

**Examples of Dysfunctionality
in the Population Section of BC Stats**

Submitted in compliance to Article 32:15 (b) of the
Thirteenth Master Agreement between the
Government of the Province of British Columbia represented by the
Public Service Employee Relations Commission and the
B.C. Government and Service Employees' Union (BCGEU).

William Warren Munroe
Population Analyst
BC Stats
Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services

January 30, 2006

This document is being submitted in compliance with article 32:15 (b) of the Thirteenth Master Agreement between the Government of the Province of British Columbia represented by the Public Service Employee Relations Commission and the B.C. Government and Service Employees' Union (BCGEU).

Employee:
William Warren Munroe
Population Analyst,
Population Section, BC Stats,
Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services

Respondent:
Dave O'Neil
Manager
Population Section, BC Stats,
Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services

Submitted

January 30, 2006

Signed,

William Warren Munroe

Table of Contents

Introduction

Overview

Events occurring after first contact with Carol Gore from Human Resources

Appendix A – Events leading up to meeting with Carol Gore

Appendix B – Before Dave O’Neil became excluded

Appendix C – Family Formation Paper not welcome

Appendix D – Notes regarding antagonism displayed by a co-worker

Appendix E – Encouraging Constructive Dialogue

Appendix F – Population Projection Paragraph

Appendix G – Provincial Electoral District population estimation criticism

Appendix H – First Contact with BCPSA

Appendix I – List of Accomplishments

Introduction

I have been accused of doing things wrong when I have not, bossed around and told what to do and how to do it in front of others, and yelled at by every member of the Population Section of BC Stats. What is most disconcerting is that the manager has supported this behaviour.

When I suggested team effectiveness training courses to the manager, he said that they would only make things worse. He was right. Since our meeting with Carol Gore from Human Resources (October 13, 2005), the section manager has been making an open effort to discredit me instead of choosing to benefit from the work place skills program (training courses based on three core competencies). After meeting with Carol Gore, the manager was involved in an effort to have my co-workers write letters of complaint against me to be sent to the Director and to the BCGEU. The increased antagonism resulted in me filing a complaint of harassment. The investigation concluded that there was no misuse of managerial authority and therefore no resolution would be proposed. There was a suggestion that team effectiveness training courses might be made available but that this was not certain. Since there has been no resolution to the problems, I am providing the following document.

Even though there had been a history of dysfunctionality in the section, where I have been yelled at by every member of the section, the manager chose to not support the work place skills program but instead reacted negatively to this opportunity and chose to participate in efforts to discredit the person who had been the subject of the yelling. I contend that this was a misuse of managerial authority as was the creation and maintenance of a negative work environment.

Therefore, I must put forward my statement of the events that had occurred before the October 13th meeting, as well as though since, in order that it be recorded and I must also continue with the process initiated by the Director of BC Stats on December 2nd, 2005, since no resolution has been proposed.

I honestly feel that given the opportunity, the members of the population section can work out problems and come up with positive solutions. This effort will require the support of management as well as the employees. If we focus on working to provide the best products and services possible, communications will improve and personal agendas will not be allowed to interfere with improvements.

This document is arranged with a short summary of problems found in the Overview section followed by a chronological listing of the events that occurred after I first made contact with Carol Gore from Human Resources regarding the dysfunctionality in the Population Section of BC Stats. The details of the dysfunctionality which led up to the request for help from Human Resources are listed in Appendix A. As in many dysfunctional units, the problems at first were small and ignored; however, after being yelled at during a section meeting in October 2004, I began to keep notes which also recalled some of the earlier problems. Some of the successes are included as well to show

that I was very much involved in improving our processes, and therefore learning more about computer languages than interpersonal skills. Nonetheless, even though I had been yelled at many times, I have never yelled at my co-workers. Several documents with more specifics regarding particular events are also provided as appendices.

Overview

The following is a brief summary of some of the examples of problems in the section. An expanded listing of the problems with greater detail is provided in the List of Problems in Detail section.

Spring 2002 - Before the current manager was excluded, he stated to me several times that I was not to bring my skills to the job but rather that I am to fit the position. He also said that the position should not have been reclassified up from a RO 18 to an Econ 24.

October 2004 - Pat Blumel yelled at me, at a section meeting, wrongly accusing me of making a mistake a week previous.

November 2004 – Dave O’Neil arranged a meeting for Pat Blumel to scold me for moving a printer which had also been moved by another co-worker.

January 2005 – Dave O’Neil called me into his office, asked me to close the door, and chastised me for my asking that a co-worker ask me rather than tell me about a meeting she had arranged to be held in my office.

March 2005 – Pat Blumel told me what to do again, at another section meeting. I pointed out that she does not need to tell me what to do. After the meeting, the manager called me into his office twice and threatened me with a formal reprimand. I replied that I had done nothing wrong. (See Appendices D). I emphasised that we need to work towards creating a positive work environment (See Appendices E).

June 2005 – Jennifer Hansen yelled at me (see Appendix F). Dave O’Neil supports her yelling, telling me that she had been given responsibility for the project.

June 2005 – Frank Ip yelled at me. (lights were turned on – or off?). Dave O’Neil later says that it was my fault again.

July 2005 – Criticized for new method of handling the estimation of total population for Provincial Electoral Districts (See Appendix G).

July 2005 – I requested information from BCPSA about how to create a positive work environment.

August 2005 – I spoke with the Director about wanting to stay on with the public service, and suggest that the antagonism directed towards me appears to be because I offer suggestions on how to improve our methods and processes. I am told to persevere or move on.

August 2005 – BCPSA responded and I was pointed to Carol Gore of Human Resources. I asked about resources to help create a positive work place and was told that it is important for everyone to be involved and that the manager plays an important role in creating the work environment.

September 2005 – I spoke to the section manager about Team Effectiveness Training. Dave O’Neil stated that the courses would only make things worse, and that I was not to say anything about taking these courses to my co-workers.

October 2005 – Meeting with Carol Gore and Dave O’Neil about team effectiveness training in an attempt to address the negative work environment. Instead of choosing to benefit from the work place skills program, Dave O’Neil embarked on a campaign to discredit me. The manager solicited negative statements about me from my co-workers to be submitted to the Director and the BCGEU.

