

Susan Pcola-Davis TESTIMONY

Human Resources Committee: March 23, 2023

V. Recommendation for Action

- A. [Committee Action on amendment of Department of Education \("Department"\) Leadership Salary Structure: salary establishment process for Deputy, CAS, and AS and salary range change](#)

Pg. 4-5

A breakdown of current principal salaries reveals that 19 principals earn a salary of more than \$165,000 (Attachment B). The projected principal salaries for 2025 show that 54 principals will earn a salary that exceeds \$165,000 (Attachment C).

Therefore, pursuant to Section 111.C of the May 5, 2022, Department of Education Leadership Salary Structure, the Department proposes new salary ranges for the Executive Leadership as follows (Attachment A) :

1. Deputy superintendents \$185 ,000 to \$225 ,000; **22% increase**
2. Assistant superintendents: \$170 ,000 to \$210 ,000; and **23.5% increase**
3. Complex area superintendents: \$165 ,000 to \$205 ,000. **24% increase**

To determine the appropriate compensation commensurate with the leader's ability and experience, an initial salary placement component was added to the Department of Education Leadership Salary Structure.

In general, the placement of a newly hired subordinate superintendent will be based on a combination of factors that include years and types of executive leadership experience and an internal pay equity review. In addition, candidates will have an opportunity to justify a higher initial salary placement.

Upon Board approval of this proposed amendment to the Department of Education Leadership Salary Structure, the Department will request future Board action on a one-time salary adjustment to place all appointed subordinate superintendents on the same salary structure. Initiating this one-time analysis will ensure that all current appointed subordinate superintendents are appropriately compensated based on their experience and qualifications.

Pg. 6

Educational implication:

Appropriate compensation for all Department employees is inherent in aligning with the upcoming strategic plan, supporting a high-performing culture where all employees effectively contribute to student success, and is in alignment with Board Policy 500-6.

Pg. 8

OTHER SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department requests future Board action on a one-time salary adjustment to place all appointed subordinate superintendents on the same salary structure.

Pg. 9

IV. Initial Salary Placement

A. The placement of a newly hired subordinate superintendent will be based on years and types of executive leadership experience and an internal pay equity review.

Years and types of executive leadership experience are defined as the number of years and kinds of experience in an executive leadership position in a K-12 or similar education organization (i.e., Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent,

Assistant Superintendent, Complex Area Superintendent, etc.). Principal experience is not considered executive leadership experience for the purpose of calculating initial salary placement.

Internal pay equity review is defined as the process in which an internal review of incumbents is conducted to ensure that the new candidate does not overly exceed the salary of an incumbent in a similar position with the same executive leadership experience.

Pg. 10

B. Initial Placement Above the Minimum (IPAM) Request

The IPAM request provides a conditionally offered executive leadership candidate an opportunity to justify a higher initial salary placement above the minimum. This request will allow the Superintendent to determine whether the IPAM has merit based on qualitative and quantitative data where appropriate. The decision is based on available data and analysis rather than being arbitrary.

A request for an IPAM shall be a memorandum of justification to the Superintendent. The memorandum should:

1. document and present the rationale for an IPAM;
2. the requested IPAM amount in dollars up to the maximum of the salary range; and
3. attach any data or other evidence, if appropriate.

Before submitting the IPAM, it is recommended that the employee review their job description, qualifications, and recent and past performance as they formulate their justification.

Examples of an IPAM request that could be submitted for, but are not limited to:

1. Completed project(s), which are complex in scope, or a function assigned on an ongoing basis by an appropriate authority (i.e., Superintendent) where the work is not a typical duty or responsibility
2. Scope of responsibilities

Pg. 11

3. Specialized certification (e.g., superintendent certification)
4. Education (e.g. a degree above minimum requirements that aligns to job duties and responsibilities)

The Superintendent will review the request and decide on whether the IPAM will be approved as requested, approved with adjustment (e.g., IPAM is made lower or higher), or disapproved. The employee will be notified of the final decision taken. There is no appeal process, and decisions are final.

If the Superintendent approves the IPAM request, the IPAM request will be reflected in the initial salary placement request to the Board.



