The "White-Collar" Exemptions

Prepared by:
Michael A. Pavlick
K&L Gates LLP

LORMAN®

Published on www.lorman.com - February 2021

The "White-Collar" Exemptions,, ©2021 Lorman Education Services. All Rights Reserved.

LORMAN®

Lorman Education Services is a leading provider of online professional learning, serving individuals and teams seeking training and CE credits. Whether you're looking for professional continuing education or an enterprise-wide learning and development solution, you will find what you need in Lorman's growing library of resources.

Lorman helps professionals meet their needs with more than 100 live training sessions each month and a growing collection of over 13,000 ondemand courses and resources developed by noted industry experts and professionals.

Learn more about Lorman's individual programs, economical All-Access Pass, and Enterprise Packages:

www.lorman.com

The "White-Collar" Exemptions

The most important, and often most troublesome, exemptions to the minimum wage and overtime requirements under federal and state law are the white-collar exemptions. The FLSA and most state laws provide exemptions for "any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity." 29 U.S.C. § 213(a)(1). The statutes typically do not define these terms; however, USDOL has issued extensive interpretive materials on the subject. 29 C.F.R. Part 541.

To qualify for the executive, administrative, or professional exemptions, employees must satisfy a minimum compensation requirement and both a duties test and a salary basis test. When evaluating whether these tests are satisfied, an employer should consider both its formal policies and job descriptions and its actual practices. If either policies or practices fail to meet the required tests, the exemption may be lost. In addition, the USDOL has identified certain categories of workers who are excluded from the white-collar exemptions. USDOL Fact Sheet #17A (July 2008) (manual laborers, other blue-collar workers, police, firefighters, paramedics, and other first responders are categorically excluded).

A. The Duties Tests

Both federal and state regulations require an analysis of specific activities and duties to determine whether employees are properly classified as executive, administrative, or professional.

1. Executive Exemption

- Must have a primary duty of management.
- Must supervise two or more full-time employees (or their equivalent).
- Must have authority to hire or fire (or determine the status of) other employees.

2. Administrative Exemption

- Must have a primary duty of performing office or non-manual work directly related to management or general business operations of the employer or the employer's customers.
- Must exercise discretion and independent judgment on matters of significance.
- Does not apply to production workers.

3. Professional Exemption

- A learned professional must do work requiring advanced knowledge in a field customarily acquired through prolonged instruction.
- A creative professional must do work requiring invention, imagination, originality, or talent in a recognized artistic or creative field.
- An exempt teacher must be engaged in the imparting of knowledge and work within a school system or educational establishment.
- Must consistently exercise discretion and independent judgment.

4. Combination Exemption

The federal regulations specifically provide that work that qualifies for exemption under the executive, administrative, professional, computer, and outside sales exemptions may be tacked together for employees who have mixed job duties and responsibilities. Such combination exemptions are discussed in 29 C.F.R. § 541.708. *See Schmidt v. Eagle Waste & Recycling, Inc.*, 599 F.3d 626 (7th Cir. 2010) (waste disposal account representative fell within outside sales or combination exemption); *IntraComm. Inc. v. Bajaj*, 492 F.3d 285 (4th Cir. 2007) (finding that combination exemption does not apply if salary requirements are not satisfied).

B. Minimum Compensation Requirement

- Must be paid a minimum of $684 per week on a salary or fee basis.

Federal regulations currently require a base salary for exempt executive, administrative, and professional workers of $684 per week ($35,568 per year). This rate is a minimum and cannot be prorated for part-time employees. USDOL

Opinion Letter FLSA2008-1NA (Feb. 14, 2008); USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2006-10NA (June 1, 2006). The salary requirement does not apply to a few exempt workers, such as attorneys and doctors.

In some cases, this requirement may be satisfied by fee payments for administrative and professional employees. 29 C.F.R. § 541.605(a); USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2018-15 (Jan. 5, 2018). A fee, generally speaking, is an agreed-to sum for a single job regardless of the amount of time it takes to complete the job. It resembles a piecework rate, but a fee differs in that it is paid for a kind of job that is unique rather than for a series of jobs repeated indefinitely and for which payment on an identical basis is made over and over again. Payments based on the number of hours or days worked and not on the accomplishment of a single task are not considered fees. Determining what is and what is not a fee may be difficult. *Compare Elwell v. University Hosp. Home Health Care Servs.*, 76 F.Supp.2d 805 (N.D. Ohio, 1999) (finding payments for visits were not fees) *with Fazekas v. Cleveland Clinic Foundation Health Care Ventures, Inc.*, 204 F.3d 673 (6th Cir. 2000) (finding per visit payments were fees).

