

Peter Wallace City Manager **City Manager Office** City Hall, 11th Fl. East Tower 100 Queen St. West Toronto, ON M5H 2N2 Tel: (416) 392-3551 Fax: (416) 392-1827 Peter.wallace@toronto.ca www.toronto.ca

2017 OPERATING BUDGET BRIEFING NOTE Progression Pay for Non-union Employees – City of Toronto Divisions

Issue/Background:

This Briefing Note responds to a request from Budget Committee for detailed information on the financial impact of progression pay for non-union employees in City Divisions and Agencies in 2016. Specifically, information to include:

- number of employees subject to progression increases in 2016;
- the 2016 financial impact of these increases;
- the number of employees by division or by agency and the corresponding rating;
- the cost of living increase given in 2016, and
- the average performance increase given in 2016.

In addition, a legal opinion on whether these increases can be frozen (i.e. negated for 2017) or paid back, was requested. A Confidential Briefing Note is attached providing this opinion.

- The Council approved Non-union Compensation and Performance Management System for employee in City of Toronto divisions includes a performance-based salary progression, which allows employees to progress through their salary grade range, from range minimum to maximum, based on individual merit/performance.
- Employees who are at the top of their salary range are eligible to receive an annual performance-based re-earnable lump sum payment.
- The salary range maximum is the competitive job rate for the position.
- Under the current performance management system in the Toronto Public Service, it takes the majority of employees, based on a performance rating of *'meeting expectations'*, seven (7) years to move from the minimum of the salary range to the competitive job rate. As identified in previous external Consultants' reviews, this is an excessive length of time for an employee to achieve the job rate of their position (and is not in keeping with best practices followed by other organizations in the broader public sector).
- Any reductions in performance financial rewards will increase the time it takes an employee to reach the competitive job rate of their position.
- A competitive compensation program includes salary progression and merit performance rewards and is critical for driving a high-performing workforce, for optimizing organization performance, and for being able to effectively recruit and retain talent.

Key Points:

- Approximately 4400 active non-union employees received a performance payment in 2016, for a total cost of \$11,317,695
- The cost of living increase provided in 2016 was 1.25%
- The average performance increase given in 2016 was \$2526
- Performance payments are added to base salary for those employees moving through the range, and provided as lump sum payment for those at the maximum of the range
- A separate, accompanying Confidential Briefing Note provides a legal opinion on whether 'progression pay' and cost-of-living increases for non-union employees can be frozen for 2017 or paid back
- In addition to the legal considerations, it should be noted that the City's nonunion/management group have previously received wage freezes and cancellation of performance payments, resulting in reduction of salary increases relative to their unionized colleagues at the City. Unionized employees, representing the large majority of the workforce in the Toronto Public Service continue to receive negotiated cost-of-living increases, and, where applicable, step increases.
- Any type of freeze on non-union compensation may contribute to salary compression, as union wages continue to rise, while non-union do not.
- Management and non-union employees are responsible for maintaining City operations during any potential labour disruption, emergency situation, etc. Providing differential salary treatment to this group does not demonstrate the recognition for these significant and essential contributions.
- Any decision to implement performance pay freezes should consider the impact on employee morale, engagement and the City's ability to attract and retain talent.
- The performance rating distribution for City divisions, by clusters, in 2016 was as follows:

Cluster/ Division	Numbers Exceeds	Per cent Exceeds	Numbers Meets	Per cent Meets	Numbers Meets Most	Per cent Meets Most	Numbers Unsatisfactory	Numbers Unsatisfactory
А	260	14.76%	1,390	78.93%	57	3.24%	6	0.34%
В	187	15.13%	945	76.46%	33	2.67%	4	0.32%
С	125	13.62%	697	75.93%	38	4.14%	3	0.33%
City Manager's Office	65	15.33%	327	77.12%	7	1.65%	0	0.00%
City Clerk's	10	8.85%	98	86.73%	1	0.88%	0	0.00%
Legal	24	15.09%	120	75.47%	1	0.63%	1	0.63%
Overall (TPS)	671	14.55%	3,577	77.58%	137	2.97%	14	0.30%

2015 Performance Review Ratings by Cluster

Notes:

Data does not include Accountability Officers and their staff and staff in the Mayor's or Councillors' offices.

