

Canadian
University
Employees

2170 Western Parkway, UBC, Vancouver, B.C V6T 1V6 224-2308

November 5, 1985

CUE Work to Rule Bulletin #1

At a Special General Meeting on October 24, 1985, close to 500 of our members voted overwhelmingly in favour of a motion to work-to-rule in response to the University's use of the firm Ritchie and Associates. A statement regarding work-to-rule and a list of work-to-rule tactics (see attachments #1 & #2) were distributed at that meeting.



Subsequent to the October 24th meeting, a Steering Committee was struck to coordinate our work-to-rule campaign. The members of the committee are: Ted Byrne (224-2308), Nellie Cavasin (3711), Helen Glavina (5911), Rochelle de la Giroday (222-5273), Mary McKenna-Forkin (7696) and Maureen Barfoot (7172). This committee will be meeting weekly in order to prepare bulletins, buttons, steward meetings, division and shop meetings, and generally monitoring the campaign. If you have any questions, please contact any of the above mentioned individuals, or your shop steward.



The particulars of this campaign, and our demands have been communicated to the University, and some discussion has been had. It remains to be seen how the University will respond to our demands, but that response will depend largely upon your commitment to this campaign.



The Operating Engineers will soon be taking a vote regarding work-to-rule. Discussions are also ongoing with CUPE 116. The TAU, the Defend Education Services Coalition, and our sister local at UVIC sent messages of support to the October 24th meeting. A personal message of support was also conveyed to us from Jeff Rose, the CUPE National President. CUPE National has made a commitment of defense funds to this campaign, and we expect to have the benefit of a full-time research person on campus for a couple of weeks. Ritchie and Associates are already at work at UVIC, UBC and Dalhousie. There are six CUPE locals effected, and CUPE is concerned that this problem may spread to the many other under-funded campuses across the country where CUPE members are working.



A letter was sent to the Vancouver Sun (see Attachment #3) after the appearance, on October 24th, of an unfortunate article headlined: 'UBC efficiency report pleases union official'.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

We have included in this bulletin a press release issued by the CUPE National President (see Attachment #4) for the benefit of those of you who have not seen it.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Also attached to this bulletin you will find an article on yet another consulting group currently employed by UBC (see Attachment #5). The Arthur Anderson Group has re-structured the Information Systems Management department and is installing a sophisticated and expensive computerized accounting system for the University. Similar to the effect of Ritchie and Associates, they have imposed stringent work systems and are implementing permanent procedures to be followed long after their withdrawal from the department.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Attachment #6 was submitted as an article for the Library Bulletin, at their request. The Library Administration decided that it should not be published.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Following is a selection of quotes from two interviews with Vice President Gellatly. One was published in the above mentioned Library Bulletin, and the other was conducted by Patrick Munroe on his CBC program, the Afternoon Show.

Library Bulletin Interview with Bruce Gellatly

"R & A looked first at traditional administrative areas on campus, and to the extent that we were getting good results there, it's being looked at for other areas as well." ...

"R & A are assessing tasks. They are not assessing people. They make no comment upon the quality of how people perform the job. They address the effectiveness of how things are being done in terms of scheduling and organizing," he said. "Staff can be assured that R & A are not observing how people are doing the work. The point is that most people work very hard. It is a case of how the work is organized to make the best use of their time and talents," said Mr. Gellatly. "What they (R & A) do is to organize the work to make the best use of staff's time and talents. It is the work they plan, not the people they plan."...

"R & A bring unique skills to the job which allows for control of the system, controlling the process, and analysing the work. Most of our managers wouldn't have the time even to do these kinds of observations. R & A bring to bear certain expertise we can use at this time." ...

"There's a whole variety of things that are not happening that we need to be concerned about. One, for example, is the absence of a salary increase for two years, and now we're into the third year. If dollars can be generated, which can be freed up and there's no reduction in the performance of the service or the improved service and those dollars can be used for salary increases - that's one area where we'd likely want to consider." ...

"A memo from the President's Office is being issued (issued September 16) only because some of the questions being raised imply there is some secrecy. There really is none that I am concerned about."

CBC Afternoon Show

Patrick Monroe: I guess some people might be saying, since UBC is already in a deficit situation, why do they have to spend more money. I mean, I've heard that one of these contracts is for 1.3 million dollars, now...