In addition, the regulations establish a highly compensated employee exemption. This exemption applies to any worker (1) whose primary duty includes performing office or non-manual work; (2) who is paid $107,432 or more per year in total compensation; and (3) who performs any one or more exempt duties or responsibilities. 29 C.F.R. § 541.601; *Smith v. Ochsner Health Sys.*, 353 F.Supp.3d 483, 498 (E.D. La. 2018); USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2019-8 (July 1, 2019) (finding paralegal for trade group is exempt).

C. The Salary Basis Test

- Must pay a predetermined salary that is not subject to reduction based on the quality or quantity of work performed.

Employers that claim employees as exempt under the executive, administrative, and professional exemptions must, with minor exceptions, pay those employees on a salary basis. Payment on a salary basis involves more than simply payment

of a salary. The salary basis test requires that a white-collar exempt employee be paid a predetermined amount, on a weekly or less frequent basis, that is not subject to reduction because of variations in the quality or quantity of work performed. 29 C.F.R. § 541.600 to .606.

The salary basis test rests on two basic premises. First, employees must receive their full salary for any week in which they perform any work without regard to the number of days or hours worked. Second, employees need not be paid for any work week in which they perform no work.

In the 1990s, class actions focused on violations of the salary basis test. This was true primarily because salary basis violations were often amenable to class determinations. Indeed, in its November 6, 1996 issue, Forbes Magazine estimated salary basis test class actions as a $20 billion liability for private sector employers. Although the likelihood of class-wide litigation was reduced by the Supreme Court decision in *Auer v. Robbins*, 519 U.S. 452 (1997), class litigation is still likely if employers have explicit policies or established practices that violate the salary basis requirements. *See Block v. City of Los Angeles*, 253 F.3d 410 (9th Cir. 2001). If such violations exist, employers run the risk that all their white-collar employees will be treated as hourly employees and entitled to overtime compensation.

1. Permitted Deductions From Pay

The federal salary basis regulations provide that an employer may make certain deductions in a salaried exempt employee's pay without negating that employee's salaried status. Permitted deductions include:

Personal Absences — Deductions for personal absences from work of one day or longer are allowed. Personal absences do not include absences caused or engendered by the employer. Although the federal regulation speaks in terms of deductions for one day or longer and would seemingly allow a deduction for a day-and-a-half, USDOL and the courts have generally required that deductions for personal absences be made in one-day increments. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2018-14 (Jan. 5, 2018).

Sickness Or Disability — Deductions for absences due to sickness or disability lasting one day or longer are permitted if done in accordance with a bona fide plan, policy, or practice of providing compensation for loss of salary occasioned by both sickness and disability. If an employee's absence is covered by a bona fide sick leave policy, the employee's pay may be reduced in one day increments and compensation under the sick leave policy substituted for the relevant days. Thus, if sick leave benefits are provided at a level equivalent to full time pay, then this provision will often have no impact on an employee's actual pay. If sick leave benefits are provided at a fraction of an employee's regular pay, then actual pay is impacted. Moreover, employees who exhaust benefits pursuant to a bona fide sick leave or disability plan may be subject to deductions in pay even though they are not eligible for replacement compensation. *See* USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2018-14 (Jan. 5, 2018); USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2005-7 (Jan. 7, 2005); USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2003-3NA (May 5, 2003).

Disciplinary Suspensions — Deductions for unpaid disciplinary suspensions of one or more full days "imposed in good faith for infractions of workplace conduct rules" are allowed under federal law. 29 C.F.R. § 541.602(b)(5). However, many states do not allow such deductions. This exception focuses on employee misconduct and not on basic performance and attendance issues. *E.g.*, *Watkins v. City of Montgomery, Alabama*, No. 13-11718 (11th Cir. Dec. 24, 2014).

