



COMPILATION OF COTAPSA MEMBER RESPONSES TO Performance Plan Survey (June 2017)

Concerns and comments made to the COTAPSA Office in the winter of 2017 in relation to Performance Planning (PP) and its process created the COTAPSA Boards interest in surveying members on their experience(s).

The response received over a 2 week turn around in mid-June/17, by over 1/3 of members, was overwhelming.

- Respondents believed the timing of the PP should have been initiated in Jan/17 to start 2018.
- Respondents see Council using PP as a tool making non-union employees 'scapegoats' during budget deliberations with the intent to use them as political pawns to garner votes and foster positive media attention ... this is unfair to the group who keep the City running in difficult times and are the employees the City looks to for leadership and creativity.
- It was expected there would be criticism but **frustration/demoralization** was highlighted throughout - *I've worked for the City for 28 years and never received anything but a satisfactory rating. Never exceeded anyone's expectations? I've given up caring about it, and cynicism in regard to policy: It appears to be a paper exercise with little commitment in setting objectives at the beginning of the year. The entire document is developed and written in one week.*

Yet, there was some support as to the process: *TESS follows the Performance Management guidelines. We are required to follow the corporate timelines. We are expected to coach our management staff throughout the year and have performance conversations as well, clearly identifying expectations. We have mid-point meetings. There should be no surprise about an individual's performance rating at the final review. I always have demonstrated examples in each performance area to align with the rating.*

13 question survey - 1-12 multiple choice (responses supplied in graph form), question 13 asked for comments. The volume of anecdotal remarks was not expected (50+ pages) and resultantly the report is longer than anticipated. NOTE: many responses proved difficult to categorize as they reflect across multiple areas of concern. Items flagged in the report are not one-offs, similar themes cited a multiple of times

The first 12 pages of this report reflect compiled responses to questions 1--12,

1. What Division/Cluster?
2. Did you complete your 2016 performance planner and set out your 2017 objectives?
3. In what month did you complete your 2016 performance planner and set your 2017 objectives?
4. Were you satisfied with your 2016 performance evaluation/rating?
5. Did you have a mid-year performance review?
6. In what month did you have the mid-year review?
7. Did you have a fulsome one-to-one meeting with your immediate manager to discuss your 2016 performance?
8. After having your mid-year evaluation, were you surprised by the performance rating you received?
9. Did you have ongoing discussion during the period either verbally or documented?
10. Were you given a performance rating in advance of City Council approving the budget?
11. If you were given a performance rating in advance of City Council approving the budget, did your rating change afterwards?
12. What was your performance rating?

This is followed by a summation of the comments to Question 13 and then a COTAPSA Summation

