

Canadian
University
Employees

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

UPDATE UPDATE UPDATE

SPECIAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING

The meeting will now take place on:

THURSDAY OCTOBER 24, 1985

IRC 2

12:30-2:30

NOTICE OF MOTION:

"THAT THIS UNION LOCAL WORK TO RULE IN
RESPONSE TO THE RITCHIE AND ASSOCIATES'
EFFICIENCY REVIEW."

Moved by: Suzan Zagar
Seconded by: Sheridan Murray

Special Membership Meeting
October 24, 1985

Minutes

Chair: Kitty Byrne

Secretary: Patricia House

It was announced that George McLaughlin, the Vice-President of CUPE 116, is running for the Board of Governors. The Executive endorsed his nomination and encouraged our members to support him in this election.

The only item on the Agenda was the notice of motion.

Moved by Suzan Zagar

Seconded by Sheridan Murray

THAT THIS UNION WORK TO RULE IN RESPONSE TO THE RITCHIE AND ASSOCIATES EFFICIENCY REVIEW

It was announced that Geraldine Maguire, the President of the UVic. CUPE Local 951, phoned this morning with a message of support from that Local. The Union office also received support from Jeff Rose, CUPE National President, the B.C.T.F., the T.A. Union, and the Defend Education Services Coalition.

It was announced that Patricia House is running for the Pension Board and the Executive has endorsed her nomination.

Ritchie and Associates Update

Ted Byrne gave an update on what has happened with regard to Ritchie and Associates since our last general meeting on September 26, 1985.

1. The Executive has decided to file grievances on anything that is possible to grieve such as:
 - a) harassment
 - b) consultation
 - c) the activity report forms
 - d) reduction of the work force
 - e) increase in workload
 - f) contracting out
2. It is also the intention of the Executive to keep a PR campaign going. There have been articles in
 - a) The Sun
 - b) interview on the CBC
 - c) a number of news reports in other publications and on the radio

It was requested of the membership that if there were reporters outside to refer them to Ted or Kitty.

3. Ted reported on the AV services public presentation. He explained what was contained in their report. It was a very elaborate management control system evidencing extreme control.

There has been a steering committee setup. If this work to rule motion passes, they will plan the action from there. The Executive intends to tie in the increment issue with the Ritchie and Associates problem. There was considerable

discussion of the motion. It was felt that if this motion passed it would show some support for our members who are undergoing the efficiency review at the present time.

Moved by Suzan Zagar
THAT ROD HAINES BE SEATED.
The motion was CARRIED.

Seconded by Adrien Kiernan

(Representative from the TA Union)

There was a complete discussion of the activity report forms and advice was given on how to fill them out. There was some discussion of whether this efficiency review fits into a larger political picture.

Moved by Sheila Rosen

Seconded by Sonali Gunawardene

TO SEND THE MOTION TO REFERENDUM BALLOT.

The motion was DEFEATED

The question was called on the main motion.

The main motion CARRIED overwhelmingly.

The meeting was adjourned.

Canadian
University
Employees

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.