November 2005 – I request help from Director pointing out that there is a problem with communications in the section and suggested conflict management courses.

November 2005 – Frank Ip apologises-no hard feelings agreed upon. I had heard Frank tell Dave O’Neil in October that he would not submit a letter of complaint against me.

December 2005 – Having not heard anything back from the Director, I sent another email clearly pointing out the role of the section manager in having created and maintained a negative work environment.

December 2005 – Investigation into my allegations of harassment finds that since there was no misuse of managerial authority no effort will be made to resolve my concerns. There is a suggestion that there may be team effectiveness training but this is not certain.

Events occurring after first contact with Carol Gore from Human Resources

August 2005 – First contact with Carol Gore from HR.

I was very interested in finding a way to recognize the contribution made to the successful development of the estatsBC project. This led me to look into finding resources about how to create a positive work environment which would (I thought), if not encourage, at least reduce the bad reaction to innovation.

I was pointed to Carol Gore from Human Resources by Erika Taylor from Corporate Initiatives and Solutions. I asked Carol Gore via email (August 18, 2005), about resources that might be available for creating a positive work environment (See Appendix H). Carol Gore pointed out that the manager, who she later named, (I had been trying to be anonymous and discrete) had to be involved. Carol Gore stressed the fact that the manager has an important role in creating a positive work environment. I initially stood back (fearing an escalation in hostilities as had hitherto been the pattern) but knew that something had to be done and agreed to speak with the section manager about team effectiveness training for the group.

September 2005 - I also attempted to find resources from the union side.

I sought out Marvin Paxman for a meeting to let him know what was going on, but he did not respond to my phone call or email. I also went to his office and asked him personally to get in touch with me when he had time which did not happen.

I met with the staff representative from the BCGEU (September 14, 2005) as I was told by Marvin last June that this person would be helpful. I asked the staff rep to invite the shop steward to the meeting scheduled with Carol Gore and the section manager. The shop steward did not attend but he had spoken to the staff rep. Later the shop steward told me that he had instructed the staff representative to listen to what Dave O'Neil had to say as he is a 'good man' and that he had been a shop steward for many years himself. Also, Dave O'Neil often refers to the fact that he was a BCGEU representative in discussions regarding Article 29.

September, 2005 – The manager says that Team Effectiveness Training would only make things worse.

When I spoke to Dave O'Neil about team effectiveness training before meeting with HR, Dave O'Neil had said that these courses would only make things worse. I still do not understand the logic of this statement. But Dave O'Neil was right...he made sure that my request only made things worse.

I met with Carol Gore (September 15, 2005) describing the difficulties in the pop section. I expressed my concern about the current section manager particularly that he had a history of reprimanding me when I asked to be treated equitably.

September, 2005 – Article published that had been rejected a year previous.

Because Carol Gore had stressed the importance of the manager in influencing the work environment, I began to prepare to tell her what has been going on in the section. As I began to list the difficulties, I remembered that the manager had not edited a paper (feature article) submitted for a regular publication a year previous. Indeed, it appeared to me that there may have been an effort made to make it look as though I was not good

at my job and that my paper not being published was used as an example. Also, there had been a great deal of fumbling with the co-ordination between Dave O'Neil and myself in handling the quarterly migration data. The article pointed to a very important transition in terms of population change that is occurring in the province. Because Dave O'Neil was away, I resubmitted the paper unaltered to the designated reader (Dan Schrier). He returned it soon after with some suggestions and said that he thought it was interesting. I cleaned it up and added a footnote and asked others throughout BCStats to give me their comments. Everyone said that they thought it was interesting. The Director had a few edits as well and the paper was published (September 28, 2005). This paper could have and should have gone out with the quarterly release one year previous however, that edition never had a feature article. I must say here that I was again astounded by the behaviour of the manager. I had assumed that we were all interested in our products and services first and everything else was secondary. After this event, it became clear that meeting our commitments to our clients for our products and services was dysfunctional and needed to be addressed.

October 2005 - Dave O'Neil does not want Team Effectiveness Training.

Since there had been a history of antagonism and dysfunctionality in the population section of BC Stats, I asked for help in working towards creating a positive work environment (see Appendix H). The meeting with the manager and Carol Gore and the staff rep from the BCGEU was held on October 13, 2005. I used this opportunity to point to the importance of having a team effectiveness facilitator who would be good at helping us improve our communications. As well, I pointed out the structural change that had occurred in the section prior to my taking the position in January 2002. I described some of the many problems in the section with examples of the yelling and of having been threatened with a formal reprimand by the manager for asking to be treated as an equal.

Dave O'Neil became agitated and upset and said that he knew where I was "taking this". Instead of seeing the benefits of team effectiveness training, Dave O'Neil said that I was "passive aggressive" and this made it impossible for me to work with others. He said that the others would no longer meet with me since they had tried but failed to be able to work with me. When I told of how Dave O'Neil threatened to reprimand me, he loudly denied the fact saying that he had too much respect for the work that the union does to do something like that. He was so upset that the meeting was aborted and I was not able to complete my statement. In fact, where I was "taking this" was to say at the end of my statement that I realize that I am not the easiest person to work with for some people. However, I felt that if we agreed on team effectiveness training courses along with an awareness of structural adjustments, that we could turn problems into solutions.

Immediately after the meeting with HR, I waited for the staff rep. I asked what she thought of the meeting and she described it as a disaster. She told me that she agreed with Dave O'Neil that I was passive aggressive. Dave O'Neil had told the BCGEU rep before the meeting with Carol Gore that he had been a shop steward for many years before becoming excluded and had represented union concerns regarding Article 29.

I returned to the office and spoke with the shop steward, Marvin Paxman, expressing my concern that Dave O'Neil was very angry and that it looks like I will be

the subject of attacks. When I went to my office, Dave O'Neil was loudly explaining to Jennifer Hansen (Population Analyst) in his office how he rebuked my statements regarding the problems in the section.