Ques #13	Of the members participating in the survey 55% responded to question #13
PP PROCESS	
	Positive to Process - Relatively small number (2.1% of respondents) indicated: <i>happy with the process of performance evaluation</i> but indicated the plan should take place in the fall for the following year. Some commented that they had supportive managers.
	<i>We take the performance planner process very seriously in ML&S, Policy Unit and ensure we have ongoing dialogues with staff.</i> <i>I am a Manager and have provided my staff with both mid-term and final performance reviews. I have set 2017 objectives based on my understanding of needs. Surprisingly, I haven't received any feedback on objectives or received a formal or informal, midterm or final performance review in over a year!</i>
	Negative to process Numerous respondents (93.4%) defined the entire process as a <i>joke</i> and a very large number wrote of a flawed, failing, unfair and broken system. Many were frustrated and cited that the entire process lowered staff morale.
	The process was cited as being <i>too political</i> and there was a belief it is <i>financially driven by Corporate instead of merit, with definitions that are too restrictive, arbitrary and based on percentage restrictions resultantly failing to encourage creativity and innovation.</i>
DISPUTE PROCESS	Huge frustration and concern overall as to having nowhere to go after having gone to a Director in regards to a questionable PP and incidents where were cited where Division/Mgr. did not follow policy, raising there are no penalties or ramifications for mgrs. who choose to ignore the guidelines... <i>My mgr. and her mgr. ignored the guidelines and refused to change the rating, even when supplied with evidence which contradicted their reasoning for the inaccurate and unjustified rating. Senior Executives in the Division were not interested in the process, merely in supporting their friend the Administrator. HR did not play any role.</i>
	Negative Responses Regarding Manager Many cited receiving the same rating year after year and that comments during their PP were often more negative than expected even if objectives were met, providing a backdrop for a poor rating.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many complained regarding the slowness of the process...<i>I completed my planner in January did not hear from Mgr. /get rating until June... She has 5 employees!</i> • Many believe mgrs. have bias and the evaluations are based more on personality and relationships then work (i.e. not liking or disagreements with employee) Many stated a new mgr. can't properly gauge work.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some spoke to the language used during the sessions -- <i>Is a planner about not meeting her expectations or about reaching your objectives as set at the beginning of a year and should take into account all accomplishments. When managers use the language of not meeting their expectations, it becomes personal. Different managers have different expectations. You may have two or even three managers in one year all with different expectations</i>
	<p>Conflict of Interest - Some cited receiving an unfair PP or rate due to a mgrs. competing for a higher rate, in other words is a built in bias for supervisors and managers to serve themselves at the expense of staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I was told I did a good job, but no money in the budget to give me more ... I find that my position will always be competing with my Supervisor and Manager for pay performance</i> • <i>The dept. only gives a certain number of 4.5%. My immediate supervisor rejects everyone he supervises to better his chances of getting the higher percentage. He's received it several times.</i> • <i>Claims... Mgrs. we're trying to save money to show what a good a job they do were made number of times</i> • <i>Mgrs. only and very few chosen ones (token) receiving top percentages. Seems upper management is just passing it around amongst themselves to boost their pensions.</i>
<p>FORCED DISTRIBUTION OF PERFORMANCE RATINGS</p>	<p>A concern with a blatant use of Quotas, Percentage, Rotation, Bell Curve process is in place was often raised</p>
	<p>QUOTAS - <i>With this system there is no incentive to strive for higher performance</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>The "quota" for outstanding performance is unfair and makes process a fraud. It discourages initiatives and real efforts. Performance objectives that are strategically oriented are not recognized.</i> ○ <i>It has been used to improve morale instead of true performance. It often causes resentment.</i> ○ <i>Currently management is given quotas for various levels. It is not possible to remain within specific percentages.</i> ○ <i>Wrong to tell a mgr. there must be a certain number of each performance rating. The performance interview should be an opportunity to celebrate the good work an employee's done and provide feedback, suggestions for improvements. It can be a wonderful morale booster and motivator if used correctly. Too often it's done perfunctorily.</i> ○ <i>Several Mgrs. took the position they were directed to, which is the max would be 2.5%. I expressed dissatisfaction for last couple of years but signed off as there seems to be direction from 'above' to limit opportunities to obtain the 4.5% increase regardless of the efforts made and achievements accomplished.</i> ○ <i>Since this exercise is based on a quota system (i.e. Division needs "X" number of underperform, "X" number of</i>

	<p><i>exceed) ... It has nothing to do with performance and is an exercise of numbers! Why can't a Division have many employees meeting the different categories instead of a certain percentage in every different category?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>I conducted PP for my direct reports and believe it's unfair to limit the number of individuals who can receive "exceeds" to 15% and to strongly encourage Divisions to ensure some staff be designated as "developmental" since not all should receive status of "meets expectations".</i> ○ <i>Setting quotas renders a system that has been set up and promoted as having clear performance standards and achievement levels meaningless and it demoralizes individuals.</i> ○ <i>How can performance be rated fairly when there is a quota system in place that limits exceeds and expects developmental or does not meet expectations?</i> ○ <i>This is a quota system that creates more division among staff than motivation. In my case only one person can achieve 4.5% no matter how well the entire management team performs.</i> ○ <i>I do so much above and beyond - am left in charge of the office when MESS is absent. MESS said he would have liked to give more but hands are tied. It's as if there are quotas</i> ○ <i>Think it odd the conversation about performance rating (and general mgr. feedback) was conducted when everything was a "done deal". Makes the conversation a formality/box ticking exercise, which is a shame as often written communication (email or document) often may not be interpreted as the writer intended.</i>
--	---

