

Ministry of Tourism,  
Culture and Recreation  
400 University Avenue  
Toronto ON M7A 2R9

Ministère du Tourisme,  
de la Culture et des Loisirs  
400, avenue University  
Toronto ON M7A 2R9



March 26, 2001

TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARY  
City Librarian's Office  
MAR 29 2001

Ms. Josephine Bryant  
City Librarian  
Toronto Public Library  
789 Yonge Street  
Toronto, Ontario  
M4W 2G8

Dear Ms. Bryant:

Congratulations on the launch of Toronto Public Library's Internet gateway, NewsConnect. Through this newest gateway addition to the Virtual Reference Library, Ontarians will have greater access to Canadian and international news sources.

I have visited the Virtual Reference Library, and was impressed by the information resources and research guidance provided through this innovative electronic library initiative. From their homes, offices and libraries, visitors to the Virtual Reference Library can access extensive reference materials, subject guides, research tools and gateways to in-depth information about career development, science and genealogy. I am confident that Ontarians will find the NewsConnect gateway to be a valuable addition to this increasingly comprehensive range of online resources.

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation is pleased to be Toronto Public Library's partner in the continued growth and development of the Virtual Reference Library. We celebrate the launch of NewsConnect with you.

Yours truly,

  
Donald A. Obonsawin  
Deputy Minister  
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Recreation



*Sherene*  
**SHAW**  
Councillor Sherene Shaw  
Scarborough Agincourt • Ward 39

b.



Toronto City Hall  
100 Queen Street West, Suite A1  
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2N2  
Telephone: (416) 392-1374  
Fax: (416) 392-7431

Email: councillor\_shaw@city.toronto.on.ca  
Scarborough Community Office  
Telephone: (416) 395-7687

TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARY  
City Librarian

APR. 04 2001

RECD

March 26, 2001

**MEMO TO:** Councillor David Shiner, Chair & Members  
Budget Advisory Committee

**FROM:** Councillor Sherene Shaw  
Scarborough Agincourt, Ward 39

**RE:** Request to Reconsider Impact of Library Board Budgetary Cutbacks

It has come to my attention that the Library Board will be coming back to the Budget Advisory Committee, as directed, next week in order to advise the Committee about the budgetary savings option they have selected. I understand that this will potentially mean hourly cutbacks for some libraries and may effect the Steeles Neighbourhood Branch Library in by Ward.

The Steeles Neighbourhood Library services a mixed population composed of young families and a large multicultural community with many new immigrants, as well a significant number of empty nesters and seniors in the neighbouring condominiums. This library has a practical, intellectual and cultural impact on the community by providing timely and relevant materials for everyday life. Currently, the branch has already been a casualty of hourly cutbacks and is open for only four evenings per week. Young people make great use of these evening hours for studying and for use of the Internet and other electronic resources.

In discussions with Library staff, Steeles Library is a well-used facility. It circulates over 200,000 items per year and ranks 20 out of 78 neighbourhood libraries in terms of circulation. It offers regular story-times and special activities for children, and provides materials regarding parenting and English as a Second Language, as well as provides collections in other languages, such as Chinese.

Steeles Library is a vital resource for the multicultural communities in my Ward, and provides an integral service and resource for young and old alike. It is a meeting place for the community at large and helps to introduce the Canadian culture to first time residents.

The reduction of library hours penalizes children, and curbs their educational potential, and it hinders all our diverse communities.

I am requesting that the Budget Committee reconsider the impact this will have on our residents. Your attention and reconsideration in this matter is greatly appreciated.

*Sherene Shaw*  
Councillor Sherene Shaw

cc: Rick Goldsmith, Chair, Toronto Public Library Board, 789 Yonge St., Toronto, Ontario, M4W 2G8

Letters-DA: - 01-0088 Shiner

SS:rh



Toronto Transit Commission

Toronto Diversity Advocate



C.

191 Franklin Ave  
North York, Ontario  
M2N 1C8  
16 April 2001

Mr Rick Goldsmith CA  
Chair,  
Toronto Public Library Board  
789 Yonge St  
Toronto. M4W 2G8

Dear Sir,

We, the undersigned, would like to draw your attention to the fact that LINK COMMUNITY INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICE at North York Central Library has been advised that it will close at the end of June.

Are you aware that LINK was established in 1971 to fill an obvious need in the North York community. Later, Tax and Legal clinics were added for people on low income. These clinics are still operating, staffed by professionals who volunteer their time.

Clients whose first language is not English are able to obtain assistance with forms, and understanding governmental processes.