October 2005 - Dave O'Neil was actively involved in soliciting stories to discredit me.

Over the next few weeks, tensions rose dramatically. There was even mention of people feeling unsafe. I went to Jennifer to assure her that I would rather quit than make anyone feel unsafe (October 18, 2005). She said "thanks". Later that day, I mentioned to the shop steward that I was considering quitting, because there was so much animosity in the section. Marvin Paxman said that he thought this would be a positive solution to the difficulties. On Friday (October 21, 2005), I spoke with Don McRae about the situation, and stated that while there are difficulties in the section that there is still hope for making things better. In particular, I pointed to the problems in communications. Also I told him what I had said to Jennifer about quitting.

The next week (October 25, 2005) in the kitchen with no one else around, Marvin asked when I was going to be leaving because 'the others' wanted to know. I said that I would leave only after the difficulties were clearly described so that people knew what had been going on in the section. I also said that it is not right to be bullied out of my position. I pointed out that I had asked for team effectiveness training. Instead, it appeared to me that the goal was not to work together to create a positive work environment but rather to have me quit. At a meeting a couple of days later (October 27, 2005), Marvin said that it was not my role to ask for team effectiveness training and that I was to do what was best for Warren Munroe. I said that what would be best is if I could go to work in a positive work environment. I sent Marvin this link

http://www.viha.ca/conflict_management/ which I also later sent to Don McRae.

Also, incredibly, the shop steward made a point of telling me that my co-workers have a right to a safe workplace, just as I have a right to a safe workplace. I explained that it was they who have been doing the yelling and that it appears that they are colluding against me as they have been excluding me from meetings and from going out with them for coffee. Marvin said that perhaps I am not included because they feel unsafe. I found this to be astounding. Also that day Marvin Paxman suggested I write a letter about the problems in the section to Don McRae and to cc it to the BCGEU as the other members of the section would be doing so.

On October 31, 2005, I came in at an unusual time and heard Frank say to Dave O'Neil (Frank was standing in the door way of the manager's office) that he would not write a letter to McRae, but that Dave O'Neil could use a story (I did not hear what this story was) if he wanted.

November 2005 – Letter sent to Director regarding some of the problems in the section.

I sent an email to Don McRae (November 3, 2005), describing some of the problems in the Population Section and suggest possible solutions including a link to a conflict management course (http://www.viha.ca/conflict_management/). I received no reply.

December 2005 – Plea for help leads to the start of the grievance procedure.

I sent another email to the Director (December 1, 2005), clearly pointing to the importance of the section manager's involvement in having created a negative work environment. This starts the grievance procedure (December 2, 2005).

December 2005 – No effort will be made to resolve the concern.

The investigation into my allegations of harassment found that since there was no misuse of managerial powers no effort will be made to resolve my concerns. There is a suggestion that there may be team effectiveness training but this is not certain (December 12, 2005).

January 2006 – Cheryl Jones (BCGEU) will ask for Team Effectiveness training

Cheryl Jones called and recommended that I not file a 32:15 and that my grievance had to be more specific. She suggested that the employer be given the opportunity to arrange team effectiveness training. She suggested that I think about it (going ahead with the grievance) for a couple of days. I stated that I would be going ahead with the grievance. This led to an in-depth conversation about the circumstances. She highlighted that some of the main document was general and frivolous. I replied that I had included most everything that had occurred since arriving here and that portions could be removed but also mentioned that the exercise had been a good in order to get things written out.

I pointed out that given the history of dysfunctionality in the population section, the manager's reaction to my request for team effectiveness training and his subsequent efforts made to discredit me were a misuse of managerial authority. We both agreed that yelling is not acceptable. Cheryl agreed that my goal of being able to work in a positive work environment was legitimate. She said that she would ask the employer to confirm in writing that team effectiveness training courses (or courses aimed at creating a positive work environment) would be made available to all the members of the population section including the manager. I agree that if a concrete truthful and honest commitment were agreed upon, that I would not proceed with the grievance. However, if the courses do not help and there is continued animosity, the grievance would be advanced to the next step.

Conclusion

The effort of the current section manager to have co-workers send in letters of complaint about me began when I asked for help in working towards creating a positive work environment. Since there had been a history of dysfunctionality in the population section of BC Stats, I contacted Carol Gore from Human Resources. Carol Gore pointed out that the problems would not be solved by one person taking the courses, but that everyone should be involved and that the manager would have to be involved as well.

Knowing that the intimidation would increase if my manager were contacted, I asked for a more discrete approach, but soon agreed to proceed and I went to my manager myself to suggest that we all participate in team effectiveness training. The manager responded that this would only make things worse and that I was not to mention this to others. Instead of taking advantage of the resources available (Workplace Skills Program), an effort was made by the section manager to discredit me which only served to increase dysfunctionality in the section.

As mentioned it is my contention that in choosing to support efforts aimed at discrediting me for asking for work place skills instead of choosing to encourage this program was a misuse of managerial authority.

I feel that the BCPSA has done a very good job providing courses that support the goals of the ministry through the work place skills program. It is my sincere hope that the members of the population section of BC Stats take advantage of these courses in order that we may better work together to provide as good a service as possible.

Appendix A – Events leading up to meeting with Carol Gore

Spring 2002 - Work place before Dave O’Neil became manager.

Dave O’Neil told me that my abilities were not to be brought to the position but rather I am to fit the position. He also explained that the position had been reclassified for Dan Schrier and that I am no Dan Schrier (See Appendix B).

Fall 2002 – My contribution to estimates model considered to be dumb luck.

Because Ruth McDougall, the previous manager was here at the time, I was asked along with others to also try and reduce the error in our estimates. Dave O’Neil claimed that it was dumb luck that I figured out that the number of people per household was important to consider (See Appendix B).

January/February 2003 – Another co-worker displays odd behaviour.

