



# "Hey, baby!" (part 2)

Earlier in bargaining, the employer tried to sell OPSEU members on a little idea called "pay for performance."

Pay for performance would have allowed managers to unilaterally decide who would and would not get a pay raise within a job classification. Under the employer's initial proposal, it would only have applied to employees who were **not yet** at the top of their pay range.

Newer workers weren't biting. They quickly saw through the plan as a way to introduce favouritism into the pay structure and give managers a not-so-subtle way to discipline people – e.g., union activists sticking up for their co-workers.

On Feb. 14, the employer did an about-face. In the contract offer, pay for performance

would **only** be for people who **were** at the top of their pay range. The employer said it would add 0.5 per cent to the total payroll and dole it out based solely on the non-grievable whims of individual managers.

A worker could only get the lump-sum pay-for-performance peanut with the approval of the boss. Plus, workers would have to re-earn their peanut every year. It would not be like moving an extra step up the grid and staying there. You'd have to climb back up again and again.

Collective bargaining is about fairness. Pay raises should be for everybody, not just a few of the boss's favourites. **Vote to reject the employer's Feb. 14 offer** and give your team a strong strike mandate to stop favouritism in its tracks.

# What's on the table:

*Bargaining proposals as of Feb. 14, 2002*

---

## **EMPLOYER PROPOSAL**

The Employer withdraws its original proposal to eliminate merit increases, and instead proposes to maintain the existing merit system without change. The Employer proposes to add a pool of money equal to .5% of payroll available to those at the maximum step based on a 're-earnable lump sum' pay for performance scheme. If this is accepted in principle, the details will be worked out with the Union.

---