Immigrants are given information on LINC programmes and aids to settlement.

Mothers can obtain locations for child care and recreational facilities for their children.

Teenagers can be directed to a confidential "Talk Shop" run by Public Health nurses.

Persons in care are able to obtain information on advocacy groups without fear of reprisals.

Seniors are directed to organizations that assist with snow clearing and yard work.

And of course we are able to direct clients to the correct library department for their needs.

These are only a few examples of the services offered by LINK and its volunteers.

While we understand that a lot of this information is now available on-line, for many of our clients it is impossible to use these facilities. Either they do not have a computer or lack the necessary skills to find their way through the complex maze of services and information offered.

If budgetary restraints are driving this decision, may we respectfully point out that the one salaried person will stay in the Library system, as will the part time staff. So we are at a loss to

understand what savings will be effected, since the remainder of the staff are volunteers.

Should LINK close there will be a huge Information Services gap between the old City of Toronto and Richmond Hill.

In conclusion may we ask that you earnestly reconsider this decision in light of the minimal savings to the library but maximum service to North York.

We are sincerely,

B. Worthington

Teresa Duncan

cc  
G.Mason  
M.Augimeri  
O.Chow  
B.Buckingham  
Dr.R.Chopowick  
M.Feldman  
S.Douglas  
M.Ibrahim  
L.Knight  
D.Minnan-Wong  
J.mihevc  
K.Rae  
J.Pitfield  
M.Weisberg  
J. Bryant  
M.Lastman  
D.Shiner  
J.Filion  
F.Di Giorgio  
H.Moscoe  
A.Johnston  
P.Sutherland

N. Kramer

Al Gomez

J. Anthony

T. Sundt

E. Dunn

J. Aeton

M. Murphy

X. March

Diane Brown

Ellen & Gudilia

Lillian Silver

Jeanne Bereskin

B. Harscher ppd

P. Beiles

DR T. SURRIDGE

LINK Volunteers

# TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARY

d.

April 24, 2001

LINK Community Information  
and Referral Service Volunteers  
c/o C. Worthington  
North York Central Library  
5120 Yonge Street  
Toronto, ON M2N 5N9

Dear LINK Volunteers:

Thank you for your letter of April 16, 2001 expressing concern about the loss of community information and referral service for the North York community that will result from the closure of the LINK office this summer. As active volunteers at LINK, with first-hand experience in the types of service it has delivered over thirty years, I can appreciate your concern for any potential change in service level.

This has been a particularly challenging year for the City of Toronto to develop a budget that balances service demands, fiscal pressures and acceptable tax levels. Within this context, the Library Board has had to look at all of its services and operations in order to reduce its budget request to meet the target set by the City.

At the same time, staff were in the process of completing a service review of community information provision within Toronto Public Library. The objectives of this review were to develop recommendations for a future model that would harmonize community service across the City, make optimal use of staff, technology and resources and support collaboration with other community agencies. The environment in which community information is delivered has undergone significant change and greatly increased in complexity. There are also significant local community information initiatives in development that will have great impact on access to information. These include Community Information Toronto's development of a web-based information database and the United Way's 211 twenty-four hour call line.

All of these factors were carefully weighed in considering a service adjustment for LINK. The LINK office at the North York Central Library which currently operates a separate, stand alone service will close at the end of June. The office closure will realize an ongoing, annual saving of \$112,000 to the Library's budget and represents a significant contribution to the overall budget reduction the Library Board had to achieve.

## Library Board

### Chair

Rick Goldsmith, CA

### Vice-Chair

Gillian Mason

### City Librarian

Josephine Bryant

Councillor Maria Augimeri

William Booth

Moyer Brownstone

Councillor Olivia Chow

Councillor Mike Feldman

Lillian Knight

Councillor Joe Mihevc

Mark Nightingale

Councillor Denzil Minnan-Wong

Councillor Jane Piffield

Councillor Kyle Rae

Marjorie Stephenson

Mitchell Weisberg

While the decision to close LINK was not an easy one, I would like to assure you that many of the services currently provided by LINK will continue to be provided to the community, albeit through alternative means. Library staff are currently developing an implementation plan for the transition of community information and referral service. While the staff positions in LINK will be eliminated (thereby reducing the budget), the staff themselves will move into vacant positions in the North York Central Library.