I had volunteered to help Pat Blumel (Cartographer) with the RCMP boundary file as she was very busy at the time. I had to make many judgement calls on where to draw the digital boundaries and would ask others for their opinions. On three occasions, Pat Blumel abruptly stood up (when a manager walked past) and loudly told me what to do and how to do it, and just as abruptly left. This behaviour was all the more unbelievable because what she said to do made no sense. I found out later that she was trying to get her position reclassified at the time, and I suppose that she wanted to appear to be managing someone. I soon forgot about this but recalled it later when Pat Blumel continued to be antagonistic towards me, as are described later in this write up (See Appendix D).

Spring 2003 – I am to fit the position. The position is not to fit my skills.

Because I felt that Dave O’Neil would continue to be unfair to me when he took over the role of manager, I asked Ruth that there be a section meeting where we could discuss the future roles of the section members as things were changing so much. At this meeting (which also include Pat Blumel and Frank Ip), Dave O’Neil again stated that I was to fit the position and that the position had been reclassified with Dan Schrier in mind and that I am no Dan Schrier. I found this antagonism to be unbelievable. I spoke with Dan Schrier shortly after this meeting and told him of what was said by Dave O’Neil. Dan was surprised as Dave O’Neil had been involved in the reclassification. I spoke also with Dave O’Neil and said that there were two ways that this could go; either we would learn to work together and treat each other fairly or the section would become increasingly dysfunctional. Dave O’Neil appeared to agree that it would be best to try and work together.

December 2003 – Finish Regional Index narratives.

The gathering and organization of the data took seven five percent of the time to do this project. I have spoken to many people about the structure of databases and have come up with a structure that will accommodate any dataset. With help from the current events database, the Regional Index could be revised annually. All that is needed now is a program that will write the code to create queriable webpages directly accessing our public datasets and therefore allow our users to query datasets themselves.

May 2004 – Liquor Board maps.

Just before the Migration Release, Dave O’Neil asks me to help with the Liquor Board maps as Pat Blumel was away. Not being familiar with the latest GIS upgrade and having only used Corel Draw for cartography, I failed miserably at doing the maps. Inadvertently, I found out that Pat Blumel had been using .txt files instead of dbase files in the GIS. I told Dave O’Neil that this should not be done this way because the power of a GIS and the reason we use a GIS is because it displays data from a database. Therefore, we should use .dbf or to try to use .mdb files as they work well with the GIS. I mention this as it may at least partially explain why Pat Blumel angrily stormed out of my office as I had been away for a minute, exclaiming that I should not have had a file open.

May 2004 – Pat Blumel turns off a program on my computer.

Pat Blumel turned off a program on my computer without asking. I had just stepped out of my office for a minute and as I returned she stormed out of my office and scolded me for having a file open on the shared drive. She knew I had that file open because I had been talking to her about the problems with that shapefile just that morning. She said that she was showing the new employee, Jennifer Hansen, files on the shared drive. There was no reason to be showing the new employee the file that I was trying to fix.

June 2004 – Discussion paper not welcome.

At a meeting in May with Jennifer Hansen, I was told by her that we were to get my portion of the population projection project done and she came to my office to do so. I chose to ignore her commanding tone and pointed out that this was a great opportunity for us to look at the migration of reproducing females with which I was not very familiar. She said that was not what she was there for, but I pointed out that while we do other things as well that looking at where fertile females are moving and where families are being raised would be beneficial. Regardless, we eventually did focus on this aspect of migration and I found it immensely helpful. Because it was such an eye opener, I wrote a paper on the subject. However, when I asked the others in the section to read the paper, it was not well received. I gave it to Don McRae and he returned it with comments but Dave O’Neil made no edits. Jennifer said that a pet peeve of hers was the use of the term ‘baby boomers’ and that the purpose of the paper was not stated and she returned the paper with no edits. I pointed out that the term ‘baby boomers’ was italicized and that the purpose was clearly stated in the middle of the first page, at the end of the second paragraph. I was surprised that there was no interest in the exploration of this topic.

July/October 2004 – Abridged discussion paper not welcome.

Because no paper had been submitted for the spring migration release, I wrote an abridged version of the larger paper and submitted it to Jennifer Hansen and then Dave O’Neil. Jennifer returned it with a few suggestions but it sat on D. O’Neil’s desk for many weeks and after many requests for its return, I received it with no edits at all. Dave O’Neil said it was fine and I passed it on to the Director. A couple of days later, Dave O’Neil told me that the Director thought the paper was poorly written and that it should have had age specific fertility rates in it. I told Dave O’Neil that it did have age specific

fertility rates in it but heard nothing more and there was no feature article published for the release. I resubmitted the paper a year later when Dave O'Neil was away and it was accepted.

October 2004 – Co-worker with history of antagonism yells at me at a section meeting.

Pat Blumel, who has had a history of being antagonistic towards me, yelled at me at a section meeting (October 7, 2004). There had been a problem with an in the recent migration release and she waited almost a week to accuse me of negligence in front of all the section members. (see Appendix D). I spoke to the manager after the meeting to say that yelling is unacceptable behaviour. Dave O'Neil said that this particular co-worker is aggressive towards me because that is just what she is like, and that she is a frustrated manager. I stated that she is not my manager. Later I was told that her attempt to reclassify was not as successful as she had hoped and also that she was having trouble at home.

At the same section meeting, I mentioned how formatting for the migration release feature article is awkward, and suggested that we consider other layouts. Pat Blumel replied that no alternatives should or would be considered. I have since changed the format layout to be the same as that done in the Business Section as it is much easier to produce and also looks better. I was also blamed for not being aware of the 'corporate culture around here'.

November 2004 – Manager arranges meeting so that co-worker can chastise me.

A month after this incident, Pat Blumel became angry with me again because a tab broke on an old color printer when I was moving it. Dave O'Neil said that I threw the color printer on the floor and that was why a small tab had come off. Dave O'Neil arranged for me to meet with him and Pat Blumel who was upset with me so that she could chastise me.

I told Dave O'Neil that it was an accident that had occurred when I moved the printer from another co-workers office to my office to do a map (spatial interpolation of change in number of births). In fact, I had been asking for that printer to be set up in a common area so that it need not be moved as it is old and prone to break.

Dave O'Neil told me, in preparation for the meeting that I was not to mention the fact that I had been asking for the printer to be set up in a common area because, Dave O'Neil said, that that would be like putting lemon juice on a paper cut.

