a distinction in scope and level of authority/independence to warrant the staffing structure.

The following apply when ESA prepares classification studies:

1. Classification studies include a review of relevant information, including how the classification(s) under study relates to other classifications in the organizational structure, both horizontally and vertically, in factors such as pay, reporting structure, scope of responsibility, duties and employment standards.
2. Classification reports include information relevant to possible recommendations (allocation, salary, and job description).
3. The following counties will be reviewed for salary comparison and classification structure:
 - a. Alameda
 - b. Contra Costa
 - c. Santa Cruz
 - d. San Francisco
 - e. San Mateo
4. In addition, for classification structure, the following counties may be included:
 - a. Los Angeles
 - b. Orange
 - c. Riverside
 - d. San Bernardino
 - e. San Diego
5. If classifications exist in city employment, the following may be reviewed for salary comparison and classification structure:
 - a. Campbell
 - b. Cupertino
 - c. Gilroy
 - d. Los Altos
 - e. Los Gatos
 - f. Milpitas
 - g. Morgan Hill
 - h. Mountain View
 - i. Palo Alto
 - j. San Jose
 - k. Santa Clara
 - l. Saratoga
 - m. Sunnyvale
6. Other jurisdictions that may be reviewed for classification structure and salary comparison:
 - a. Valley Transportation Authority
 - b. Santa Clara Valley Water District
 - c. Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara
 - d. Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority

7. For hospital classifications, the following hospitals may be reviewed for classification structure and salary comparison:
- a. Alameda County / Highland Hospital
 - b. El Camino
 - c. Good Samaritan
 - d. Kaiser Permanente (Northern California)
 - e. O'Connor
 - f. San Francisco General
 - g. Stanford
 - h. UCSF
 - i. VA – Palo Alto
 - j. Washington
 - k. Sutter Health
 - l. Palo Alto Medical Foundation
 - m. St. Rose Hospital
 - n. Sequoia Hospital
 - o. Fremont Hospital
 - p. San Leandro Hospital

For guidance on submitting a request for an Executive Management Initiated Classification Study, see the Executive Management Initiated Classification Study Policy.

WRITTEN AUTHORITY FOR POLICY

- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-35
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-36
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-44
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-45
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-78
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-96
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-97
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-98
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-99
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-100
- ◆ Merit System Rule A25-104
- ◆ Human Resources Practices Manual