

October 28, 1985

Horacio de la Cueva  
TAU

Dear Horacio:

For the past nine months the University has been employing the American firm of Ritchie and Associates to conduct an efficiency study of various University departments. The cost of this review is enormous, and we question the usefulness of this expenditure. We feel that this time-motion study, and the "management control system" it results in, has already had a detrimental effect on services in some areas - Campus Mail and Delivery, Purchasing, Physical Plant, and Finance, for example -- and that this trend will continue. We have also seen a serious increase in stress, and decline in morale amongst our members as a result of this work speed-up, job reduction exercise.

On October 24, 1985, in a meeting of close to 500 of our members, we voted overwhelmingly to work-to-rule as a response to this problem. We would like to explain our purpose for doing this, and the intended result.

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 perform. 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 our members to slow down.** We are asking them not to speed up under the current pressures to the point where their health is at stake or the quality of your work is jeopardized. We intend to work to the rule of the contract, to the requirements of our job descriptions. The University, at this point, does not deserve more than that from us.

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, the Arthur Anderson Group, and other consultants, they should be able to find the money to pay us our contractually agreed upon increments for the past two years (they have been arguing inability to pay under the CSP). 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.

We appreciate your interest in this matter, and we look forward to any support you can offer. We would be pleased if you could reproduce and distribute this statement. We also ask that your association, and its members, continue to put the blame for the decline in services on those who deserve it: the University Administration and the Social Credit government. Thank you again for your concern.

Yours truly,

Ted Byrne  
Union Coordinator

TB:dz