

## **Industrial Mechanic Millwright Apprenticeship Program**

*(City Council on December 14, 15 and 16, 1999, adopted this Clause, without amendment.)*

**The Works Committee recommends that individuals who were denied an opportunity to participate in the Industrial Mechanic Millwright Program based on educational requirements that exceeded those required by legislation, be deemed qualified and be provided with an opportunity to participate in the program as soon as practicable; and that eligible individuals be placed on a waiting list for the next program.**

**The Works Committee submits the following report (November 16, 1999) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services:**

### Purpose:

The purpose of the report is to identify how employees who wish to be retrained as part of the Industrial Mechanic Millwright Apprenticeship Program can be facilitated and how this can be achieved before the change of legislation.

### Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of this report.

### Recommendation:

It is recommended that this report be received for information.

### Background:

The Works Best Practices Work Group, a sub-committee of Council, at its meeting of October 25, 1999, requested the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to report to the Works Committee at its meeting to be held on Wednesday, December 1, 1999, on the feasibility and cost of implementing Recommendation No. 8 contained in Clause No. 1 of Report No. 2 of The Works and Utilities Committee, as follows:

“The Works Best Practices Program Work Group be requested to submit a report to Council for its meeting to be held on April 13, 1999, through the Works and Utilities Committee, on how those employees who wish to be retrained can be facilitated and how this can be achieved before the change of legislation.”

The Work Group also directed that individuals who were denied an opportunity to participate in the Industrial Millwright/Mechanic Program based on educational requirements that exceeded those required by legislation, be deemed qualified and be provided with an opportunity to participate in the program as soon as practicable.

The Works Best Practices Work Group, at its meeting of April 12, 1999, received a binder from staff that addressed the process followed in the Water and Wastewater Services Division that dealt with job design and classification, redeployment, staffing, training, mechanical skills training program, industrial mechanic millwright, electrical and instrumentation control technician and safety as they related to the implementation of the Works Best Practices Program initiated in the Works Department of the former Metro Corporation.

At its meeting of June 2, 1999, the Work Group requested staff to contact the colleges regarding the status of academic entrance requirements for the Industrial Millwright Apprenticeship Mechanic Program and subsequently the issues related to the current Apprenticeship Act and the new Bill 55.

Comments:

In the reference binder that was distributed to the attendees at the April meeting of the Works Best Practices Work Group, we identified the existing establishment of Industrial Mechanic Millwrights and the future requirements. We also identified the number of apprentices that would potentially graduate through to the year 2005.

The Apprenticeship Program was started in the former Metro Works in 1995, and is a four-year program that allows the employee to attend college one day per week for up to 35 days per year for the first three years. Ninety percent of the apprenticeship program is work related and ten percent of the training curriculum is carried out at the college over the three years. A total of 8,000 hours is part of the apprenticeship program. As identified in the April material, the existing establishment of Mechanic Millwrights is 63 and the projected future establishment in the year 2005 is 112. With an allowance for ten normal retirements over the next five years, we are looking for 59. Based on the program that has been established, a potential total of 65 will graduate by the year 2005.

Under the apprenticeship program, each graduating employee is expected to be placed in a permanent full-time position and to practice their trade in the Province of Ontario the successful apprentice must apply to sit and pass an exam for a Certificate of Qualification. As can be seen from the numbers, we could potentially be training more staff than there are jobs available depending on the actual success rate and the actual attrition rate. Beyond the year 2005, we would only need staff to enter the apprenticeship program in order to replace employees retiring or leaving our organization. Given the commitment of time and effort required from the employee and the employer, we would not wish to put too many people through the program if there are insufficient jobs.

With regards to the individuals who were denied an opportunity under the current program, we identified that the original application list comprised 261 staff. From this original list, 45 are no longer employed with the division, 42 did not sit for an assessment of their qualifications, 45 were assessed and needed educational upgrading and a further 32 needed upgrading but declined to participate. Of the remaining 97, 21 graduated in 1998 and 65 will graduate from the program between 1999 and 2005. The seniority list that was used to pick the order for entry into the

program still has seven names left on it, and there is the pending list of names for employees that will be enrolled in 2001.

The Work Group identified that individuals who were denied an opportunity to participate based on educational requirements that exceeded those required under the Apprenticeship Act be provided with an opportunity to participate in the program.

Reviewing the original applicant list, we would be required to contact approximately 119 staff on the original list who were either not assessed or were assessed and needed upgrading to determine if they met the requirement for the course and had a minimum of Grade 10. While we could undertake this process, we are reluctant to do so given the fact that there is no guarantee of a position at the end of the program.

