

be the first to admit that efficiencies could be achieved in the way the ~~university~~ universities' budgets are being managed. But why, when the universities have abundant resources of their own in the area of business administration, was it necessary to hire, at great cost, an out of province company to conduct what essentially amounts to a time-motion study. ~~of the~~ Do Ritchie and Associates have some particular expertise in the area of ~~university~~ university management? From what we've seen and heard, it doesn't appear that they do. The methods that they employ could be applied to any factory. They measure the time it takes to perform the work, and based on these measurements ~~conclude~~ ^{invariably} conclude that a smaller number of workers are required. For this the University is spending, by our estimate, a couple of million dollars.

Where is the money coming from? The unions at UBC have been assured that the purpose of the review is not to reduce the workforce. ~~the~~ If the purpose is merely to increase efficiency, and possibly allow for an expansion of services within the same budget, then how will the University even manage to recover the money that is being spent on the review? UBC is a public institution, and as such is extremely ~~labor~~ labour intensive -- the only real savings that can be achieved ^{by such a review} are savings in the area of salaries. If the true intention of the review is to cut expenditures by cutting staff, then we are certain that the implementation of ~~Ritchie~~ Ritchie and Associates' recommendations

but first dept. managers + staff. having initial input, to change inefficient system. Give examples of admin. use of faculty of Commerce, etc. Perhaps together we could have solved the problem. B.C. Tax payers a considerable amount of \$.

or is the study fulfilling a broader more political purpose?

will lead to a severe reduction in services, and hence to a reduction of the quality of education. The universities have reduced staff dramatically over the past two or three years (get figures), and the ~~xxxx~~ result has already been a reduction in services, and the exodus of employees who cannot work under the conditions imposed by these reductions. The only test-run of ~~xx~~ a Ritchie and Associates' recommendation to be completed at UBC -- in the campus mail service - was a complete disaster. The recommendation that was made for the Purchasing Dept. was rejected absolutely by the Director of that Dept. as inaccurate, and virtually impossible to implement -- there was no question in his mind that it would lead to ~~xxxxxxx~~ a drastic reduction in ~~xxxxxxx~~ the level of service.

One of the worst effects of ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ these reviews, will be a worsening of the labour relations climate at the universities. The review is characterized by a complete lack of attention to the need to consult the workers on the nature of their work. People do not feel that the efficiency experts understand the work they are supposedly studying. They deal only with surfaces. Consequently the employees have ~~xx~~ little

confidence that the review will lead to anything but a worsened work situation for them. The presence of

men with ~~xxx~~ stop ~~xxxxxxx~~ watches and clip boards who time their every move -- including breaks, phone conversations, trips to the washroom -- ~~is rather insulting +~~ only increases the anxiety they already experience as a result of under-staffing, poor wages,

an unnecessary + unreasonable return to a more barbaric (Dickensian) working atmosphere.
It is possible to "belt-tighten" without becoming inhuman.

In the long-run
Fear is ~~not~~ a will
to ~~make~~ employees more
productive.

average
income is now
well below national
average (give
figure)

and uncertain futures. ~~They~~ Many of us
~~have not had a wage increase for three years~~ are entering
our third year without a wage increase, and the University
has argued in front of the Compensation Stabilization
Board that they don't have the ability to pay -- not a
wage increase, but the increments and merit increases that
are already agreed to in our current contracts. The
amount of money that would be required to pay these
increases is ~~probably~~ probably less than the amount
being paid to Ritchie and Associates. So little wonder
that the efficiency review is being met with hostility.

Summary, and out with a bang, not a whimper.