

Amendment FDE - Friday
MEMORANDUM

TO: STAFF MEETING

FROM: BONNIE, MARY, FRANK, DEBORAH, LINDA, SARAH, RAY

DATE: APRIL 9, 1986

RE: SALARIES 1986-87 AND OTHER PERSONNEL CONCERNS

We met last wekk after our staff meeting to address the lawyers' proposal regarding salary. During that meeting, other concerns were raised regarding the relationship of evaluations to salary determination and the application for new staff

Re: Salary Proposal of Lawyers

There was unanimous concern about the change which the lawyers' proposal suggested in the process utilized by staff and Management Committee for at least the last four years to determine salary levels.

This approach has involved giving equal percentage increases to all staff endeavouring to spend all of the funds allotted in the category. The lawyers then pooled their three amounts and by consensus, distributed them in a manner which recognized more equitably the equality of their job descriptions, irrespective of the year each was called to the Bar.

An expectation has been built up over those four years that this method is our procedure, even though it was never formally made policy. We would expect some prior notice from Management Committee, some rationales and opportunity for discussion of any changes to this perceived policy.

? It was pointed out that our personnel policy was drafted with the assumption that this was the policy. Should this policy change, the personnel policy may need to be revised to reflect that change.

It was a concern that in the period of government restraint, we were all subject equally to ceilings on wages and that the same should apply for "fatter" times.

We recommend that the Board of Directors of CELA make representation to OLAP about salary increases of all staff.

Re: Recognition of Experience

Concern was voiced that CELA's highly experienced staff will continue to make the salary negotiations difficult. Remedies should be sought from the Clinical Funding Staff by the Board. ?

The current system places limits on our ability to recognize the experience that our semi-professional and support staff contribute to the clinic. ✓

This staff's work experience is as follows:

Bonnie - 14 years work experience, 3 of them editorial

Deborah - 12 years work experience, legal secretarial

Frank - 6 years work experience, 5 at CELA, 1 journalist

Linda - 26 years work experience, secretarial, typesetting

Mary - 25 years work experience, 20 community development, scientific, 5 professional librarian

Sarah - 14 years work experience, 7 at CELA, 7 managerial.

Non-legal staff employed by CELA are penalized because there is a six-year limit on allowable career progress units. We would like the Board to lobby for extensions to this limit or to eliminate limits altogether. As well, we feel it is crucial for our benefits to be extended to include a pension plan. The issue of the value of experience, loyalty to the clinic system and the Board's ability to reward it, should be raised with OLAP. ✓

Re: Salary Comparisons

We have done some preliminary inquiries as to comparable salaries:

Articling Students - \$15,600 to 20,800

Legal and Executive Secretaries - \$19,500 to 23,400

Free-Lance Editors - charges for non-profit organizations
average \$25.00 to 30.00 per hour

Government Researchers and Law Clerks - 30,000 plus

Non-legal staff are falling behind salary levels in the private and public sectors. ✓

Re: Staff Evaluations

We would like to recommend that staff evaluations remain independent from salary determination. Particular concerns were raised about the comprehensiveness of evaluations this year since the Clinic Director was on leave for half of the year. As well, n

because the lawyers are advocating a new salary approach, it was felt there was potential for conflict of interest in this and future years if evaluations were tied to salaries.

We would welcome the development of a meaningful evaluation process which would be more relevant to our day-to-day operations. It would be useful to structure the process so that it could be utilized by all staff for constructive criticism. This would go a long way to avoiding problems and frustrations building up. It was suggested that evaluations be more flexible in that they always be done for a new employee after three months, but otherwise be initiated by management, the director or any staff as they identify the need, i.e. when there is a change in a job description.

Sarah suggested that all staff consider using a self-evaluation form. A sample of one such form is attached.

Re: Potential Application for New Staff

One final concern which was identified by staff was the disparity which might be created if we apply for new staff for 1986-87. It was felt we could not simply add a lawyer or paralegal to staff without adding support staff over and above our present ratio. It is not likely that shift work alone could provide the amount of support an expanded clinic would require. ✓

These questions are preliminary guidelines and should have written answers for an informal review.

1. What are the major responsibilities or assignments of the position as you understand them?
 2. What other responsibilities or assignments are you routinely called upon to do which you feel are not usually associated with your position?
 3. What are the major skills you employ in carrying out your work?
 4. What other skills or interests do you have that may be of value in your work?
 5. What skills and abilities have you learned on the job or have been strengthened by your job here?
 6. Does your workload vary? If so, what do you think can be done to more evenly distribute that workload?
 7. For the period covered by this evaluation have you and the board achieved a mutual understanding as to what needs to be accomplished? Do you feel the goals for this period are being accomplished?
 8. What goals do you have in the coming period? How do you expect to meet those objectives?
 9. Are you able to take on additional responsibilities at this time or in the immediate future? What assignments would you like to undertake?
 10. On a scale of 1 to 6 rate your work experience (this job) in the following categories. In the categories lower than 4 how do you see improvements might be made?
 - A. Quality of work
 - B. Effectiveness of output
 - C. Dependability
 - D. Comprehension of assignments
 - E. Ability to determine priorities
 - F. Initiative
 - G. Flexibility
 - H. Work relationship with others
 - I. Attendance
-