Ritchie and Associates, for Gill Levine, Oct. 23, 1985

- most of these points more fully addressed in material enclosed or already forwarded to you
- where is the money coming from - Gellatley (VP) said yesterday on CBC that the AV Services contract cost 67,000, and there are 11 other contracts already signed, some of them for areas dozens of times the size of AV Services - we've heard various figures: 9,000/day, 70,000/two wks, 1.5 m up to Sept. - Ken Andrews of Cupe 116 was told by ex-Personnel Director that a special fund had been set up by the government - no wage increases have been paid for 2-3 years, and the Univ. is arguing before the wage control commission that they do not have the ability to pay our already agreed upon increments (for the past two years) - this money is definitely being paid up front, even if it is to be later realized in savings
- Ritchie and Associates: who are they, where have they been in the past, what is their methodology and how does it compare with current thinking in the area of management/business admin. 'science' - can it be properly characterized as a throw-back to the Taylorism of 50-60 years ago? and what are the implications of this politically - do they represent part of the new-right trend in government and business - are they respectable/well qualified/successful: they are charging a contingency fee; have never reviewed a University before in Canada (in the States?); they have worked at Ward Air, Savage Shoes, Canada Trust, NAIT, Royal Bank, Acklands (it took them three years to clean up the mess left by R&A according to our contact there) and 'a large telecommunications company in the States' where they apparently screwed up royally (but we haven't got very far in tracking down any of the above, except Ward Air); we have a lead on Mr. Ritchie himself, but it hasn't been pursued very far (see enclosed)
- why Ritchie and Associates: they approached the University, the job was never put out to tender; why not a BC or Canadian company? - why not use the University's own resources? - what does this whole exercise say about their own managers?
- decline in services: it is apparent that the changes in operations, decline in morale, tension, etc. has already lead to a significant decline in services, particularly in the areas of Purchasing, Finance, Mail Room, Campus Delivery, Custodial Services, Traffic and Security - there are a lot of complaints - the Faculty Assn. has complained by motion at meeting conveyed to Univ. by letter - managers, staff are up in arms, but mostly seem to be complaining to each other, to us, and not to the source: we need to find some way to focus these complaints on the source, and to determine exactly how services have been/will be effected by the review
- effect on workers: work speed up, fear of job loss, low morale: in Finance for eg. we have a grievance involving seven people who have all been suffering from stress related illnesses (and have been willing to talk to the press about this) and three or four peopl to date who have quit their jobs over this - we constantly

hear stories about the effects this exercise is having on people, but there's little we can do not having strong language on harassment - we have attempted one grievance on reduction of the workforce, non-filling of positions, lack of consultation, and the equation 'activity report form' = performance review (ie. the forms demonstrate that people are not performing up to expectation, and so constitute a poor performance review)

- R&A have probably tapped into a real goldmine - there are universities and colleges right across the country that are suffering from the same kind of fiscal 'restraint' as UBC, UVIC and Dalhousie - where do they go from here? - they apparently approached SFU and were sent packing, but I hear that the political pressure is now on SFU to accept them

- how much do the Socreds have to do with all of this - it is being presented as a contingency plan to deal with anticipated further budget cuts and status quo budgets, but won't the information once supplied be used to determine budgets - who hired them, who's paying them, the Univ. or the govt.? - Gellatley came from Waterloo - we should check into his background - McGeer (minister responsible) was quoted in recent Sun article as wanting to found a new institution based on the Waterloo model (self supporting high-tech. model) and said that he had found through experience that it is impossible to reform old institutions, and makes more sense to start from scratch if you want to accomplish change

- why the secrecy? - the Univ. has kept a tight rein on information from the very beginning - under the old regime (Pedersen) information was always readily available: constant memoes from the Pres., budget information published in their pr newsletter, open door policy - since he left, next to nothing and, except recently under pressure, absolutely nothing on R&A - why did they not set up an open consultative process from the beginning - we heard that the Acting Director of Community Relations tried to convince the admin. a year ago of the need for some very good PR in order to prevent an eventual 'media problem' - the Director of Personnel told us in the summer that the reason we could not have final reports was that there would be no final reports, just a series of high level meetings, and that unlike most consulting firms R&A implement their system before they leave (this is true - not only do they test and implement it, but they put in place a 'management control system' and a staff to perpetuate it - already two such positions filled) - now, under pressure, they are making public their 'final reports' - a meeting with unions and the press (separate rooms) was held this morning to present the first such report - AV Services - this very much a PR gesture - AV Services small, self supporting unit where it is possible to increase charges and production and reduce costs to realize savings - how will they achieve savings in the second largest library in the country where 85% of the budget is salaries and there are no 'profits'?

Canadian
University
Employees

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

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