March 23, 2023
Human Resources (HR) Committee
General Business Meeting

Dear Chair Barcarse, Chair Voss ,and Members of the Board,

We recommend the **BOE defer action** on HR Committee Item V. A. and GBM Item VI. A., as **the information the DOE provided was not answering the BOE’s directive and was confusing and insufficient.**

On Nov 17, 2022, the BOE directed the DOE to “to present a comprehensive system for determining **Complex Area Superintendent (CAS)** salaries based on experience, performance, and levels of responsibility and propose an amendment to the Department of Education Leadership Salary Structure recommending a new salary range for complex area superintendents.” The DOE’s proposal included all leadership levels, which was not what was asked. It is not appropriate to lump all categories together because each group is distinct and should be treated separately.

Secondly, for the CASes, the BOE already gave an across the board pay rise of the base salary to \$165,000. This is the **base salary** starting point for all CASes. Elements such as **responsibility, goals, and execution** should be part of the **performance component, as this will best align incentives with the strategic goals. The framework and details of the performance system should be clear, logical and transparent.** For an individual CAS, specific goals and metrics of what he/she should be responsible for should be clear and transparent to everyone. Because we have a new Strategic Plan and soon to have Key Performance Indicators, it would make sense that the CASes goals and metrics are aligned with these items.

Instead, DOE lumped, goals and performance in the Initial Salary Placement, and left the performance evaluation criteria vague. **We urge the BOE to direct the DOE to go back and provide a more coherent and strategic structure.**

Other Comments on the Memo

The DOE reiterates that salaries for CASes must be higher than principals because we cannot attract principals to the position. Why must we maintain the strategy of hiring internally, or in particular, principals? This practice tends to either cannibalizes the best principals, taking them further away from the students, or rewards the less-than-best with greater compensation. If we considered candidates outside of the DOE, the problem of principals making more than CASes would have less significance. This would be more strategic and sustainable in our view.

The DOE uses an Associate Superintendent Base Salary and District Enrollment table to conclude that the median salary for associate superintendents is \$180,975. We are not clear on what the CAS responsibilities are and whether it equates to those of an Associate Superintendent. Further, we should not compare ourselves to districts with over 100,000 students as our CASes are responsible for a range of 5,000-16,000 students. We, therefore, think this table is inappropriate.

Comments on Leadership Compensation Systems

Leadership compensation systems should reflect how to move the entire system towards improvement. We feel what the DOE has presented is far from complete. It does not provide the current compensation philosophy, objectives and structure. It does not explain how it furthers the mission, vision or goals of the strategic plan. It doesn't explain a performance management system. It doesn't look at cost implications like: can we afford it? What are the implications to the State in terms of costs long-term? How does it impact the State's long-term liabilities?

We thank the BOE for considering our points. **We urge the BOE to direct the DOE to go back and provide sufficient and specific compensation structures for CASes, Assistant Superintendents, and Deputy Superintendents.**

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,
Cheri Nakamura
HE'E Coalition Director

HE'E Coalition Members and Participants

Academy 21
Alliance for Place Based Learning
American Civil Liberties Union
Atherton YMCA
Castle Complex Community Council
Castle-Kahuku Principal and CAS
Education Institute of Hawai'i
*Faith Action for Community Equity
Fresh Leadership LLC
Girl Scouts Hawai'i
Harold K.L. Castle Foundation
*HawaiiKidsCAN
*Hawai'i Afterschool Alliance
*Hawai'i Appleseed Center for Law and Economic Justice
*Hawai'i Association of School Psychologists
Hawai'i Athletic League of Scholars
*Hawai'i Children's Action Network
Hawai'i Education Association
Hawai'i Nutrition and Physical Activity Coalition
* Hawai'i State PTSA
Hawai'i State Student Council
Hawai'i State Teachers Association
Hawai'i P-20
Hawai'i 3Rs
Head Start Collaboration Office
It's All About Kids
*INPEACE
Joint Venture Education Forum
Junior Achievement of Hawaii
Kamehameha Schools
Kanu Hawai'i
Kaua'i Ho'okele Council
Keiki to Career Kaua'i
Kupu A'e
*Leaders for the Next Generation
Learning First
McREL's Pacific Center for Changing the Odds
Native Hawaiian Education Council
Our Public School
*Pacific Resources for Education and Learning
*Parents and Children Together
*Parents for Public Schools Hawai'i
Special Education Provider Alliance
*Teach for America
The Learning Coalition
US PACOM
University of Hawai'i College of Education
* Youth Service Hawai'i
Voting Members () Voting member organizations vote on action items while individual and non-voting participants may collaborate on all efforts within the coalition.*