This purposed meeting was so ludicrous that I went to Marvin Paxman (the shop steward) to tell him about this proposed meeting. Marvin told me to tell Dave O'Neil that it was inappropriate that Dave O'Neil 'single me out'. Marvin said that Dave O'Neil would be familiar with this statement. I did speak with Dave O'Neil about having talked to Marvin and thankfully, this meeting was not called.

December 2004 – e-statsBC program is successful.

Finally after two years of incremental development, three students complete writing a program designed to make any dataset queryable via the internet with table and graph output options. This program reduces the amount of time it takes to make a queryable website from months to minutes.

December 2004 – rewrite of the monthly interprovincial migration procedure is successful.

I have been successful in rewriting the routine that generates the monthly interprovincial migration estimates from the Child tax benefits data. These numbers have been out by as much as 2500 migrants for many years before my arrival. After two more quarters of data are released (Summer 2005), indeed the results are exactly the same as the numbers that are put out by StatCan.

February 2005 – Manager calls me in to chastise me for asking a co-worker to ask rather than tell me that there will be a meeting in my office.

After the holidays, I was surprised that no one was interested in the results of the project and decided to not push it but wait for an opportunity to avail itself. This did not take long as there is a lot of work done to put data on the internet. In early February (February 1, 2005) I heard Jennifer cussing (politely) about the time and effort that it was taking to create a webpage of fertility data. I went to her office and asked what was up and offered to show her how this could be done with the new program. She went to ask Dave and also spoke with Richard (Information Technology guy) and came back with conflicting stories about the usefulness of the program. She said that no one knows what is going on around here. I told her that the program would work and could do the job and to send over the data and I would show her. Indeed, it did work wonderfully and took seven minutes to do because there was an error in the dataset. With no errors, it takes less than a minute to walk through the wizard that writes the code (.asp) that creates the queryable webpage with a labelled graph and with an option to download a .csv. This program is approximately 250 to 350 times faster than the old method. However, instead of cheers something odd happened again.

Jennifer Hansen (who regularly goes out for coffee with Dave O'Neil and Pat Blumel), told me that there would be a meeting in my office the next day. The next day in the morning, I asked what time the meeting was scheduled for. Jennifer replied 'I told you that the meeting would be at 3:00!' I said to her, that she should ask me if it is alright to have a meeting in my office.

Later that morning, Dave O'Neil called me into his office, asked me to close the door and told me that I was to never tell another co-worker what to do. I responded that I'll say what I think is fair and that Dave O'Neil reprimanding me for asking people to ask is unfair. Once again, instead of being positive, negativity ruled the day.

February 2005 – e-statsBC is taken to the next step.

Nonetheless, the director just happened to be walking by my office while I was showing several people the results of the e-statsBC program and so he was able to see how well it worked and the tremendous time savings it offered. He ear-marked more than enough money to take it to the next stage (February 2, 2005).

March 2005 – Manager threatens me with a formal reprimand.

During a very busy time for me, Pat Blumel who has had a history of being angry towards me, yelling at me, blaming me for things I had not done in front of others, was again telling me what to do and how to do it at a section meeting.

Pat Blumel was obviously still upset with me. After explaining that I thought it would be a good idea to support the acquisition of 'Place of Work' data from StatCan because this is an important indicator of social and economic integration, she rolled her eyes, pointed at me and said that I should go to the data services library to look at a dataset that she thought it was important for me to see (See Appendix D).

I explained how the dataset she wanted me to go look at had weaknesses and that I had spoken with the Director about how we might be better able to get more up-to-date intraprovincial data, when she raised her voice and pointed at me again and told me to go look at that dataset. I pointed out that she was not my boss, and that if she did not believe what I said about the dataset, she should go talk to the Director.

After the meeting, Dave O'Neil angrily called me into his office to reprimand me again. Dave O'Neil said that he would not make this a formal reprimand because he did not have the time but issued me 2 pamphlets one which had mention of harassment and the other regarding how one could seek help if they are having problems. I said that I had done nothing wrong. Dave O'Neil said that my statement had been a personal attack. I explained that it most certainly was not a personal attack nor could possibly be considered a personal attack by a reasonable person. Dave O'Neil eventually agreed.

I asked that Marvin be present at a meeting with Dave O'Neil to discuss how to go forward (March 8, 2005). I explained how the co-worker had been angry with me over the years. Dave O'Neil said that the co-worker was just like that, then he said that she was a frustrated manager, then later he said that she was having personal problems. I wrote up a brief paper which was given to Dave and Marvin about how it was important that we focus on 'positive' communications techniques, and that we all had a role in working towards creating a positive work environment. (see Constructivemeetings.doc)

I also proposed that I would like to sign up for the following courses (March 8, 2005)...

[Effectively Working Through Team Issues and Problems](#)

[Difficult People and How To Deal with Them](#)

[Effective Problem Solving & Conflict Resolution with Customers/Clients](#)

Only later in the fall did I realize that there were workplace skills courses available and which I then also asked to enrol in.

March 2005 – Manager points me to the wrong dataset on which to base an article.

As mentioned, this is a very busy time. Not only was I working on the population projections run, I was desperately trying to resolve the differences between StatCan migration estimates which are used as a base for the migration projection assumptions and the numbers generated by Dave O'Neil, I was also coordinating the efforts of the contractors who were working on the next stage of the e-statsBC program, and I was also working on another article for the quarterly migration release. I asked Dave O'Neil

which dataset to use as it was he who generated the numbers and he said to use mig0412 (March 16, 2005). After having written the article based on this dataset, it was given to Dave O'Neil for checking who passed it on to the Director. The Director returned the paper because all the numbers were wrong. Dave O'Neil then told me that I should have used the comp0412 dataset (March 29, 2005). Dave O'Neil never volunteered that he was responsible for having told me to use the wrong dataset.