	<p>PERCENTAGE</p>
--	--------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Advised exceptional rating can only be provided to a percentage of staff, as opposed to performance.</i> ○ <i>Advised senior management tries ' to share the wealth'. Disheartened as the decision to provide this great opportunity is not based on the actual work completed.</i> ○ <i>Have to give certain percentage of staff each rating ... it is like a baseball draft at the managers table as to who gets what.</i> ○ <i>Divisions are assigned by the City Manager's Office a percentage for how many staff can receive each level. The effect of this is that 'exceeds' is doled out carefully and is essentially meaningless and to have to find people to label 'developmental' has the effect of causing harm and stress.</i> ○ <i>Rating system is rigid in terms of staff who go above the call on a daily basis only to be rated 'meets' for 2016. The fact they only give a percentage of non-union staff 'exceeds' limits those who deserve a better rating however due the percentage/numbers are only granted 'meets'. This rating devalues work done.</i> ○ <i>The fact only 10% of the non-union staff can qualify for the 'exceeds' level hurts morale among the management group...we all want to do great work and excel, but we also want to be recognized for our efforts and the current practice of limiting the 4.5% to a small group is detrimental.</i> ○ <i>Was told I was an 'exceeds' expectations employee for 2016 but due to direction from the City Manager's Office I would receive 'meets'. We were advised at a team meeting in Feb we would receive lower rankings than previous years. The system has been re-calibrated, so receiving a '0' or '1%' would be the new normal. Anything above a</i>
--	--

	<p><i>'0' should be considered a bonus. This sounds like a change in the terms of employment.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>There is a notion in the Corporation that if say 50% of the ratings are 'meets' expectations then 50% must be 'developmental'. This approach is counterproductive especially in a situation where unionized staff earn as much as management staff when factoring over time.</i> ○ <i>There is no set formula to achieve exceeds. It is simply a comparison with the top performers and whether one ranked high enough for the year. Without certainty on what it takes to achieve exceeds there is no motivation to staff which is contrary to the purpose of PP. ...Also the idea that there MUST be a certain percentage of people in the bottom two categories is offensive</i> ○ <i>Percentages for who receives are pre-determined. You are not graded on what you do, you are slotted into where you fit. We are also advised to sign PP before we even talk to anyone or hear anything. Never given the next years goals/objectives.</i>
	<p>ROTATION -- <i>It was often stated -- if one earned 'exceeds' twice, they wouldn't likely receive again. In the last two years I've exceeded my targets, this last year by a significant amount. In 2014 I received an 'exceeds'. In both 2015 & 2016 I exceeded all my targets but was told I only get the 'meets' rating because I received it in a previous year and it has to get spread around and there was nothing my Mgr. or Director could do about it. Therefore to many performance rating has nothing to do with actual performance and is a very phony exercise.</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Every year my mgr. advises she considers my work exceptional but we are a very small unit and the bonus rate gets rotated.</i> ➤ <i>Strict limits on the number of staff who can receive "exceeds" reduces motivation. In a small group (about 10 -12 employees) that means only one can get this rating. We are aware it will not be the same person every year. So, if you get it one year, you know you will not get it the next year - no matter how hard you work or how much success you have.</i> ➤ <i>Process does not reward hard workers, as a limited number of staff can receive merit increase, so it is rotated between top performers. Gives wrong message to high Achievers - you can work as hard as you want, but you will not necessarily receive a merit increase, as it may be someone else's turn this year.</i> ➤ <i>The whole process is the antithesis of employee engagement. The term meets expectations gives the sense of average. Exceeds is circumstantial for many positions. It is widely acknowledged that some divisions and units in Divisions give exceeds on a rotational basis</i>
	<p>BELL CURVE</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Division performance will be based on a "Bell Curve" meaning a small number of high performers but also forces the assignment of a percentage of "developmental performers" which is unfair for our section as we don't have any "developmental performers".</i> ○ <i>Received several talks about how too many people are getting "met expectations". Can't possibly have everyone doing such a good job. Hints of bell curving and colleagues are concerned how they will now have no choice but</i>