Bruce Gellatly: No, that's not correct. And as I say, I'd prefer not...

PM: How much is it?

BG: Well, the one that is completed tomorrow, the fee for that particular program is 67,500 dollars...

PM: And that's one of twelve?

BG: That's right. And the annualized savings on that will be exhibited at something in the order of 74,000 dollars, which we should be able to save each year from here on. We will be paying for that fee through the savings. That particular program will not involve any layoffs whatsoever, and as a matter of fact in most cases there will not be any layoffs. I appreciate that there is some concern, but the University has had a freeze on appointments that Dr. Pedersen put in last November as part of our restraint environment.

PM: What about the negative effect that this ongoing series of studies is having on your staff out there.

BG: Well, I'm inclined to think that any change has that kind of effect. You can't make change without dislocating the comfort that people have with the way things have always been done. In the case, there was some reference that was made to our custodial in which it was referred to the fact that it's a very time and motion study type thing. That is not the case. What happens is this firm does look at all the tasks that are required to perform a custodial task. They do look at the work to time relationships of this. How much time it takes to do each component of the work. They look at the frequencies in which that is done, and the times are simply used to develop the routes, as to how long, and what we should be able to expect our custodians to do without changing the existing level of standards.

PM: What will you do if your employees decide to work-to-rule.

BG: Well, I think we have little option but to carry on. As indicated, I think the work-to-rule, as I understand, indicates that people would work to their job descriptions.

PM: Which doesn't include filling out efficiency study forms.

BG: Well, it's the supervisors who would be filling these out in most cases.



False Economies

At a shop stewards meeting on October 23, one of our stewards suggested that we keep a list of 'false economies' created by Ritchie and Associates. The example that she used was the rapid creation of an 'underground' system of delivery as a result of the re-routing and staff reduction that was imposed on Campus Mail and Delivery. Suddenly we had a multitude of people running around delivering things by hand, employing courier services, etc. This is a 'false economy'. Another example might be the number of people currently forced to clean their own offices. If you have any additions to this list, or facts that might support the examples already given, please send them in to the Union office.

Grievances

Arbitration has been invoked on the grievance concerning the Payroll department. We are grieving reduction of the work force (5.04), consultation (24.05), contracting out and job postings (5.05, 22.01) and employee files (23.01). Under 23.01, we are arguing that employees should have the

opportunity to contest the information contained on the activity report forms, since these forms constitute an evaluation of performance, and could be used as cause for discipline. The employees claim that the times allowed for the performance of duties are unreasonable. On this point, the University responded: 'These reports are being used to collect data on productivity and are not being used for disciplinary purposes. Should the University ever change its mind and decide to make use of the Daily Activity Summaries for disciplinary purposes, then copies will be provided to the employee concerned and placed on file in the Staff Records Section of Personnel Services, as is required by this article.' The article states: 'Copies of any document which constitutes, may result in, or arises from disciplinary action, shall be provided immediately to the employee concerned and entered in her/his file in the Staff Records Section of the Employee Relations Department.'

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆
End of Bulletin #1

October 24, 1985

RITCHIE & ASSOCIATES

WORK TO RULE

It is our belief that, because of the severe cut backs of the past three years, the majority of CUE members are working against backlogs and pressure created by understaffing. We believe that many of us are currently working to capacity or beyond capacity in an attempt just to keep our heads above water. Now the water has been deepened in some areas by the changes to working procedures introduced by Ritchie and Associates. The effect of the added pressures this entails has had a disastrous effect on some of our members, and on the services that they provide. We believe that by working to rule, we can demonstrate to our employer that the majority of us have already been working beyond what should be reasonably required of us, and that the imposition of additional pressure and a further speed-up is not acceptable to us. We are not asking you to slow down. We are asking you not to speed up under the current pressures to the point where your health is at stake or the quality of your work is jeopardized. You should work to the rule of the contract, to the requirements of your job description. The University, at this point, does not deserve more than that from you.

Many of you work in areas that have not been directly effected by Ritchie and Associates. However, we think you will agree that the cut backs to date are already effecting the amount of work required of you, often beyond what is reasonable. WE are asking those of you who have not yet had to deal with the efficiency review to show your solidarity with those who have by also taking part in this work to rule campaign. Remember, you may be next.