Over the last two years, I have had to cobble together instructions on how to do the quarterly release from bits and pieces that I had been told to do and by trial and error. Although I had asked many times, the instructions were never laid out clearly. However, before leaving, Ruth had written clear instructions on another task that I was able to use in part for the quarterly release. Also, I told Dave O'Neil that it is very error prone for him to change some of the numbers in a write-up and then have me go through and change the rest of the numbers as well as the wording. Instead, one person should be responsible for the handling of the information from beginning to end.

There has been a great deal of fumbling of the migration data between Dave O'Neil and myself, and in some instances I made errors. I offered to do the migration release from beginning to end now that I have written clear instructions so that I can take responsibilities for any mistakes just as I had done with the monthly migration estimates using Child Tax Benefit data (which is now accurate).

April 2005 – Calculation errors can not be explained.

I mention this difficulty because it points again to fumbling between Dave O'Neil and myself regarding data sets. During the projection run, Dave O'Neil wanted me to figure out the ratio of male to female migrants (April 13, 2005). He said to calculate it by using total pop, against births and deaths by sex to come up with a total number of males and female migrants historically. Since I had been wanting migration by age as well and since I would have to use disaggregated data, I kept the age as well as sex numbers in the calculation and did a sum of the ages for each sex and found that the total did not add up to the total figure found in the database (APL).

I spoke to Dave about this many times to figure out what was going on with the numbers. He suggested that I look at other datasets, none of which worked and finally after many days of working on this he said that I should have used 'death separation' in the calculation (April 21, 2005). I replied that I had never heard of this before. He pointed to a binder in his office shelves and said that it was all explained there. Since it had taken so long with no good results and time was pressing I said that we should use last years ratios until this could be figured out properly. I spoke to Jennifer about 'death separation' and she said that she was unfamiliar as well.

Spring 2005 – Section manager tells Pat Blumel that there is to be no more work done on Regional Index.

Sometime in the spring/summer at one of the last pop section meetings, Dave O'Neil had one last thing to say and looked at Pat Blumel and said that there was to be no more work done on the Regional Index. Pat Blumel nodded approvingly. I had worked very hard on this "labour of love" as the manager of the data services section calls my work on this project. I found it very odd that the section manager should tell Pat Blumel about the termination of my work on the Regional Index rather than to me.

June 2005 – Another co-worker yells at me and again the manager supports this unprofessional behaviour.

Jennifer Hansen came to ask me when I would be finished my portion of a project (June 1, 2005). I said by the end of the day (2 more hours) and asked how her portion was coming along. She asked many more times about when I would be finished even though I had already said, but, she would not say how she was doing. She became very upset and began yelling even though I had said many times that I felt comfortable about finishing by days end. (See Appendix E) I was astounded by her becoming upset. I had done 2 of 3 parts to her 1 of 3 parts, and I was fixing a mistake she had made at the time. A little while later, after she had some time to calm down, I said that I was going out to get a coffee and asked her if she would like one too. She politely declined.

The next day, (June 2, 2005) Dave O'Neil could not make it into the office so he called Pat Blumel, the co-worker who had a history of negative behaviour towards me to have her tell me that I had to get a particular job done that day.

After the weekend (June 7th, 2005), I went to Dave O'Neil's office to talk about the co-worker yelling at me and about Dave O'Neil calling Pat Blumel who has a history of yelling at me and telling me what to do, to come and tell Jennifer and particularly myself that another task had to be done by the end of the day. I said it looks like I answer to Jennifer, who answers to Pat Blumel who answers to Dave O'Neil. I pointed out that the yelling by my co-workers towards myself appears to have been instigated by the section manager. Dave O'Neil became upset and called Marvin Paxman, the shop steward, in. Dave O'Neil told us that Jennifer had been given responsibility over my work. I was surprised and replied that no one had told me. I asked what if the Director had wanted me to do something? Dave O'Neil replied, if the Director, Don McRae, wanted me to do an emergency task he would have to first go through himself, the manager, and my co-worker, Jennifer, first.

I requested that this arrangement be made clear before hand rather than me finding out in this manner, and that in fact since my co-worker and I have the same classification and that I have been here longer, that we should be treated as equals. I also pointed out that Dave O'Neil, the manager, should be the manager as my less experienced co-worker may not be familiar with best practices of a manager.

I also pointed to the importance of projects being laid out clearly so that team members (everyone in the Population Section) know what is expected of each other. I requested that he call me and not Pat Blumel about my tasks schedule. I also requested that we have pre and post production meetings so that all the tasks would be clearly laid out with time lines. Because there have been so many problems with how projects are handled since Ruth retired, I have been taking Project Management Courses through the BCPSA.

June 2005 – Another co-worker yells at me.

Even though I have had so much success in improving systems, writing the narratives for the Regional Index, correcting the monthly interprovincial migration numbers etc. another co-worker Frank Ip yells at me. This time it is because I turned on (off?) the lights. I was yelled at, being told that I should go home and that I should not be

doing this kind of work anyway and other very unpleasant statements. I was again astonished at the incredibly unprofessional behaviour amongst my co-workers.

Here I must mention that the members of the population section, including the manager have been going to coffee together without inviting me. Indeed, during the summer I had asked my co-workers on many different occasions about going to coffee. Often, on the same day that they said no, they would go out together without inviting me (not that I want to discuss the latest episode of Survivor anyway). On two occasions, I found that every one was gone and assumed that they had gone to coffee but had not found me to invite me. When I got to coffee shop on both occasions the others immediately got up and left saying they were done.

July 2005 – Request help from BCPSA regarding creating a positive work environment.

Because the level of antagonism has been increasing and there has been no help from the manager who sides with those who yell, I sought help through human resources. I found that there was recognition not only for creating an innovation (I will be doing this for the people in BC Stats who have helped make the estatsBC project a success) but also for creating a work place that encourages innovation. I emailed asking for help.

July 2005 – Criticism for bringing population estimates into a GIS and making maps with too many colors.

I was asked to ground truth the results of the population estimates for the Provincial Electoral Districts (PEDs). I was given a paper copy of a table of the estimated total population for the PEDs for the years from 1996 to 2005. I have been asking that ground truthing not be done using a paper copy but rather by using GIS. We have very capable computer programs that can create the information we want in seconds. This approach increases productivity and reduces error at the same time. I was asked to refer to a color map of PEDs with place names in a legend found on the internet so that I could see where the place names on the paper copy of the table were on the map.