Initial And Terminal Weeks — Deductions that result in partial payments for the initial and terminal weeks of employment are allowed. Employers need not pay exempt employees their full salary during the first and last week of employment. An unresolved issue, however, is what constitutes the terminal week of employment. Employers who suspend an exempt employee pending an investigation that ultimately results in termination should not adjust the employee's compensation for the last week during which the employee worked if the termination decision is made beyond the conclusion of that work week. The issue here is whether the employee's terminal week is the week when the employee is removed from the work site (the last week of work) or the week when the employee is notified of termination (the last week of employment).

FMLA Intermittent Leave – When an employee is eligible for intermittent leave under the FMLA, an employer may make deductions for partial day absences taken in accordance with that law. 29 C.F.R. § 825.206.

Weeks During Which An Employee Performs No Work — One of the general premises underlying the salary basis test is that an "employee need not be paid for any workweek in which he performs no work." Courts have endorsed this position when employers have shut down operations for a complete workweek and when employees have been suspended for a complete workweek. *See Paresi v. City of Portland*, 182 F.3d 665 (9th Cir. 1999) (week-long suspensions do not violate the FLSA); *Childers v. City of Eugene*, 120 F.3d 944, 946 n.2 (9th Cir. 1997) (week-long suspensions do not violate the FLSA); *Leslie v. Ingalls Shipbuilding, Inc.*, 899 F. Supp. 1578 (S.D. Miss. 1995). Note, however, that this approach is fraught with danger. If a salaried-exempt employee does *any* work (even for one-half hour) during the week-long suspension or shutdown, they must be paid for the entire workweek.

2. Prohibited Deductions From Pay

The federal salary basis regulations also identify certain circumstances where the white-collar exemptions may be lost if an employer makes deductions from an employee's established pay. Such prohibited deductions include:

Employer Shutdowns — Deductions for absences caused by the employer or its operating requirements are prohibited. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2009-18 (Jan. 16, 2009). Note, however, that if employers shut down operations for an entire work week, employers may choose not to pay exempt employees their entire weekly salary pursuant to the general rule that employers need not pay exempt employees for any work week in which the employees perform no work. *Leslie v. Ingalls Shipbuilding, Inc.*, 899 F. Supp. 1578 (S.D. Miss. 1995).

Civic Responsibilities — Deductions for absences involving responsibilities such as jury duty, attendance as a witness, and temporary military leave are prohibited. Under these provisions, employers may offset any compensation employees receive for their activities against the salary employers would otherwise pay.

Partial Day Absences — Deductions for partial day absences are generally not allowed. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2018-14 (Jan. 5, 2018). The implicit message in the personal absence and sick leave deduction provisions is that such deductions must be made in full day increments. Deductions for partial day absences are thus generally prohibited. Note, however, that special provisions allow for partial day deductions by public employers under prescribed circumstances. 29 C.F.R. § 541.710.

Overpayments --- Deductions for overpayments may be limited with respect to exempt employees. Generally, employers may deduct from or reduce pay for non-exempt employees for the purpose of recouping overpayments. In those instances, the employer can usually reduce the pay of a non-exempt employee at its discretion (subject to state law, including wage payment laws). Where there is an overpayment of wages, the principal often may be deducted from the employee's earnings even if such deduction cuts into the minimum wage or overtime pay. An employer may not make, however, an assessment for administrative costs or charge any interest that brings the employee below the minimum wage. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2004-19NA (October 8, 2004). However, with respect to exempt employees, deductions for amounts overpaid pursuant to a short term disability plan are not permitted pursuant to the salary basis test. It would be possible, though, for the employer to recover such overpayments from later disability payments, or through reductions in the employee's accumulated sick leave. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA (July 30, 1996). Additionally, there is some suggestion that deductions for overpayment of wages would not implicate the salary basis determination. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA (March 20, 1998) ("The overpaid employee's status as a pilot relative to the professional exemption . . . and the [Railway Labor Act] exemption would not affect [the employer's] ability to recoup money due to it because of previous advances of wages by reducing the employee's paychecks.").