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
202								
203								
204								
205	Lawyers	Sample	High	Low	Average	Median		
206								
207	85 call	9	25750	20000	22837	22800		0 yr.
208								
209	84 call	5	25985	22575	24946	24000		1 yr.
210								
211	83 call	6	28000	26000	26822	26233		2 yr.
212								
213	82 call	13	31000	25250	28429	28440		3 yr.
214								
215	81 call	12	31567	22360	28940	29073		4 yr.
216								
217	80 call	13	37836	27350	31892	31840		5 yr.
218								
219	79 call	8	37000	29921	33419	33854		6 yr.
220								
221	78 call	11	38267	28200	34671	34800		7 yr.
222								
223	77 call	3	38675	29200	34513	35665		8 yr.
224								
225	76 call	2	35739	35739	35739	35739		9 yr.
226								
227	75 call	2	42374	36510	39442	39442		10 yr.
228								
229	74 call	3	49900	46000	48233	48800		11 yr.
230								
231	Pre 73	2	36000	32351	34176	34176		
232								
233								
234								

LAWYERS

Nov. 7/85

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

COMMUNITY LEGAL WORKERS

Nov. 7/85

	Sample	High	Low	Average	Median	
start	19	25225	17500	20392	20000	0 yr.
start	13	28875	20585	23065	22435	1 yr.
start	8	25504	21000	22715	22995	2 yr.
start	10	27500	23000	24677	24001	3 yr.
start	14	25254	21500	23996	24027	4 yr.
start	19	26705	19938	25026	25982	5 yr.
start	7	28160	23739	25799	25530	6 yr.
start	10	25858	24044	25213	25228	7 yr.
start	9	29694	24044	26940	27123	8 yr.
start	3	0	0	27050	27050	9 yr.
start	1	0	0	0	0	10 yr.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
36								
37	SUPPORT STAFF						Nov. 7/85	
38								
39	Support	Sample	High	Low	Average	Median		
40								
41	85 start	16	20500	15000	15909	17050	0 yr.	
42								
43	84 start	13	22100	15139	18681	18250	1 yr.	
44								
45	83 start	11	22810	15000	18937	18600	2 yr.	
46								
47	82 start	10	21384	18630	19804	19865	3 yr.	
48								
49	81 start	14	24776	18502	21181	20184	4 yr.	
50								
51	80 start	10	23691	16312	20377	19228	5 yr.	
52								
53	79 start	4	23008	18130	20548	20526	6 yr.	
54								
55	78 start	1	20662	20662	20662	20662	7 yr.	
56								
57	77 start	0	0	0	0	0	8 yr.	
58								
59	76 start	1	19000	19000	19000	19000	9 yr.	
60								
61	75 start	1	20765	20765	20765	20765	10 yr.	

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: CELA STAFF

FROM: GRACE, TOBY AND STEVE

RE: SALARIES

DATE: APRIL 1, 1986

REVISED APRIL 23, 1986

As you know, the lawyers have asked Charles Birchall to determine from Ross whether there was any particular intention when a 9.5 percent increase overall was granted to CELA. We specifically wondered whether they had intended this to be a catchup year for lawyers' salaries. We have not yet heard from Charles, but meanwhile we have reviewed the OLAP salary figures to see how the increased have been allocated in terms of career progress units.

Career Progress 85/86

Lawyers	14,700
Staff	6,375

Base salary	23,300
-------------	--------

Career Progress 86/87

Lawyers	29,250 (increase of \$14,500 or approximately 98%)
---------	--

Staff	8,475 (increase of \$2,100 or approximately 32%)
-------	--

Base salary	23,900 (increase of \$600 or 2.5%)
-------------	------------------------------------

Lawyers combined salary last year was \$100,498

Increase of CPUs and base	16,300 (or approximately 16.3%)
---------------------------	---------------------------------

Staff combined salary last year was \$128,500

Increases	5,700 (or 4.4%)
-----------	-----------------

Splitting the difference would mean 12.6 and 7.2 percent increases respectively and the reallocation to staff of \$3,750.

As the Articling Student's salary appears to be approximately equal to salaries in the private sector, rather than proportionately lower, that salary might be increased from \$19,461.60 to \$20,000 for next year, with the difference of \$1,210 allocated to secretaries or librarian/editor categories.

We would like to discuss this memo at the next staff meeting.

/lg

ADDENDUM

Legal Salaries Comparison

MOE legal services - call '80 - \$45,000 to 47,500

Metro Toronto - call '81 - \$37,500 plus 16% benefits
including pension

Large downtown law firm - call '86 - \$30,000
- call '80 - 65,000

Medium-sized downtown firm - call '81 - \$50,000 to 57,000

Teaching - 4 years - \$50,000.