It took me a few hours to find the proper shapefile for the GIS and to get the data in an electronic format and clean it up as there were mistakes again (regularly there are mistakes in the Geographic component of the tables – names and/or numbers are wrong. Nonetheless, by mid afternoon, I had some very interesting results to show Dave and Jennifer. However, instead of being greeted with interest, Dave O'Neil again became critical and focused not on the results but rather on the colors used. (Appendix F)

After this project was finished, I told Dave O'Neil that I can not help but offer solutions to reduce our errors as well as ways of improving our theories, methods, models and processes. Dave O'Neil shook his head to adamantly signal that this approach to analysis is not wanted.

July 2005 – Keith from IT asks me about GIS routines.

Keith Morris (July 28, 2005) asked me if I knew of any way to find the x and y coordinates for nodes in roads as he was doing a project for Pat Blumel and Dave O'Neil where he thought this approach would really help. I sent him several scripts that could be used with our GIS program. I am amazed that there is such poor dialogue in our section and that I am not invited to participate in discussion regarding Geography with Dave

O'Neil and Pat Blumel, nor have I been involved in methods and modelling while the rest of the section is. Instead, I have a better dialogue with people outside of our section.

August 2005 - meeting with Don McRae, BC Stats Director.

At a meeting with the Director, I said that things were very odd in the section (August 3, 2005). I felt that the antagonism was due to my automating the systems. I also mentioned that I know when I am doing things well because I get yelled at. Don McRae said that he has seen this sort of thing before and that he knows it is tough but that I should keep doing what I am doing. He suggested that I persevere or move on. He suggested that a ML 3 position would probably be the best next step, and not only is there more responsibility but the higher pay is nice. I asked if it would be alright to propose improvements and was told that would be fine. I also mentioned that I thought it would be very helpful if the population section had pre and post production meetings so that there would be an emphasis on the project rather than on anything else.

I also asked about the history of the position because there seems to be some difficulty with the internal organization in particular with regard to the structure. Don McRae gave me a brief history of the reclassification of the position saying that it had been a long and hard fight but that eventually it had been reclassified up from an RO 18 to an Econ 24 after the union appealed. I said that Dave O'Neil had told me that the position should not have been reclassified because it was reclassified with Dan Schrier in mind and that I am no Dan Schrier. Don McRae said that the position is an Econ 24 whether Dan Schrier is in it or not. He also clarified that Jennifer has the same classification but is at a lower grid as she has been here for a shorter time period.

August 2005 – No interest in new data source.

Because I was asked about whether I took certain major developments into consideration in my projection of migration for a particular area, I looked again for detailed postal code boundary maps on the internet (August 11, 2005). I found that there were new and improved maps available that show the Local Carrier Walk (LCW) areas. (the internet is such a helpful, and improving, tool). These maps show which side of the street belongs to which LCW code and there are also estimates of the number of houses and apartments visited by each Carrier. Since this information could be particularly helpful to us, I sent an email to the rest of the population section with the link. However, this too was not met with interest. Mistakenly, Pat Blumel replied that she has the hardcopies of this information. She also pointed out that this was her job. I spoke with Dave O'Neil about this and was able to show him the steps to the maps of interest and he suggested that it could be pursued. I also went to speak to Pat Blumel to say that I mean no offence by pointing these things out as they are of interest to all.

August / September 2005 – Population Projection meetings.

Thankfully, Dave O'Neil, Jennifer Hansen, and myself started to have meetings in preparation for the next Population Projection run. After the meetings with Dave O'Neil and Marvin Paxman last June, I assumed that Dave O'Neil was the manager of the project and that Jennifer and I were equals, equally interested in sharing the chores and equally interested in helping each other get the job done. Dave O'Neil called the meetings

and they were in his office and he had started getting the information into a Project Planning program.

At the first pre-production meeting, Jennifer said right away that there was a problem with my task of completing the write-ups of the projection paragraph. I said that it was not necessarily my task, since anyone involved in this project should be able to explain the projection. She continued to insist that it was my task and that she was not doing it. I suggested that these meetings were an opportunity for us all to try to do as much as we can so that we can work together to get things done.

At a later meeting, Jennifer said that I should write out the projection paragraph for each region of the province (~240 areas therefore ~240 paragraphs) in order to practice for next year. I was told by her and the manager that these write-ups would not be used but I would have practice writing them so that I could do them more quickly next year. There was no mention of the fact that the reason it took extra time to do the write-ups (which anyone could do) the last time was because my co-worker had made an error in explaining what a particular calculation meant. (See Appendix E). Apparently, because I raised this issue, the production meetings were discontinued.

Appendix B – Before Dave O’Neil became excluded

Spring 2002 - Work place before Dave O’Neil became manager.

Dave O'Neil told me that my abilities were not to be brought to the position but rather I am to fit the position. He also explained that the position had been reclassified for Dan Schrier and that I am no Dan Schrier.

Dave O'Neil was defensive and not helpful when I asked for information about migration by age and sex. In fact, it was obvious by his mannerisms that he resented my asking for this information. He is protective of his work and unfriendly towards me when I asked for methods and modelling information. Often I speak with analysts from many ministries and I have found that we are always able to have frank discussions about data strengths and weaknesses. However, this is not the case with Dave O'Neil, and I found (and continue to find) this to be very strange for a statistical organization to be begrudging open discussion about the data.

Fall 2002 – My contribution to estimates model considered to be dumb luck.