Regarding the academic qualifications, I have received a response from Durham College that arrived in my office after the last Work Group meeting that addresses the issue of Grade 10, Grade 12 and the new Bill 55. While Bill 55 is not in force at the present time, the college suggests that an employer entering staff into the apprenticeship training program should encourage the minimum level of Grade 12 Math and Communications to allow the employee career opportunities and success.

The next opportunity for staff to enter the college program is September 2000. There are no opportunities to enter the program once it is underway, and even if some students drop out of the program, you cannot add others to replace them as they need to attend from day one.

Regarding costs for the programs, the City has set up milling machines, lathes and welding machines to create on-site work shops that has cost \$740,000.00. The on-going annual expenditure for the trainers, tools and textbooks is in the order of \$300,000.00. While the apprenticeship program is provided by the colleges at no cost, the one-day leave of absence for each employee at an average of \$18.00 per hour for an eight-hour day, 35 days a year equates to \$5,040.00 per employee per year. The City has provided and paid for a skills enhancement program and academic upgrading that runs in excess of \$130,000.00 since September 1996.

#### Conclusions:

Based on the original program that was established that will produce Industrial Millwright Mechanic graduates through to the year 2005, we will have all of the qualified staff that we need at the end of this program. To allow additional staff to enter the program at the next opportunity in September 2000 will provide graduates in excess of our needs as projected to date. In the future, we only need sufficient graduates to keep up with the normal attrition rate in this area of expertise which we anticipate to be ten between now and the year 2005, and we have included this number in the final graduates. Given the fact that we should have a permanent position for an apprentice to move into, we are reluctant to train staff based on false expectations.

We are prepared to discuss with the unions how we might contact the 119 on the original list to determine how we can create a new list of potential students for the apprentice program in order to keep pace with normal attrition beyond the year 2005. Given that the earliest opportunity that

any new students can be enrolled in this program is September 2000, we believe that there is time to discuss the establishment of a new apprenticeship pending list with the unions, prior to this date, which would be based on normal attrition rates.

The colleges have indicated that the level of entrance is relatively uniform across the province by colleges delivering apprenticeship or apprenticeship accredited post secondary programs, as contained in the two letters which are attached.

Contact:

Michael A. Price, P.Eng., FICE  
General Manager, Water and Wastewater Services  
Email: mprice@city.toronto.on.ca  
Tel: 392-8200; Fax: 392-4540

**The Works Committee also submits the following communication (December 1, 1999) from the Toronto Civic Employees' Union, Local 416:**

Local 416 represents approximately 7,000 members who work for the City of Toronto in many capacities, including the Water and Wastewater Divisions.

We appreciate the opportunity to address the Works Committee with respect to the report dealing with the Industrial Millwright/Mechanic Training Program. There has been much discussion regarding this training program over the years. As always, it is our goal to see if issues related to this program can be resolved in a manner that would satisfy all parties involved.

It is important for us to note at this point that the following information is being provided without prejudice or precedent to any other proceeding that Local 416 is involved with in relation to the Industrial Mechanic/Millwright Program, including but not limited to, grievances, arbitration, labour board proceedings or collective bargaining.

The report on the Industrial Mechanic/Millwright Apprenticeship Program is in response to a directive from the Works Best Practices Work Group, from its meeting of October 25, 1999. The minutes from this meeting are attached.

The report expresses a willingness to a motion of the Works Best Practices Work Group adopted October 25, 1999, which states:

“The Work Group also directed that individuals who were denied an opportunity to participate in the Industrial Millwright/Mechanic Program based on educational requirements that exceeded those required by legislation be deemed qualified and be provided with an opportunity to participate in the program as soon as practicable.”

During the meeting, the Work Group asked that staff contact those individuals who were denied into the program based on educational requirements. It is our understanding this has not occurred. We are here to ask why.

A City of Toronto Council recommendation adopted by the City of Toronto Council at its meeting on March 3, 4, and 5, 1999, states (a copy of the minutes and correspondence from Local 416 to the Works Best Practices Work Group are attached):

“The Works Best Practices Work Group be requested to submit a report to Council for its meeting to be held on April 13, 1999, through the Works and Utilities Committee, on how those employees who wish to be retrained can be facilitated and how this can be achieved before the change of legislation.”

In addition, we will provide a response to some of the content of the report itself in the following submission.

Background:

Local 416 requested that an agenda item with respect to the above program be on the agenda of the Works Best Practices Work Group at its meeting of October 25, 1999. The request was made because we believed that there was a motion already adopted by Council that was not being adhered to.

Attached to this correspondence is the submission of Local 416 to the Work Group, which included a summary of motions regarding the Works Best Practices Program that were adopted by the City of Toronto Council at its meeting on March 2, 3 and 4, 1999. Recommendations Nos. (8) and (9) deal specifically with the issues of training and retraining.