The percentages for the four performance review rating levels do not add up to 100 per cent because not all employee performance reviews were processed in SAP. The most common reasons for reviews not being processed were employee absences such as sick leave or the employee left the organization before the end of the performance review cycle.

Performance/Progression Pay – Agency Summary

		-		1			r							
		Number of Exempt	Does Agency use											
	Number of	Exempt	City policy for						Average					
	Exempt	Entitled to	Performance	Not		Meets Most	Meets		PerformancePa	Performance				
Agency Name/Program	Employees	Progression Pay	Assessments?	Eligible	Unsatisfactory	Expectations	Expectations	Exceeds	y payment	Increase \$	COLA %	COLA \$	Notes	
		,		J	,,				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				TPL non-union compensation plans	
													are administered in accordance with	
													City of Toronto non-union	
Toronto Public Library	118	115	No	3	1	17	74	20	\$ 2,759.95	\$ 309,114.40	1.25%	\$ 180,000.0	copmensation plan	
													TPS employees are not eligible for	
Toronto Police Service	6	3	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ 6,166.00	\$ 18,500.00	2.43%	\$ 24,500.0	performance pay. The performance increase is related to progression pay	
Toronio Police Service	0	3	INU	IN/A	INA	INA	INA	INFA	\$ 0,100.00	\$ 16,500.00	2.43%	\$ 24,500.0	TPSB employees are not eligible for	
Toronto Police Service Board	5	0	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	۹	¢ .	2.43%	\$ 19.500.0	performance pay.	
Toronto & Region Conservation Authority	75		No	0	0	0	75	0	\$ 2,226.00	\$ 167,000.00	2.43%	\$ 350,000.00		
Toronio & Region Conservation Authority	75	75	INU	0	0	0	75	0	\$ 2,220.00	\$ 167,000.00	2.00%	\$ 350,000.00	TTC Performance pay is related to	
													progression (step rate increases) and	
													staff at the top of their respective pay	
													range are not eligible for progression	
													pay increases.	
													The number of TTC non-union	
													employees that were eligible for step	
				[1						rate increases but were denied due to	
				[1						poor work performanance is minimal	
				[1						as the TTC takes corrective action	
													immediately for poor work	
													performance, with action including	
Toronto Transit Commission	3,239	910	No	2,329	0	0	910	0	\$ 2,021.98	\$ 1,840,000.00	1.75%	\$ 6,900,000.00	dismisal.	
Exhibition Place	119	119	Yes	0	0	4	94	21	2.81%	\$ 241,899.00	1.25%	\$ 107,722.0		
Heritage	7	7	Yes	7	0	0	0	0	N/A	\$-	2.50%	\$ 6,850.6	2	
Arena Boards of Management	56.4	33.6	No	0	0	0	8	6	1.25% to 2.5%	\$ 38,768.05	1.00% to 2.5%	\$ 31,593.2		
Bill Bolton	8.3	0	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$-	N/A	\$-	3	
Ted Reeve	10	8	No	0	0	0	8	0	2.00%	\$ 7,745.00	N/A	s -	4	
McCormick	7	0	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ -	2.25%	\$ 8,000.0	3	
Moss Park	6.7		No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.50%	\$ 8,497.05	2.50%	\$ 8,497.05	3,5	
		-							FT: 2%. PT:	+ 0,101100		• •,•••••	0,0	
North Toronto	7.6	7.6	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.3%	\$ 12,848.00	N/A	s -	3	
Forest Hill	9.8	6	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.75%	\$ 7,855.00	2.25%	\$ 10,504.0	3	
Leaside	1	1	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.25%	\$ 1,391.0	3	
George Bell	6	6	No	0	0	0	0	6	1.25%	\$ 1,823.00	1.00%	\$ 3,201.1	4	
Yonge Dundas Square	6	5	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.45%	\$ 11,153.00	1.25%	\$ 5,318.0	6	
Toronto Zoo	96		Yes	9		6	66	15	1.15%	\$ 38,824.00	1.90%	\$ 148,989.00	7	
Toronto Centre for the Arts	13		No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.50%	\$ 20,653.00	8	