	<i>to focus on the work in the planner, and not focus on taking initiative and responding to new opportunities that work for the public. This shifts the priority to the planner above all else.</i>
LACK OF TRANSPARENCY MASKING OTHER ISSUES	<i>The purpose is to motivate high quality performance in the future by among other ways rewarding and highlighting what good performance and poor performance looks like. This system does a reasonable job in regard to poor performance but fails miserably in regard to good performance. Virtually everyone who receives 'exceeds' tells no one because it will upset everyone. So no one learns what good behavior look like!</i>
	TRANSPARENCY - <i>There is no transparency in the process, no clarity of expectations with regards to where the bar is to 'exceed'. This should be a learning opportunity, we should know why our peers exceeded expectations and we should celebrate achievements</i>
	<p>Constant flagging for a need for transparency -- there should be disclosure as to the employees who received 4.5 rating or at least disclose how many people received exceeds, name of section/unit and titles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rating is never disclosed - you only know your rating when you see it on your pay. • Received highest rating... was told to keep confidential. There's too much secrecy surrounding this process. If it can't hold up to scrutiny, then it clearly needs to be re-vamped. <i>Proud of my accomplishment but not being able to share with peers takes away from it</i> • The ad-hock management of the system, lack of clear criteria for who receives and secrecy, <i>says it all</i> • <i>Seems only very senior staff receive 4.5%, perhaps who receives what should be internally released, with a justification as to why.</i> • The use of 'exceeds' increases mistrust of management and belief favoritism means more than performance. <i>Did anyone get it, why did they get it, what should I do differently to get it?</i>
	FAVOURTISM - Favoritism was cited often through various areas as an negative element of performance ratings
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exceeds has indicated many times how much an employee is liked as a person, not competency. ○ ...Candidates for "Exceeds" are selected before PPs are completed... <i>as there is a lot of favoritism in this Division (friends/relatives of certain senior staff getting plum positions without competitions being held, etc.), there is a suspicion these same people receive 4.5%</i> ○ Mgr. gave no one Exceeds. Head Office claims those spots - so none left for those "in the field"... ○ Same receive 3 out of 4 times... or, same person received 5 out of 6 years!!! ○ Doesn't matter how hard you work, only the favorites are rewarded with exceptional rating. 2016 the Supervisors of Operation Coordination all received exceptional rating

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>...disappointed for a few years and given up. ... My mgr. has recommended a 4.5%, but overruled... others have received 4.5% 2 or 3 times consecutively... Positive feedback on performance is lip service... as it doesn't matter if you're not a favorite</i>
	<p>ARBITRARY NATURE</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Majority commented process to achieve exceeds ... <i>is very subjective and hard to compare individuals in the same position within different districts.</i> ❖ Many find the process unfair, time consuming, of no real benefit, and the ratings discouraging. ❖ <i>If mgrs....do not need to justify their assessments and are allowed to assign ratings in such a capricious manner, than the whole performance planning program is without merit.</i>
<p>ELEMENTS OF ISSUE OUTLINED IN COMMENTS</p>	<p>MEETINGS/REVIEWS/DISCUSSIONS DURING YEAR</p> <p>Flagged receiving no input, direction or meetings throughout the year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Meaningful discussions, interim reviews, discussions regarding the setting of initial draft targets don't occur.</i> ➤ <i>The system needs to be streamlined with clear check in times so staff can learn about and benefit from training and other developmental opportunities in a timely manner</i> ➤ <i>Lack of leadership at the senior mgmt. level is unacceptable, how can you not have a meaningful performance conversation?</i>
	<p>Respondents whose answers related to this area highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No mid-year review, no feedback, they just submit a PP at the end of each year. ... In over 20 years with the city, I have never had a mid-term review/discussion.</i> • <i>just sign</i> • <i>Identified or requested developmental needs/aids and received no support, nor plans to help them grow and develop.</i> • <i>Their mgrs. did not have time to meet throughout the year, despite being asking repeatedly.</i> • <i>Their performance review and rating was either done/delivered via email</i> <p>➤ <i>Never had any kind of review with my mgr., in fact I rarely see him because he's never in the office. I'm not told my rating, or my salary increase. One year my group was told by the AA to sign our PPs before the mgr. comments were added. When I questioned, I was told that I should just sign</i></p>
<p>7 Page</p>	