It should also be noted that the Legal Aid Fact Finder's recommendations of a 110% increase in legal aid rates is presently being implemented. Legal aid rates went up 20% in December, 1985; 33% in April, 1986; and are scheduled to increase by 15% in 1987 and a further 15% in 1988.

SALARY AND BENEFITS 1986/87

Clinic: CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW ASSOCIATION

1. Salary Allocation:	\$		\$
a. Revised Base:	23900	x 9 staff	215100
b. Director's Stipend:			3500

c. Career Progress Allocation:
86 - start year

			LAWYER		CLW	SUPP			
			Call/ Start	Adj. Yrs.	\$ 1000	\$ 675	\$ 625	\$ 400	\$
1	Law:	Patterson	78✓	8	8000	3375	0	0	11375
1		Shrybman	81✓	5	5000	1350	0	0	6350
1		Vigod	80✓	6	6000	2025	0	0	8025
2	CLW:	Giorno	81✓	5	0	0	3125	0	3125
2		Miller	78✓*****	6	0	0	3750	0	3750
3	SEC:	McKeon	85✓	1	0	0	0	400	400
3		Gibson	84✓	2	0	0	0	800	800
3		Gilbert	85✓	1	0	0	0	400	400
3	A.S.		86	0	0	0	0	0	0

CPU Total: 34225

Total Salary Pool: 252825

2. Benefits @ .064 16181

Total Salary Pool + Benefits: \$ 269006

***** 12 yrs experience - maximum recognition for lawyers
 ***** 6 yrs experience - maximum recognition for others
 ***** lawyer seniority - yrs 4:12 - maximum 9 years

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: CELA STAFF

FROM: GRACE, TOBY AND STEVE

RE: SALARIES

DATE: APRIL 1, 1986

REVISED APRIL 23, 1986

As you know, the lawyers have asked Charles Birchall to determine from Ross whether there was any particular intention when a 9.5 percent increase overall was granted to CELA. We specifically wondered whether they had intended this to be a catchup year for lawyers' salaries. We have not yet heard from Charles, but meanwhile we have reviewed the OLAP salary figures to see how the increased have been allocated in terms of career progress units.

Career Progress 85/86

Lawyers	14,700
Staff	6,375
Base salary	23,300

Career Progress 86/87

Lawyers	29,250 (increase of \$14,500 or approximately 98%)
Staff	8,475 (increase of \$2,100 or approximately 32%)
Base salary	23,900 (increase of \$600 or 2.5%)

Lawyers combined salary last year was	\$100,498
Increase of CPUs and base	16,300 (or approximately 16.3%)
Staff combined salary last year was	\$128,500
Increases	5,700 (or 4.4%)

Splitting the difference would mean 12.6 and 7.2 percent increases respectively and the reallocation to staff of \$3,750.

As the Articling Student's salary appears to be approximately equal to salaries in the private sector, rather than proportionately lower, that salary might be increased from \$19,461.60 to \$20,000 for next year, with the difference of \$1,210 allocated to secretaries or librarian/editor categories.

We would like to discuss this memo at the next staff meeting.

ADDENDUM

Legal Salaries Comparison

MOE legal services - call '80 - \$45,000 to 47,500

Metro Toronto - call '81 - \$37,500 plus 16% benefits
including pension

Large downtown law firm - call '86 - \$30,000
- call '80 - 65,000

Medium-sized downtown firm - call '81 - \$50,000 to 57,000

Teaching - 4 years - \$50,000.

It should also be noted that the Legal Aid Fact Finder's recommendations of a 110% increase in legal aid rates is presently being implemented. Legal aid rates went up 20% in December, 1985; 33% in April, 1986; and are scheduled to increase by 15% in 1987 and a further 15% in 1988.

SALARY AND BENEFITS 1986/87

Clinic: CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW ASSOCIATION

1. Salary Allocation:	\$		\$
a. Revised Base:	23900	x 9 staff	215100
b. Director's Stipend:			3500

c. Career Progress Allocation:
86 - start year

		Call/ Start	Adj. Yrs.	LAWYER		CLW	SUPP	
				\$ 1000	\$ 675	\$ 625	\$ 400	\$
1	Law: Patterson	78✓	8	8000	3375	0	0	11375
1	Shrybman	81✓	5	5000	1350	0	0	6350
1	Vigod	80✓	6	6000	2025	0	0	8025
2	CLW: Giorno	81✓	5	0	0	3125	0	3125
2	Miller	78✓*****	6	0	0	3750	0	3750
3	SEC: McKeon	85✓	1	0	0	0	400	400
3	Gibson	84✓	2	0	0	0	800	800
3	Gilbert	85✓	1	0	0	0	400	400
3	A.S.	86	0	0	0	0	0	0

CPU Total: 34225

Total Salary Pool: 252825

2. Benefits @ .064 16181

Total Salary Pool + Benefits: \$ 269006

***** 12 yrs experience - maximum recognition for lawyers
 ***** 6 yrs experience - maximum recognition for others
 ***** lawyer seniority - yrs 4:12 - maximum 9 years