If this campaign is effective, we hope that it will not only serve as a strong expression of our feeling about the current situation at UBC, but also bring some pressure to bear on the University to reconsider its use of this firm to accomplish what it should be able to accomplish in a humane way with its own resources.

The University has said that it does not intend to lay people off as a result of this review. They have argued that any cuts can be met through deletion of frozen positions, attrition, reassignment, early retirement, etc. We want a written agreement to this effect. We also want payment of our increments. If they can find the money to pay Ritchie and Associates, they should be able to find the money to pay us what we are owed. Ritchie and Associates are not the only ones who have a contract with the University. In addition, we want some serious attention paid to the consultative process outlined in our collective agreement. We feel this can best be done by the University agreeing to meet with a committee of our members.

The Executive strongly encourages you to vote in favour of the work to rule motion.

Ted Byrne
For the Executive

2170 Western Parkway, UBC, Vancouver, B.C V6T 1V6 224-2308

October 24, 1985

WHAT IS WORK TO RULE?

- work thoroughly, and show concern for quality.
- fill out Ritchie & Associates forms correctly, and thoroughly. Don't let the form box you in: put down the actual time it takes to perform your duties, and add any duties that are not listed on the form -- make them aware of exactly what you do, and how long it takes.
- keep a carbon copy of each form for future reference (the union is arguing that these forms constitute performance reviews and should be provided to the employee)
- don't take direct orders from Ritchie and Associates.
- fill out Ritchie and Associates' forms on employers time.
- do strictly your own job duties, unless the duties you are asked to perform are those of a lower classification occasionally encompassed by our own, or unless you are paid a temporary promotion rate for performing duties of a higher classification.
- do not speed up, work at a reasonable pace for the job.
- take all breaks, lunches, to the minute.
- grieve anything that is legitimately grievable.
- if you are legitimately sick, book off.
- take medical and dental appointments at your convenience, according to the contract
- leave on time for lunch and at the end of the day.
- if overtime is requested, point out that the employer is required to 'endeavour to keep overtime to a minimum and to meet requirements on a voluntary basis'. Don't volunteer, make them demand it -- but do it if you are ordered to.
- refer complaints to managers, the Administration, Ritchie and Associates whenever appropriate.
- take your vacations (some of us don't!)
- lodge any legitimate complaints re: health and safety, physical plant, custodial services, campus mail, etc.
- attend union meetings
- stewards, see article 7.01
- apply for reclassifications if you feel it is justified -- this is often put off for a variety of reasons.
- start petitions re: decline in services; write letters, and particularly encourage managers and faculty to do the same -- but be sure you put the blame where it is deserved.
- read through the contract and see if you can add to this list.
- don't slow down, don't be obstructive or insubordinate.

2170 Western Parkway, UBC, Vancouver, B.C V6T 1V6 224-2308

October 28, 1985

Vancouver Sun
Editorial Board
2250 Granville St
Vancouver, B.C.
'Setting it straight'

Dear Sir or Madame:

Re: October 24/85 Article
'UBC efficiency report pleases union official'

Just to set the record straight: I very definitely did not say that I was pleased with the Ritchie and Associates' report on AV Services that was released on Wednesday, October 23, 1985. I am requesting a retraction of the statements made in the above captioned Sun article.

In fact, the report has very little direct impact on our bargaining unit. Some of the savings result from the deletion of one of the three CUE positions in AV Services. This position has been vacant since before the Ritchie & Associates review commenced. There was also some indication that part of this work would be contracted out to temporary employees. I'm not pleased about that.

I expressed very clearly to your reporter my feelings about the AV Services report. It is a small, self-supporting unit where savings can be realized without a severe reduction of staff. This is not true of the Library, for example, which is many times the size of AV Services. So the 'success' of this report, as claimed by the Administration, does not alleviate our fears of job-reduction and decline in services. I would also like to add that the report on AV services gives us a much clearer picture of the nature of the 'management control system' being put in place. It is a system of control which extends beyond the dreams of even the most obsessively regimentational manager. It allows for the tracking, to the minute, of an employee's work in such a way that the work is quantifiable, and the performance measurable to an extent that should not be acceptable even to the most highly mechanized workers, let alone workers whose work is varied and service oriented.