➤ *Revenue Services is consistently not following corporate responsibilities when it comes to the planner and needs to be held accountable. I have completed my 2016 planner within the timelines and still waiting to meet with my mgr. When I asked about it he said he could do it right now and give me a '0'.*

My mgr. did not set goals in 2016. When informally asked on 3 occasions if everything ok, told there were no issues. Given a 1% rating with no reason provided. When meeting with the Director told I did not complete all tasks. Director directed the Mgr. to schedule a meeting to discuss in detail. To date there has been no meeting and I haven't received a copy of the Comment Sheet.

RATING CHANGED AFTER -- Respondents cited situations wherein they were told their work was excellent and would be nominated for 'exceeds' only to receive 2.5%. Some cited receiving 'exceeds' last year, worked harder and received 2.5% 2016

➤ *When signing final copy I was told Director fought hard for my compensation (4.5%). However only a portion of people at the higher rating would receive. So had to sign off on 2.5%. ...3rd year this has happened.*

- *2015 Performance was changed after signing off the PP but never communicated to me....told 2016 performance submission was changed by senior management (i.e. does not reflect what my Director submitted).*
- *My mgr. recommend 4.5... I received 2.5 as it was dependent on other manager's nominations. Frustrated as this has been the case for last few years.*
- *'Exceeded' was my rating, advised it was not approved. Told only 13 permitted for this rating and as I received it the prior year, it was given to others that had not received it. Appears there is not much point in working hard and exceeding expectations.*
- *5-7 minute meeting with my manager and asked to sign. There was no review of the actual PD. She stated she advocated for me to get an 'exceeds' rating but I didn't get it.*
- *Measurable benchmarks of performance are vague, arbitrary and open to manipulation. My mgr. recommended Exceeds following an outstanding year. He told me our Director refused for reasons of "style not substance". I told our Director how disappointed I was... he denied turning down the recommendation and said it was GM's decision.*

NO ENGAGEMENT -- *City needs to review its evaluation policy. Discussions need to be throughout the year. It's important for morale to receive feedback*

- *Requested to sign the documents while we have not received any evaluation results. During the interview, the Mgr. did not mention anything related to the performance evaluation*
- *Mgr. did not share she planned to give me 1% when we initially met but raised new issues when she gave me this rating at second performance mtg. I was not given an opportunity to respond*
- *Mtg. consisted of signing off. I'd been directed to draft a document asking for 4.5 which I did but only received 2.5, was then told Head Office staff never get 4.5 and don't bother trying*

- *My supervisor, colleague and I have asked our manager for our ratings (its June) as we already signed the PP form early in the year and prior to the rating being filled in.*
- *We have not had any further communication from Mgr. regarding 2016 PPs. We haven't been rated for a percentage therefore PP not signed.*
- *No discussion as to reason for the decision. Management seemed uncomfortable with the process*
- *Mgr. did not read my PP and we did not talk about my work in my meeting. I do not know what my rating is.*
- *No discussion -- I get nothing out of this process with my mgr. as she puts no effort into the process. She is not held accountable by her Director as he supposedly does the same thing with his mgrs.*

YEARS OF SERVICE AS OPPOSED TO 'PERFORMANCE' - Respondents cited years of service as being an element in determining rate – most often newer mgrs. who made comments such as *if you had been there longer you would have received a 4% increase*

2016, my first year in mgmt., I implemented two projects for the City garnering significant administrative efficiencies for the Division and saving the City one million dollars, yet I was given 1% increase, however, supervisors earning the same pay grade managing day-to-day local office operations with no expectations to deliver savings for the City were awarded 2.5% because they're not considered developmental? Clearly, the review is based on yrs. of service not performance.