The Central Library, within its existing staff establishment, will assume responsibility for coordinating community information and referral service delivery through our 98-branch network. Service will continue to be available by telephone, in person and electronically either in the branches or to remote users. Library staff are trained to deliver information service and referral in a professional and confidential manner. I am confident that they will be able to do so for community information as part of their regular service. Library staff will also be responsible for maintaining an awareness of current and future developments in community information service by other organizations and ensuring that they are incorporated effectively into the Library's information provision.

Much of the adjustment in service will be transparent to its users. For those who are used to using the LINK office on the concourse level at the Central Library in person, they will in future be served from one of the subject departments in the Library itself. We plan to continue to deliver the Income Tax and Legal Aid Clinics out of the Central Library.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you and all of LINK's volunteers who for the past thirty years have made it possible for the service to develop and be available to users day in and day out. Without the many hours you have contributed to the service, it would not have been possible for the Library to offer such a specialized service delivery. I hope the Board will be able to count on your continued commitment over the next few months as we plan the transition for the next generation of community information service.

Yours truly,



Rick Goldsmith  
Chair

Copies to: Mayor M. Lastman  
Councillor F. Di Giorgio  
Councillor J. Filion  
Councillor A. Johnston  
Councillor H. Moscoe  
Councillor D. Shiner  
Councillor P. Sutherland  
J. Bryant  
TPL Board Agenda April 30, 2001 – Communications



## LOCAL 416

Affiliated with CUPE, CLC

**BRIAN COCHRANE**  
*President*

**BILL GUTHRIE**  
*Vice-President*

**GLEN MCKINNON**  
*Secretary-Treasurer*

**MIKE KEMP**  
*Outside Division Chair*

**CHRISTINA DUCKWORTH - PILKINGTON**  
*Library Division Chair*

**GARTH SMITH**  
*Chief of Stewards*

**PETER OUELLETTE**  
*Chief of Health & Safety*

**MAUREEN O'REILLY**  
*Recording Secretary*

April 17, 2001

**Rick Goldsmith**  
**Chairman**  
**Toronto Public Library Board**  
**789 Yonge Street**  
**Toronto, Ontario M4W 2G8**

1170 Sheppard Ave.W.  
Unit #3 Toronto, ON M3K 2A3  
633-7272/Fax 633-5743

Fax No. (416) 393-7083

Dear Mr. Goldsmith:

**Re: Toronto Public Library - Budget Proposal**

Please find attached, a copy of a proposal from Local 416 with respect to the Library budget.

Respectfully

*for Brian Cochrane/dg*

**Brian Cochrane**  
**President**  
**TORONTO CIVIC EMPLOYEES UNION**  
**LOCAL 416 C.U.P.E.**

BC/dg  
cupu 343

Ends.



## Toronto Civic Employees' Union, Local 416

386 Ontario Street  
Toronto, ON M5A 2V7  
968-7721/Fax 968-7829

1170 Sheppard Ave. W.  
Unit #3 Toronto, ON M3K 2A3  
633-7272/Fax 633-5743

### LOCAL 416

Affiliated with CUPE, CLC

BRIAN COCHRANE  
*President*

BILL GUTHRIE  
*Vice-President*

GLEN MCKINNON  
*Secretary-Treasurer*

MIKE KEMP  
*Outside Division Chair*

CHRISTINA DUCKWORTH  
PILKINGTON  
*Library Division Chair*

GARTH SMITH  
*Chief of Stewards*

PETER OUELLETTE  
*Chief of Health & Safety*

MAUREEN O'REILLY  
*Recording Secretary*

April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2001

### TORONTO CIVIC EMPLOYEES UNION - LOCAL 416 CUPE BUDGET PROPOSAL TO STREAMLINE STAFF SELECTION AND PREVENT PROGRAM CUTS AND THE REDUCTION OF HOURS OF SERVICE IN TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARY BRANCHES

TCEU Local 416 represents over 2,000 library workers at Toronto Public Library. Our members have expressed serious reservations concerning the proposal currently under consideration by Toronto City Council which if adopted, would cut library programs and reduce hours of service in branch libraries across the City.

We recognize the serious budget restraints which have been unfairly and unjustifiably placed upon the City and the Library Board as a result of the downloading of costs previously assumed by the Province of Ontario.

It is our view, however, that *other cost-cutting alternatives exist which are far preferable to the elimination of library programs and the reduction of public service hours in branch libraries.*

The Budget Advisory Committee has instructed the Toronto Public Library Board to carry out a budget reduction of \$464,000. The Library has responded with a plan which includes a proposal to save \$231,600 through possible reduction of hours of service in 26 public library branches. The Library Board has also proposed that *"if a further review of non-program areas identifies any further possible efficiencies, these will be used to offset service reductions".*

We do not support further service reductions or further downsizing of our membership in the Library. Our members have already borne the brunt of budget cuts for the past ten years, and particularly since amalgamation. We believe programs and services for the public can still be maintained by the application of cost-saving strategies to streamline the internal staff selection process.