Thank you for the opportunity to correct the unfortunate impression left by Wednesday's article.

Sincerely,



Ted Byrne
Union-Coordinator



CANADIAN UNION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES
SYNDICAT CANADIEN DE LA FONCTION PUBLIQUE

British Columbia Regional Office

#105, 7535 - 6th Street
Burnaby, B.C.
V3N 3M2

(604) 525-9231
Telex: 04-351470

S T A T E M E N T

September 23, 1985 News Conference - Jeff Rose - UBC

It is well known to people in this province that there is a crisis in education at all levels - elementary, high school, college and university levels. All are severely threatened, demoralized and struggling to fulfill their mandates.

At some universities here in B.C., the situation has gone beyond crisis to emergency. Employees are working within an environment of fear and uncertainty. At the Universities of British Columbia and Victoria, something has arisen that has worsened an already intolerable situation. A company, Ritchie and Associates, a large American consulting firm, has been conducting a cost-cutting review of the non-academic departments at both universities. University administrators at both institutions brought Ritchie and Associates in with virtually no advance notice to employees, department heads or deans. This lack of information - before and since - has led to a great deal of speculation and disturbing rumours, which have served to exacerbate an already tense working climate.

Generally employees at both universities had been used to being well informed about administrative decisions, with management making an effort to stay in touch with their employees. But on the issue of Ritchie and Associates, there hasn't been a word. It's been nothing but secrecy.

Jeff Rose
National President
Président national

Kealey Cummings
National Secretary-Treasurer
Secrétaire-trésorier national

Owen Dykstra
Jean Claude Laniel
Lucie Nicholson
Tom O'Leary
Jack Rodie
General Vice Presidents
Vice présidents généraux

This secrecy typifies an overall attitude by management today towards education and educational institutions throughout the province. (Ultimately, universities are public institutions administered by managements hired by the Government. Ultimately, the Government must take responsibility for the health and well-being of these institutions.) This behaviour is another example of the Government's continuing attack on the educational system, be it through Ritchie and Associates, or the firing of the Vancouver School Board, or cutbacks in needed educational support services.

The presence of Ritchie and Associates has increased the already tense working environment at both universities. The employees involved realize that -- in general terms -- benefits could perhaps be derived from studies which are carried out effectively. But with no consultation on an issue such as this, studies on any workplace are destined to be ineffective at best and damaging at worst.

Beyond that, there is the issue of cost. All indications are that Ritchie and Associates are costing the Universities of British Columbia and Victoria large quantities of money. It seems odd to us that, at a time of restraint, and a time when both universities are pleading "no funds", they should be spending big money in this manner.

It seems that the days of involving employees in building a stronger education system are gone. Gone too are the days of treating employees with respect and consideration. The Government and management have lost sight

of what makes our educational system, including our universities, strong. That is the people who work in them: from the professors and teachers, right through to the custodians and maintenance people and the ever-essential administrative people. It is they who are the heart and soul of our educational system. It is they who ultimately make the difference between a good institution and an average institution.

I call on the management of the University of Victoria and the University of British Columbia to answer the following points of important public interest:

1. Are Ritchie and Associates members of the Association of Consulting Management Engineers, and governed by their mandatory Code of Professional Responsibilities? If not, why not?
2. Are Ritchie and Associates being paid fees based partly on the savings they recommend? If so, what guarantee is there that Ritchie and Associates will behave with professional detachment in assessing potential areas of savings, instead of as bounty hunters?
3. Will the managements of the two universities sit down with their employees as soon as possible, to talk about this intolerable situation? Will they involve their employees, make them part of the system again, and in doing so strengthen education overall through the kind of collaboration and consultation that is at the heart of a strong and independent educational system?

Article on Ritchie and Associates for Library Bulletin
Ted Byrne, Union Coordinator, AUCE Local One

I attended the Aug. 22, 1985, meeting at which Doug McInnes addressed the library staff on the issue of Ritchie and Associates. I would like to make several observations on Mr. McInnes' presentation.

First of all, I would like to congratulate him for his decision to hold such a meeting. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that an administrator has called a meeting of all staff to discuss the purpose and procedures of the Ritchie and Associates' review. This is a step in the right direction, and it is unfortunate that the University has not taken such an open and public approach to this issue in general. Part of the reason for the high level of tension and apprehension on the part of the staff is the apparent secrecy that surrounds this project.