- *In Feb, at a Mgrs. Meeting, it was suggested our division was assigning too many staff at the 2.5% level. It was further indicated anyone who had been in a new or acting role for 1 year or less should be given a 1% rating. The "developmental" rating=1% has rarely been applied in our area. I stated concerns at the time as it was unfair to retroactively apply a 1% rating when in-year conversations made no such indication.*
- *Advised TESS has decided to give 1% to all staff who are in their 1st year of a promotion. In my situation, the role/responsibilities I was given wasn't the role I applied for. The entire role was changed and therefore every mgr. in this classification should have received 1%. They were treated as being in the classification even though their role/responsibilities had changed completely.*
- *Manager told me that my rating has to be 1% because I was new but that has nothing to do with my performance level which was supposed to be 2.5 or even 4.5%.*

EQUALITY - *I switched jobs Nov/16 from PFR to EDC. EDC management has provided timely feedback. PFR did not. I requested the number of women who receive 'exceeds' in PFR and have not rec'd a reply. The current system of PP does not provide transparency in traditionally male dominated fields. It is vital these stats are provided to ensure fairness and ability for women to receive equal pay to male counterparts. I hear too often of perf. pay based on relationships, not merit*

- *References were made to women having difficulties especially if they have a sick child*
- *Mgr. does not always provide equitable distribution of work and therefore neither is the rating system. In PFR 15*

	<p>people receive 4%. Divisionally not comparable and unfair. <i>Mothers and disabilities not factored in/not equal</i></p>
	<p>Concerns raised as to medical leave, burnout (EAP) and accommodations due to a family member's illness, the fairness of ratings for those experiencing these issues and the feeling of being penalized. Terms like 'Bullied' into agreeing were used.</p> <p><i>... worked hard and met goals (by working overtime) but received a lower rating then colleagues who were there the whole year and did not complete objectives</i></p> <p><i>... There are many tools that can be used by people in positions of power to 'professionally bully' an employee.</i></p>
	<p>POSITION APPLICABILITY -- <i>PP is too cookie cutter. My role is to manage staff and contracted services to ensure assets are open to the public and run in an efficient and safe manner. There has never been a measurement of productivity or how more was done with less. A review of the "Strategic Actions" and how they are applied to the front line Tech. Professionals needs to happen</i></p> <p>❖ <i>It was asserted that rating was the same for all in my unit and not individualized.</i></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 'People services' is a challenge; how to commit to do things above and beyond regular duties when duties are not regular. Each day is different and issues arise that are unpredictable: building issues, political issues etc. ○ From an equity stand point Part-time Shift Leader expectations of performance should be based on different criteria then full-timers. ○ PP doesn't work for non-managers in building engineers ○ PP does not account for the extra tasks/duty which occupies 40% at Technical Services, it only focus on the project delivery. ○ Supervisor of Road Operation, nothing in planner is done by me ○ Design and Construction of ECS are extremely overloaded with work, duties, and responsibilities. Unfortunately, ECS senior management assess people totally on PTP system that is running so poorly. ECS senior management provide scoring based on what they believe and not on what the actual achievements of each individual are. ○ District based work - no comparison to equate actual performance among staff doing the same job across the district. The ultimate decision lies with the executive and can't therefore be based on performance. ○ In relation to the PP there are Internal Project Management process issues that are beyond the control of a project manager. No client feedback is requested and considered in the evaluation of performance in that capacity. ○ Not sure if it is included as part of pay for performance i.e. management coming in and viewing intra-orally our work with patients. ○ Dental Management does not disclose on what criteria that they choose a dentist to receive the exceptional