The filling of bargaining unit vacancies in the Library is currently conducted by means of an excessively staff-intensive, time-consuming and very costly process. The Union is therefore proposing the following as a non-program cost-saving measure to offset possible service reductions:

*That in place of the current and proposed staff selection procedures, which require extensive interviewing and evaluation of candidates, Local 416 and the Library Board agree to move by way of a Letter of Understanding to an interpretation of the Collective Agreement to facilitate the selection of the senior candidate having the ability and qualifications to perform the normal requirements of the job.*

Under this proposal a single interview will become the norm for most job postings, and the streamlining of staff selection can take place in a way that will be fair to employees and cost-effective for the Library. Major cost-savings will result for the Library which would entirely eliminate the need to reduce public service hours in branch libraries.

Our proposal will generate potential annual cost-savings of from \$263,750 to \$652,000. The savings would be achieved through a modest downsizing of Library Management and Human Resources. (This is a very conservative estimate based almost entirely upon figures provided to the Union by Library Management. It does not include savings on grievance and arbitration costs arising from the current posting procedure which would also be reduced drastically).

In addition to providing major cost-savings, mainly through the elimination of the vast majority of candidate interviews currently conducted in the Library, this proposal would ensure that front-line workers are not taken away from their jobs to attend interviews at a time when staff reductions and gapping have already created a serious strain on the quality of public service the Library is able to provide. The proposal supports the Library's role as a provider of public programs and services, while reducing the need for the costly diversion of funds into a cumbersome and staff-intensive staff selection process.

We are asking the Policy and Finance Committee and the Toronto Public Library Board to support this proposal in the interest of maintaining the high quality of service Toronto residents have come to expect of the busiest public library system in North America.

Opeiu 343/dg

## BACKGROUND TO THE TCEU LOCAL 416 LIBRARY BUDGET PROPOSAL

### 1. Costing the Library's Staff Selection Guidelines

In recent weeks the Union was asked by Library Management to comment on new "staff selection guidelines" being developed for the Library. During the review of the proposed guidelines it became apparent that the new procedures would be highly subjective, require a major time-allocation for Management and Human Resources staff, remove front-line workers from already badly understaffed workplaces for considerable periods of time, and be very costly to the Library.

Many departments of the City are now required to report to the Province using performance measurement criteria based upon cost benefit analysis. The Union asked Library Management whether or not any similar costing had been done regarding the proposed "staff selection guidelines". We were told that no such costing had been done. The Union then asked for sufficient information to do our own costing (which we have included with this submission).

### 2. Achieving Savings Through Elimination of Vacancies

In both the Library Board's proposal to reduce hours of service in branch libraries, and the Union's proposal to streamline staff selection, the cost-savings would be achieved through the elimination of permanent positions. In both proposals the elimination of existing vacancies would be one means of achieving the cost-savings.

The Union contends that any further elimination of front-line public service positions will have a harmful impact on overall library service to the public across the City. Also, the permanent vacancies slated for elimination in the Library Board's proposal are the same positions which Library Management have repeatedly assured the Union were being held open for the redeployment of workers who will be displaced from their jobs in a planned major reorganization of the Library which has been delayed due to wage harmonization negotiations. (The Union has an outstanding grievance maintaining that these positions should have already been posted and filled on a permanent basis.)

### 3. The Union Proposal is Based on Collective Agreement Language Familiar to Both Parties

The Union proposal is based upon language already familiar to the parties in the past Collective Agreement of the former East York Public Library. (Grievance and arbitration costs were virtually non-existent under this language in the EYPL agreement).

The requirement to interview candidates would be restricted in our proposal to ensuring

the senior candidate does in fact have the ability and qualifications to perform the normal requirements of the job.

The current protections and safeguards for both the successful candidate and the Employer within the current Library Collective Agreement would be fully retained.

- Please see attached document for estimated cost-savings \*

*Opeiu 3438g*

## **The cost benefit analysis of the job selection process for TPL**

A number of scenarios will be looked at. Scenarios 1 and 3 have been used in preparing the Union proposal.

A) -Up to about the end of March, 2001, there have been about 126 job postings. At this pace there could easily be more than 300 postings this year. Last year there were approximately 400 job competitions.  
-Management had stated that in a normal recruitment year there should be about 150-200.