3. Reductions In Leave Banks

Federal courts have generally drawn a distinction between deductions from pay and reductions in accrued leave banks. Thus, courts interpreting the salary basis regulation have generally agreed that employers may require salaried exempt workers to use leave time to offset their partial day absences. *E.g.*, *Barner v. City of Novato*, 17 F.3d 1256 (9th Cir. 1994); *McDonnell v. City of Omaha*, 999 F.2d 293 (8th Cir.), *cert*. *denied*, 510 U.S. 1163 (1994). Similarly, an employer may require employees to use accrued leave time for absences due to plant shutdowns or operational concerns. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2009-2 (Jan. 14, 2009); USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2009-18 (Jan. 16, 2009). This analysis applies to private employers under federal law. *Webster v. Public School Employees of Wash., Inc.*, 247 F.3d 910 (9th Cir. 2001).

An important issue that must be addressed by all employers is what happens when salaried exempt employees have exhausted their leave time and take further partial day absences. If the employer then allows for deductions from pay, the salary basis test is violated. *E.g.*, *Kinney v. District of Columbia*, 994 F.2d 6 (D.C. Cir. 1993). Moreover, at least one court has found that employers violate the salary basis test by maintaining records of negative compensatory time that an employee must pay back to the company. *See Klein v. Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Ctr.*, 990 F.2d 279 (7th Cir. 1993). Despite the *Klein* decision (which can be limited on its facts), employers should not run afoul of the federal salary basis test if they require reductions in leave banks but specifically assure that no deductions in pay will occur even if leave banks are exhausted. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2009-2 (Jan. 14, 2009); USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2005-7 (Jan. 7, 2005).

4. Payment Of Additional Compensation

The salary basis regulations require that white collar exempt employees be paid all or part of their compensation on a salary basis. Federal law expressly allows compensation in addition to an exempt employee's guaranteed base salary. The payment of bonuses or commissions in addition to a base salary amount is consistent with the salary basis requirement. *See Hogan v. Allstate Ins. Co.,* 361

F.3d 621 (11th Cir. 2004) (finding that insurance agents who received a guaranteed minimum plus commissions fell within the administrative exemption). Although there was once some dispute as to whether salaried exempt employees may be paid additional compensation on an hour-for-hour basis, *e.g.*, *Brock v. Claridge Hotel & Casino*, 846 F.2d 180 (3d Cir.), *cert*. *denied*, 488 U.S. 925 (1988), it is now clear that payment of straight-time or overtime wages to salaried exempt employees is permissible under the FLSA. *See Boykin v. The Boeing Co.*, 128 F.3d 1279 (9th Cir. 1997); *Fairris v. City of Bessemer*, 252 Fed. Appx. 309, 2007 WL 3120313 (11th Cir. Oct. 25, 2007). However, the "reasonable relationship" rule at 29 C.F.R. § 541.604 acts as a limit on such extra compensation where it is paid on an hourly, daily or shift basis. Section 541.604 generally allows an employer to "provide an exempt employee with additional compensation without losing the exemption or violating the salary basis requirement, if the employment arrangement also includes a guarantee of at least the minimum weekly-required amount paid on a salary basis." However, the reasonable relationship rule acts to limit the amount that can be paid in addition to the guaranteed salary. While no firm ratio has been established, a 1.5:1 ratio between the extra compensation and the guaranteed salary has been deemed to be reasonable. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA2018-25 (November 8, 2018). A ratio above 1.5:1 may violate the reasonable relationship rule and result in the employee being treated as an hourly, non-exempt employee. *See Rachid Chakir, et al., Plaintiffs, v. BA Research Int'l, LP, et al., Defendants*, No. H-10-2850, 2011 WL 13248862 (S.D. Tex. July 15, 2011) ("An example of an unreasonable relationship is this: a guarantee of $455 per week—an implicit $12.50 per hour—when the nurses are paid $50 per hour."). However, if the employee is "highly compensated," *e.g.*, makes enough to qualify for the highly compensated employee exemption, the reasonable relationship rule may not apply. *Anani v. CVS RX Services, Inc.,* 730 F.3d 146 (2d Cir. 2013).