	<p>rating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Need clear competency guidelines for our sub-division -- there is no clear reflection of our performance for example how many patient encounters, phone calls, administration emails, teaching students, change in front desk clerk and retraining staff, loss in productivity due to unforeseen events with less staff or the breakdown of equipment, lack of space to write down notes, etc.
	<p>TIMING --2016, did not have any performance meetings and so far nothing in 2017. I prepared my own 2017 goals but mgr. does not want to accept the PP as still waiting to receive instructions from Director. Now July, and it is not officially submitted... I'm concerned it appears I've not submitted a 2017 PP as per the required deadlines</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Still have not received performance rating. ➤ Have not set objectives for 2017, have not signed ➤ Late receiving of performance pay, or no idea when to receive ➤ Need to submit planners on time (April), but mgmt. spends months finalizing. ➤ Wasn't happy with the comments. Still awaiting feedback on my concerns. ➤ Waiting almost 6 months for my performance pay is inappropriate as it is tied to receiving the COLA. ➤ As we often get the City/Division objectives mid-way (or later) through the year, it's difficult to plan appropriately. <p>A number of respondents questioned the fairness -- <i>Unionized staff receive their increments at the beginning of the year. Why should we be treated any differently?</i></p>
	<p>RETIREEES – slowness of process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>PP approval takes too long. Almost 5 months since the PP was filled and still the pay is not processed. For staff retiring, this creates problem as it takes City too long to process this pay</i> • <i>My last day of work was March 31st--have not heard from manager as to final ratings.</i>
	<p>MANAGER, NEW OR NOT UNDERSTANDING JOB - <i>A PP is to set objectives and review your achievements. Where those objectives met? Usually my performance review has been around "expectations." Expectations are subjective. Sometimes staff have three different managers in one year and their expectations have all been different and my ratings have all been different. It is mandatory for Upper Management to based performance on the objectives set, not their individual expectations</i></p>
	<p>A change in mgr./director created confusion, with bad ratings, obscure objectives for next year (i.e. do the same as you did last year) ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Performance rating was not based on performance but the acting mgr.'s opinion of a "team player".</i> • <i>Frustrating to be evaluated by a mgr. who does not have my professional qualifications (RECE) and has never done the job... often feedback is minimal and difficult to understand</i>
<p>POLITICAL IMPACT</p>	<p>CITY COUNCIL REFERENCES -- <i>The discussion at Council regarding performance reviews for non-union employees earlier this year impacts on ratings. Work load has more than doubled and I have gone above and</i></p>