St. Lawrence Centre for the Arts	13		No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.20%	\$ 19,700.00	8	
Sony Centre for the Performing Arts	31.7	N/A	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.25%	\$ 50,000.00	8	
Applegrove Community Complex	31.7	3	Yes	0	0	0	0	3	4.50%	\$ 8,481.05	1.25%	\$ 2,673.98	8	
Cecil Community Centre	3	3	Yes	0	0	1	1	1	4.50%	\$ 7,649.00	1.25%	\$ 2,073.98		
	3	4	Yes	0		1	1	3	3.40%	\$ 7,649.00 \$ 10,809.38	1.25%	. ,		
Central Eglinton Community Centre	4				1									
Community Centre 55	3	3	Yes				2	1	3%	\$ 6,732.98	1.25%	\$ 4,258.51		
Eastview Neighbourhood Community Centre	3	3	Yes				2	1	\$ 2,606.00	\$ 9,615.00	1.25%	\$ 1,796.00		
													1 Staff was hired in November 2015,	
Ralph Thornton Community Centre		2	Yes	4				4	2.17%	\$ 5,380.00	1.25%	\$ 3,127	therefore, not eligible for progression increase.	
Scadding Court Community Centre	5	5	Yes	0		1	3	1	2.17%	\$ 13,306.80	1.25%	\$ 6,239	inorodoc.	
	5	2					2		2.50%			÷ 0,200		
Swansea Town Hall Community Centre	2		Yes	0						\$ 3,974.00	1.25%	\$ 1,984	3 Staff were hired in 2016, therefore,	
The 519 Community Centre	15	12	Yes	3			10	2	2.09%	\$ 23,541.36	1.25%	\$ 12,432	not eligible for progression increase.	
Waterfront Neighbourhood Centre (former Harbourfront	15	12	Tes	3			10	2	2.09%	\$ 23,541.30	1.25%		not eligible for progression increase.	
Community Centre)	6	6	Yes	0			6			\$ 15,197.43	1.25%	\$ 6.259		
	, in the second se		100	0						φ 10,101.10	1.2070	\$ 0,200		
Total	3832.1	1423.6		2352	2	29	1254	75		\$ 2,769,945.45	1.94%	\$ 7,913,475.34		
Notes					L									
										t meeting expectat				
2							ncreases being	awarded to t	he Agencies 7 e	exempt employees.	COLA is award	ed to those		
	exempt employees who have completed one full year of service (2016: 4 employees)													
3	3 The Arena does not leverage City policy for performance assessments; performance pay and COLA awards are ultimately subject to approval by the Arena's board of management.													
4	4 The Arena leverages City policy for performance assessments as a guideline only; performance pay and COLA awards are ultimately subject to approval by the Arena's board of man												agement.	
	5 The Moss Park Arena Board of Management approved a uniform 5% increase to its 5 full-time employees to cover cost of living as well as progression increases (assumed to be 2.5%)													
	6 The Agency maintains its own system of performance/merit assessment which is applied within Board approved salary ranges to determine increases. Under this methodology, 5													
	implying menetation is form system or province pay increases based on start dates, however all 6 exempt employees were available COLA. Performance pay and COLA avaids are													
		vere eligible for	performance bav	intracted subject to approval by the agency's board of management.										
	employees w													
e	employees w ultimately sub	bject to approva	al by the agency's	board of	management.									
7	employees w ultimately sul The Board h	bject to approva as adopted a pe	al by the agency's erformance pay po	board of blicy that	management. is consistent with	n the City's prac	ctices.							
7	employees w ultimately sul The Board h The Boards f	bject to approva as adopted a pe	al by the agency's erformance pay po vic Theatres do no	board of blicy that	management. is consistent with	n the City's prac	ctices.							

Prepared by: Kerry Pond, Executive Director of Human Resources, Human Resources Division, 416-397-4112, kerry.pond@toronto.ca

Further information: Barbara Shulman, Director, Strategic Recruitment, Compensation & Employment Services, Human Resources Division, 416-392-7987, barbara.shulman@toronto.ca

Date: January 6, 2017