The former Metro Toronto and the former Local 43 entered into an agreement regarding the selection process for an Industrial Millwright/Mechanic Apprenticeship Program ("IMM") in 1995.

The agreement did not specifically address the issue of educational requirements. The legislated requirement for a program of this nature was, and continues to be, grade 10. Notwithstanding this legislated requirement, the employer required individuals to possess grade 12 math and English before they could be considered for the program.

Since that time the provincial government has taken certain steps to amend legislation to require that the educational requirements for entry into a program of this nature be set at grade 12. Bill 55, the Apprenticeship and Certification Act, has received Royal Assent, but has not been proclaimed. We have been advised, as of October 22, 1999, by a representative of the Apprenticeship Office of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, that the former act (which requires grade 10) remains in effect.

Councillor Bussin moved the attached motion No. 8. After consultation with Councillor Bussin, it is our understanding that the intent of the motion was to ensure individuals who were denied access to the IMM training program based on educational requirements, and who possessed the legislated requirement, be provided with an opportunity to participate in the program before Bill 55 became law.

Prior to the Works Best Practices Work Group meeting, there had been discussions regarding this issue in a number of forums, including the Works Best Practices Work Group and during Collective Bargaining, but there had not been a resolution to that date.

Subsequent to the Work Group meeting, we believed that the directive provided a direction to staff that would bring the parties closer to a resolution.

Unfortunately, the report before the Committee does not allow for such a resolution.

#### Responses to the Report:

(1) Numbers quoted in the report:

The report provides a discussion of the numbers required in the “Comments” section.

We provide the following as a response:

- (1) Regardless of the numbers, there is a Council directive in place, that must be complied with.
- (2) Notwithstanding our position with respect to the former lists, a discussion and clarification of the numbers being cited is warranted. For example, it is our understanding that a list stemming from the agreement between the former parties of those who have been deemed qualified stands at five individuals. We are aware that there is another “unofficial” list of individuals who are not on a “formal list”, who are also qualified.

We believe that individuals who were otherwise denied based on qualifications must be put on the list in order of seniority.

- (3) If, in fact, this results in a surplus of workers, the provisions of the collective agreement would apply accordingly.
- (4) We believe that individuals who were denied this opportunity in the program to participate must be compensated for their loss of opportunity if no further individuals are to be trained.

(2) Academic Qualifications:

We provide the following response:

- (1) We have been advised by representatives of the Apprenticeship Office of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, on an ongoing basis, that the legislated requirement for an apprenticeship program of this nature remains grade 10.

- (2) While the Work Group requested that only two colleges be canvassed for information regarding the issue of academic qualifications, the union asked that four colleges be canvassed (correspondence attached). This did not occur. In our discussions with representatives from various colleges, there is an acknowledgement that the legislative requirement for an apprenticeship program of this nature is grade 10.
- (3) It is important to note that, while the college may have made recommendations, the City admits setting the educational requirement for entry to this program.
- (4) The current climate is one of downsizing. This is not a period of “business as usual”. Employees with seniority should be given every opportunity to be provided with training that will allow them to retain their employment with the City.
- (5) The Work Group directed that letters to the colleges be done in consultation with the Union. We note that the letter from Durham College was received October 27, 1999. The local did not receive a copy until November 25, 1999.

#### Conclusions and Recommendations:

The report before the Committee states that they are “reluctant to train staff based on false expectations”. We believe that this is not an acceptable response, given a directive from Council, as well as directive from the Works Best Practices Work Group.

Based on the foregoing, we believe that the Works Committee should provide direction to staff to implement the Works Best Practices Work Group [directive], which states that:

“Individuals who were denied an opportunity to participate in the industrial Millwright/Mechanic Program based on educational requirements that exceeded those required by legislation, be deemed qualified and be provided with an opportunity to participate in the program as soon as possible.”

We thank the Committee for the opportunity to express our view on this very important issue, and would welcome questions.

---

The Works Committee reports, for the information of Council, having also had before it during consideration of the foregoing matter Course Outlines from Durham College of Applied Arts and Technology for the Industrial Maintenance Mechanic/Millwright Apprentice Program, submitted by the Toronto Civic Employees’ Union, Local 416, for the following courses:

- Trade Theory – Basic Level;
- Mathematics – Basic Level;
- Blueprint Reading – Basic Level; and

- Workshop Practical – Basic Level.

The following persons appeared before the Works Committee in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Ms. Gina Gignac, National Representative, Toronto Civic Employees' Union, Local 416, and submitted a communication with respect thereto; and
- Councillor Sandra Bussin, East Toronto.

(A copy of each of the attachments referred to in the foregoing report has been forwarded to all Members of Council with the agenda for the Works Committee meeting of December 1, 1999, and a copy thereof is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)