## Appendix 1: Performance Management Program

Table 1: Performance reward for the 2019 performance year (effective April 1, 2020)

| 2019 Performance Plan Rating | 2019 Merit | 2019 Economic Adjustment | Definition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exceptional | 5.25\% | 1.75\% | Significantly exceeded expectations in every way. Proactively seeks extra responsibility and out-performs goals. Demonstrates role model with an outstanding reputation organization-wide. |
| Exceeds Expectations | 4.25\% |  | All work exceeds the City's standards and expectations for your position in both quality and method of achievement. |
| Meets Expectations | 2.25\% |  | Delivers on all objectives, and may have excelled in one or more areas. Conduct aligns with Corporate Values, and fosters valuable contributions to their and the City. |
| Meets Most Expectations | 1.75\% |  | Achieves some goals, but not all. May need to adjust conduct, or demonstrate an increased level of consistency to meet expectations. |
| Needs Improvement | 1.75\% |  | Does not achieve goals. Regularly demonstrates undesirable behaviours. Performance does not meet expected standards. |

Table 2: Distribution of ratings for the 2019 performance year

| Performance Plan Rating | 2019 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Exceptional | 8 | $1 \%$ |
| Exceeds Expectations | 150 | $21 \%$ |
| Meets Expectations | 535 | $75 \%$ |
| Meets Most Expectations | 19 | $3 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement | 1 | $0 \%$ |
| Total Employees | $\mathbf{7 1 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## Appendix 2: Municipal Benchmarking

City of Brampton Non-Union Salary Ranges compared to 3 neighbouring Municipalities
Effective April 1, 2021

|  |  | City of Brampton Ranges |  |  | Municipal Grade Max. Average | \% Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Standard Jobs | Grades | Min | Mid | Max |  |  |
| CAO | 14 | 266,194 | 299,469 | 332,743 | 300,815 | 10.6\% |
| Reserve | 13 | 229,131 | 257,772 | 286,414 | NA | NA |
| Commissioners | 12 | 183,303 | 206,215 | 229,128 | 230,542 | -0.6\% |
| City Clerk, Director, City Solicitor | 11 | 160,820 | 180,923 | 201,025 | 202,419 | -0.7\% |
| Director | 10 | 148,882 | 167,492 | 186,102 | 184,940 | 0.6\% |
| Sr Manager, Legal Counsel | 9 | 131,453 | 147,884 | 164,316 | 163,707 | 0.4\% |
| Manager | 8 | 118,329 | 133,120 | 147,911 | 148,037 | -0.1\% |
| Mgr, Spvsr, Sr. Advisor, Project Leader | 7 | 105,313 | 118,477 | 131,642 | 128,854 | 2.2\% |
| Prosecutor, Spvsr, Coord, Advisor, Proj. Leader | 6 | 92,190 | 103,713 | 115,237 | 117,183 | -1.7\% |
| Admin., Analyst , Spvsr, Foreperson, Coord, Advisor, Proj. Coord. | 5 | 81,325 | 91,490 | 101,656 | 102,107 | -0.4\% |
| Analyst, Coord. | 4 | 72,611 | 81,687 | 90,764 | 89,373 | 1.6\% |
| Admin to Mayor, CAO, Leg Asst, Coord. | 3 | 63,791 | 71,765 | 79,739 | 79,971 | -0.3\% |
| Admin to Commissioner, Dir, Mgr | 2 | 55,079 | 61,964 | 68,849 | 69,164 | -0.5\% |
| Admin Asst/Clerks | 1 | 46,364 | 52,160 | 57,956 | 57,461 | 0.9\% |

NA - Not available, as none of the 3 neigbouring municipalities had a similar grade level to compare against.
A full regression analysis against all the City's standard municipal com