	<p><i>consistently beyond the call of duty and not been recognized for it. (4 similar responses)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ <i>It was suggested that pay increase should be received at the beginning of the year and not the last item on the Council agenda before summer break as that sends a poor message</i> ❖ <i>The across the board 'bell' curving of performance is not fair and will only boost the general feeling that Sr. Management and Council does not care. They only want to address public opinion.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Seems the City wants to see more downgraded #s</i> ➤ <i>Rumors abound the Mayor is attempting to save money by ensuring only a small percentage of management receive the "meets expectations" criteria.</i> ➤ <i>The process is useless if the results are dictated by Council without ever looking at performance.</i> ➤ <i>No one listens to frontline staff anymore this is not good for Torontonians</i>
<p>PP CLARIFICATION</p>	<p>ONE OF THE SINGLE BIGGEST ISSUES RAISED – <i>When meeting with a Mgr., how does one argue an assigned rating? In many cases there is no discussion. There needs to be a dispute process, because some mgrs. are unethical, lack civility are punitive because there is no one to hold them accountable.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I've been given 1% in the past which I didn't agree with and didn't know what to do or how to deal with it.</i> • <i>I was told there is no appeals mechanism. Is there?</i> <p>ADDITIONALLY -- <i>There must be a vehicle for reports to evaluate the performance of their supervisor or mgr. Should be able to rate our mgr./supervisor on how they performed - provide anonymous feedback (3)</i></p> <p>FOLLOWED BY... <i>What is criteria to receive Exceeds, what defines going above the call of duty? (7)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. <i>How do you compete with colleagues whose work is different from yours?</i> II. <i>Do higher profile programs get the higher increases?</i> III. <i>Is there training to prepare objectives, i.e. my Director didn't modify the approach from previous years whereas other Directors have streamlined. Unclear which is the correct approach directed by HR.</i> IV. <i>Who is responsible for writing up a performance planner? Employee should be responsible for objectives but not for the actual planner.</i> V. <i>Are there guidelines as to how many years in succession an employee can receive 'exceeds'.</i> VI. <i>How do you equitably determine rate to those who have large numbers of staff? (A mgr. who has 103 staff, receives 100+ emails a day, has continuous Labour relations etc. is markedly different from Mgrs. /Supervisors who have a fewer staff and therefore time to work on special assignments and resultantly receive higher rate).</i> VII. <i>How can I control the outcomes if I don't control the opportunities?</i> VIII. <i>Rating can be directly related to divisional shortcomings of which an employee has no control, i.e. OT is high due to divisional and corporate areas not hiring appropriate number of required PT staff and filling FT vacancies.</i> IX. <i>Can PP be used as a tactic to build a constructive dismissal case?</i> X. <i>Why are Operational Supervisors never given the full above expectations rating?</i>

	XI. Must one sign off a PP at a lower rating if manager/director initially evaluates work as "exceeds"?
SUGGESTIONS	<i>Goals need to be set collaboratively across the Division and Divisions to achieve the City's vision. Tying goals and achievements to salary is counterproductive, the process becomes about financial gain. The performance process focuses on achieving and completing goals and not around maintaining the items achieved. Policy is written, but never monitored for success nor given the correct resources for successful implementation</i>
	<p>Many suggested additional rates because of the limited options available --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>System needs more diverse range of ratings i.e. 0, 1, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5 %... as it is now its subject to herding (several employees awarded same rating)</i> ➤ <i>4.5 % should be lowered to 3.5%, so more staff can be recognized.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Those who receive 'exceeds' should be reviewed by someone in addition to the Division Head.</i> • <i>If at the top of the Grade, one receives the regular 1.25% COLA increase, perhaps there should be additional compensation so one looks forwards to this (3)</i> • <i>A review should be done solely by the manager or report. The report should lay out expectations and then the employee should be evaluated accordingly.</i> • <i>Copy the Private Sector where the whole process takes about 0.5 hours with a multiple form questionnaire employees fill in and a meeting with the Mgr. and Director.</i> • <i>360 Evaluations are really the only true way of being properly evaluated</i> • <i>The development plan Supervisors complete to be thoroughly addressed</i>
OTHER ISSUES	<i>We have been told that going forward (2018), in order to receive a 2.5% we have to work at a 4.5% expectation otherwise we will receive 1%.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Loose valuable staff with specialized skill sets because of this tool ... way it is designed is bad corporate planning</i> • <i>Many dismayed about the overall way management staff is treated... It is not only in this area. We are now not being paid for sick days after a fourth occurrence.</i>
COTAPSA CONCERNS	<p>Issues / concerns re-appear throughout this survey and considering the high response numbers this concerns the COTAPSA Board, some are very severe, inappropriate and need re-evaluation. It appears that the PP system requires an overhaul and education on all levels</p> <p>While COTAPSA believes and supports the idea of the PP, there is an escalating opinion that HR is hiding behind 'providing policy' and now it must again become responsible and take leadership on the issues that are implied in this report, dispute resolution process. This includes the immediate need to step in and be involved in the process when a</p>

PP concern has gone beyond being addressed by a Director.
A major concern is the feeling of frustration with the results of the PP – it should be positive and boosting and seems to be far from that.

Performance Planning has a goal of ensuring improved performance outcomes...However, one negative unintended impact is low morale which performance undermines