This tension was very evident at the meeting, but I believe it was somewhat muted by the sympathy that the staff feel toward Mr. McInnes and the difficult position this efficiency study has put him in. It was obvious from some of his remarks that the library administration had vigorously resisted the arrival of Ritchie and Associates. His position seemed to be that the decision to hire Ritchie and Associates cannot be reversed, and therefore we had better try to make the best of it.

Mr. McInnes assured us that the library has a firm agreement with the University administration regarding the degree of control that library management will have over the process, and that hopefully some of the problems that have occurred elsewhere can be avoided. He also assured us that the entire review would be carried out with a high degree of constant and open consultation with staff. It is to be hoped that these ambitions can be realized.

Mr. McInnes stressed three points when explaining the need for this review: improved management methods, improved efficiency, and the need for a 'campus-wide management control system' to determine real staffing needs.

He said that the preliminary study in IPC showed that the Centre's 'informal' approach to supervision permitted a considerable amount of time to be lost. If this 'informal' approach exists, and is not a misperception on the part of Ritchie and Associates — and if such an informal approach is in fact detrimental to the operation of the Centre, we don't understand why library management itself could not identify and correct the problem. In other words, what is the problem with the University's own management, and why are they not using their own resources? One of the solutions to the problem of management methods which will be introduced by Ritchie and Associates will be training sessions ('communication meetings') for supervisors and managers. Supervisors will be trained in 'basic management concepts': setting objectives, planning, implementing plans, control and follow-up ('positive control'). We

have seen many of the documents from these 'communication meetings', and we feel that their approach is very basic, and in no way an advance on the kind of training already provided by the library to its supervisors. The main result of increasing the control that supervisors exercise over staff — if they are successful in imposing it — will probably be a worsening of staff relations.

As for improved efficiency, Mr. McInnes said that there has been no criticism of the library's current operations. So the real question, for Ritchie and Associates, is whether or not the same level of services can be maintained with less staff. From what we have seen so far, this is not accomplished by a radical changes to methods of operation, but rather by a simple calculation of the amount of work and the time required to accomplish it. Ritchie and Associates have no expertise in the area of library systems, and so the question that was asked at the meeting regarding maintenance of quality is a very crucial one. Ritchie and Associates' calculations in the Purchasing Dept. indicated that a sizeable reduction in staff was possible. The calculations themselves were severely criticized by both management and staff in that department. We have no indication at this time as to what percentage of 'savings' were predicted by the preliminary study in IPC. In purchasing the final recommendation came very close to the preliminary projection. The important question there is whether or not these 'savings' can be effected without a reduction in the quality of service.

Finally, there is the question of an ongoing 'management control system'. Mr. McInnes stated that it is impossible for the University to continue making arbitrary percentage cuts as a response to the crisis situation imposed annually by government cuts to the University's budget. So far, the University has managed, with some difficulty, to meet these reductions. Given the severity of the reductions over the past several years, it is unbelievable to us that the Provincial Government intends to continue cutting away at the post-secondary education system. However, we were told that this is to be expected, and that we must be prepared. In order to be prepared, we need a campus-wide management control system that will allow the administration to determine 'real staffing needs', so that such cuts in future can be made rationally, and with the least damage to the University. So this review is being presented as a kind of contingency plan to allow the University to face further cuts, if such cuts are forthcoming. Our question is: given the attitude of the Provincial Government toward higher education, is it not more likely that the results of the Ritchie and Associates' review will be used to determine future cuts to the University's budget?

One last point. Do we really deserve this kind of treatment? One result of this review has already been a serious decline in morale, and increased anxiety for both staff and management. Our bargaining unit has not seen a wage increase for over two years, and many of us are struggling to get along on what we earn. The University refuses to pay already agreed to incremental increases, and yet has spent to date several times that amount on this review. The work-force has already been considerably reduced as a result of hiring freezes and attrition, and many of us are working in areas that are short staffed. Could the University have not found a way of dealing with their problem internally, using their own abundant resources?

BYRNE KATHLEEN
CURRIC LAB.
FACULTY OF EDUCATION