No. Of postings per year.			
Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
150	200	200	200

B) Interviews for postings run from about 5, particularly for temp. positions, to as high 30 or more for permanent positions.  
-Management has given us a figure of 5-9 per posting. We shall use 5,8 and 15.

Average No. Of interviews per posting

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
150*5	200*5	200*8	200*15
750	1000	1600	3,000

C) -These people will have their interview time paid for. TPL staff excluding pages, make from between \$15-\$40 per hour. For our purposes we shall use a lowball average of about \$22 per hour.

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
750*\$22	1000*\$22	1,600*\$22	3,000*\$22
\$16,500	\$22,000	\$35,200	\$66,000

D) The candidates will have an hour interview, plus you have to include the time required to get to and from the interview, about 45 minutes each way. All for a total of 2.5 hours per interviewee.

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
\$16,500*2.5	\$22,000*2.5	\$35,200*2.5	\$66,000*2.5
\$41,250	\$55,000	\$88,000	\$165,000

E) To this cost you would have to add the benefit costs, approx. 25%.

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
\$41,250*.25	\$55,000*.25	\$88,000*.25	\$165,000*.25
Add that to the previous total, gives you			
\$51,562.50	\$68,750	\$110,000	\$206,250

F) There is also the cost incurred for Managers to prepare, run, evaluate and select the “winning” candidate. Taking the number of interviews per year, you multiply that by the number of managers that conduct each interview, 2, keeping in mind that in management’s latest proposal this is the minimum number. There could even be three.

No. Of interviews, multiplied by 2 interviewing managers.

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
750*2	1,000*2	1,600*2	3,000*2
1,500	2,000	3200	6,000

G) Multiply this number by the approximate hourly rate for the Managers. The highest bargaining unit hourly rate is about \$40. Management average hourly rate could very well be above that, but for arguments we shall use an hourly rate of \$40.

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
1,500*40	2,000*40	3,200*40	6,000*40
\$60,000	\$80,000	\$128,000	\$240,000

H) Multiply this by the time that the Manager will have to dedicate for each interviewer, including the actual interview, the preparation done before the interview, the time spent assessing the candidates, and the time that the interviewee’s manager will have to spend to conduct a performance assessment for the interview. About 3 hours per interviewee should suffice.

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
\$60,000*3	\$80,000*3	\$128,000*3	\$240,000*3
\$180,000	\$240,000	\$384,000	\$720,000

I) Plus the benefit costs, about 25%.

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
\$180,000*.25	\$240,000*.25	\$480,000*.25	\$720,000*.25
Add that total to the previous figure.			
\$225,000	\$300,000	\$600,000	\$900,000

J) Turning our attention to Human Resources, their task will be to offer guidance and support to Managers and Directors in the selection process. They will also have to provide a measure of quality control to the Managers by reviewing the Management criteria for the postings. They will also review the applicants to weed out those who they believe do not qualify for an interview. H.R. will also have to confirm the selection decision. H.R. will also have to provide interview/feedback counseling to interested employees. Time spent per job posting could easily exceed 10 hours. For arguments sake we shall use 7 hours (or in other words 1 day per posting).

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
$150*7$	$200*7$	$200*7$	$200*7$
1,050	1,400	1,400	1,400

K) Multiply that by a rough average of an H.R. consultants hourly wage. About \$30.

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
$1,050*\$30$	$1,400*\$30$	$1,400*\$30$	$1,400*\$30$
\$31,000	\$42,000	\$42,000	\$42,000

L) Plus the benefit costs of about 25%

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5
$\$31,000*.25$	$\$42,000*.25$	$\$42,000*.25$	$\$42,000*.25$	$\$42,000*.25$
Add that to the previous numbers				
\$38,750	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000

Now to add the totals.

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
	5Int. 150posts	5Int. 200posts	8Int. 200posts	15Int. 200posts
Bargaining Unit costs				
Total line E	\$51,562.50	\$68,750	\$110,000	\$206,250
Management costs				
Total line I	\$225,000	\$300,000	\$600,000	\$900,000
H.R. costs				
Total line L	\$38,750	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000
	<b>\$315,312.50</b>	<b>\$371,500</b>	<b>\$762,000</b>	<b>\$1,158,250</b>

**Total Management and Human Resources costs.**

Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
<b>\$263,750</b>	\$302,750	<b>\$652,000</b>	\$952,000

We believe these to be conservative estimates of annual cost savings based on figures provided to the Union by Management. They do not include savings on costs from grievances and arbitrations which would be reduced substantially under the Union proposal.