5. Correcting Improper Deductions

Even if an employer makes improper deductions in violation of the salary basis test, USDOL has established a window of correction that provides two avenues to

avoid the loss of exempt status. First, if deductions "are either isolated or inadvertent," an exemption is not lost if the employer reimburses the employees for any improper deductions. 29 C.F.R. § 541.603(c). Second, if an employer has a clearly communicated policy prohibiting improper deductions and includes a complaint mechanism, reimburses employees for any improper deductions, and makes a good faith commitment to comply in the future, the employer will not lose the exemption unless the employer "willfully violates the policy by continuing to make improper deductions after receiving employee complaints." 29 C.F.R. § 541.603(d).

6. Furloughs and Other Reductions in Pay and Hours

As noted above, furloughs will not impact exempt status so long as the furlough is for an entire work week or a multiple thereof. However, if an employee performs any work during the furlough period, he or she must be paid his or her full salary.

The issue of reducing work weeks and/or hours worked with a corresponding reduction in salary is more opaque. As a general rule, employers may reduce the work week or the number of hours to be worked, with a corresponding reduction in salary, during a given week.

It goes without saying that such reductions should be prospective and not retroactive, and should not reduce the salary for that week below the statutory minimum. Importantly, any such reductions should not be a reaction to short-term business needs, nor should they be recurrent. Reductions done on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis will be closely scrutinized and are likely to run afoul of the salary requirement basis.

A leading case is *In re. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 395 F.3d 1177 (10th Cir.). There, the employer paid exempt pharmacists a salary, but it sometimes reduced their base hours and correspondingly reduced their salaries. The court approved the practice relative to the issue of salary basis because the changes were not so frequent as to make the salary the functional equivalent of an hourly wage. In this case, the court determined that the employer rarely reduced salaries and was not designed to circumvent the salary basis requirements of the FLSA. The court

cited with approval several DOL opinion letters which permitted similar reductions. In one, DOL approved of an aerospace employer's plan, in an effort to reduce costs after already extensive layoffs, to have five four-day workweeks per year, with a corresponding reduction in salaries for exempt employees. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA (Nov. 13, 1970). In another, a mental health provider proposed, in response to reductions in state spending, to reduce the work week from 40 to 32 hours with a commensurate reduction in pay. The DOL opined that such a reduction will not defeat an otherwise valid exemption. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSA (March 4, 1997).

In contrast, the DOL recently determined an employer's hours reduction program to be contrary to the salary basis requirement. The employer, in some instances, required employees to take time off due to short-term business needs (low patient census). DOL disapproved of the scheme because it derived from short-term needs and the operating requirements of the employer's business. The reductions in salary, reasoned DOL, were due to day-to-day or week-to-week determinations of the operating requirements. USDOL Opinion Letter FLSAO2009-14 (Jan. 15, 2009).

To summarize, reductions in salary which correspond with reductions in hours of work will not defeat an exemption unless a direct reaction to short-term business needs.

6. Tips To Avoid Salary Basis Issues

Employers should always expect to pay salaried exempt employees their full salary for any work week during which they engage in any work. Reductions in salary should not occur unless explicitly and unambiguously allowed.

An employer should be very cautious with any deductions from pay. Any incremental work (even for one-half hour) during a period of deduction will require payment of the employee's entire salary.

Employers should establish an overriding policy that explicitly states that no other employment policy shall be construed to allow any act, including any deduction

from pay, that is inconsistent with or would defeat the salary basis of payment for exempt employees. The Ninth Circuit found that an employer may use such an overarching policy as a defense to establish that instances when deductions in pay do occur are incidental and not the policy or practice of the employer. *Hackett v. Lane County*, 91 F.3d 1289 (9th Cir. 1996).

The material appearing in this website is for informational purposes only and is not legal advice. Transmission of this information is not intended to create, and receipt does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship. The information provided herein is intended only as general information which may or may not reflect the most current developments. Although these materials may be prepared by professionals, they should not be used as a substitute for professional services. If legal or other professional advice is required, the services of a professional should be sought.

The opinions or viewpoints expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of Lorman Education Services. All materials and content were prepared by persons and/or entities other than Lorman Education Services, and said other persons and/or entities are solely responsible for their content.

Any links to other websites are not intended to be referrals or endorsements of these sites. The links provided are maintained by the respective organizations, and they are solely responsible for the content of their own sites.