Because Ruth McDougall, the previous manager was here at the time, I was asked along with others to also try and reduce the error in our estimates. Dave O’Neil claimed that it was dumb luck that I figured out that the number of people per household was important to consider. He had suggested an urban rural split, Ruth suggested a split based on size and Frank Ip suggested a technical solution. Dave O’Neil has since boasted that he had said to split the data. Splitting the data is covered in first year stats courses...the trick is to figure out how to split the data in order to reduce error. While it may be convenient to split the data, this approach can be very problematic, particularly when it is used as the basis for an extrapolation, a point Dave O’Neil failed to discuss at the time. The most important consideration is how to handle the extrapolation which is why I had asked that more tests be done on the history as well as to test for post censal indicators such as the change in the number of births. I also pointed out that using a compound growth rate for the areas that had shown an increase in the number of people per meter between 1996 and 2001 should be reconsidered. I suggested that a linear equation be best and that a revision would likely be necessary in two years and that this growth rate be watched carefully. Indeed, two years later the compound growth rate was replaced. I have also been asking that a methods paper be published so that our clients know what is going on.

January 2003 – I proposed that we automate the process of providing information to the public via the internet so that we could focus on the methods and modelling.

Instead of doing more testing and a methods paper, I was given the time consuming chore of creating the .prn, .txt, .html, .csv, and the .pdf outputs of the estimates for the internet. Because this exercise was so time consuming and manual therefore taking away from the opportunity to get a revised methods paper written and published, I asked Ruth if it would be alright for me to automate this process. I think that since I was successful with automating the tasks to date, Ruth agreed. This was then written into my EPDP. (See December 2004 below).

Since then, because of the wonderful resources made available by the BC Public Service Agency through the IT learning center, I have learned several other computer languages,

and database structures, studying after work hours, in order to automate this process which Ruth had agreed should be done. I have nothing but praise for Ruth for her foresight and for the learning centre, and the BC Public Service Agency for supporting and encouraging innovation, as well as the people at BC Stats outside of the pop section who have been wonderful to work with. Hopefully, there are ways to create a positive work environment where team building is supported. I should also mention that Ruth congratulated me on my contribution as did the director.

Appendix C - Family Formation Paper not welcome

June 2004 – Discussion paper not welcome.

At a meeting in May with Jennifer Hansen, I was told by her that we were to get my portion of the population projection project done and she came to my office to do so. I chose to ignore her commanding tone and pointed out that this was a great opportunity for us to look at the migration of reproducing females with which I was not very familiar. She said that was not what she was there for, but I pointed out that while we do other things as well that looking at where fertile females are moving and where families are being raised would be beneficial. Regardless, we eventually did focus on this aspect of migration and I found it immensely helpful. Because it was such an eye opener, I wrote a paper on the subject. However, when I asked the others in the section to read the paper, it was not well received. I gave it to Don McRae and he returned it with comments but Dave O'Neil made no edits. Jennifer said that a pet peeve of hers was the use of the term 'baby boomers' and that the purpose of the paper was not stated and she returned the paper with no edits. I pointed out that the term 'baby boomers' was italicized and that the purpose was clearly stated in the middle of the first page, at the end of the second paragraph. I was surprised that there was no interest in the exploration of this topic.

July/October 2004 – Abridged discussion paper not welcome.

Because no paper had been submitted for the spring migration release, I wrote an abridged version of the larger paper and submitted it to Jennifer and then Dave O'Neil. Jennifer returned it with a few suggestions but it sat on D. O'Neil's desk for many weeks and after many requests for its return, I received it with no edits at all. Dave O'Neil said it was fine and I passed it on to the Director. A couple of days later, Dave O'Neil told me that the Director thought the paper was poorly written and that it should have had age specific fertility rates in it. I told Dave O'Neil that it did have age specific fertility rates in it but heard nothing more and there was no feature article published for the release.

September 2005 –Paper resubmitted while manager was away and is accepted.

I resubmitted the paper a year later when Dave O'Neil was away and it was accepted. This inquiry pointed to a very important event occurring in BC that can help improve our post census population estimates.

Appendix D –Antagonism displayed by co-worker Pat Blumel

Written on Wednesday, October 13, 2004

Regarding: Pat Blumel yelling and blaming me for an error (which I did not do) during a section meeting.

Last Thursday (October 7, 2004), at the end of a population section meeting, held to go over the things said at the managers meeting which I had attended, Pat Blumel proposed that we talk about any problems that we were having in the section. I said right away that I had a problem meeting deadlines, and that Dave and I had already discussed this and that I would get a feature article in to Dave for editing for the quarterly publications. She then yelled at me, shouting my name and pointing and blamed me for a mistake that had occurred in the tables portion of the latest output. This output had been generated the week before, on Wednesday, and had been 'discovered' on Friday which was my lue day and Dave had taken the day off. She was so loud and aggressive that Dave asked her to calm down. She explained (as loudly) that it appeared that I was day dreaming because I was not looking at her. I said that I did not have to look at her to hear her yelling. Dave then said that he had made the mistake and that it actually had been corrected but that the draft copy had been released.

Thereafter, each time I said anything, Pat Blumel objected stating that I did not understand how things worked because I was not aware of the 'corporate culture'.

Even when I said that I had helped Pat with the RCMP boundary files she said that that example of helping each other did not count because that had happened a long time ago.

After the meeting broke, I spoke with Dave about the yelling and said that it was counter productive. I also told Dave about the way Pat pretends to be my boss whenever a manager walks by; she suddenly starts telling me what I have to do and leaves. She has done this several times.

One other time, she closed down a program on my computer because, I had a file open from a shared drive. She knew that I was working on this particular file because I had shown her that it was not working. When I was coming back to my office she was leaving my office and gave me a scathing reprimand for having the file open as she was showing to new staff member examples of how the system worked. The project file I had been working on was lost because she had closed it was without deleting the faulty file first.

I suggested that Pat apologize.

Later that afternoon Pat came to my office and gave me a qualified apology. She said that if I thought that she was out of line that it was my perception. She said that she is very adamant about her loyalty to the customer (when I told this to Dave later he laughed). I worked very hard to make our discussion a positive one by focusing on how we could be positive and specific the next time.

Pat had stated that anyone who was loyal to the customer would have been as vocal. I stated that I would never do so, to which she adamantly replied that I could never be sure of what I would do. This statement along with others makes me think that she may continue to be capable of being antagonistic and aggressive in the future.

I talked to Dave about our meeting so that he was up to date and suggested that if Pat was so loyal to the customer that she should have talked to Dave right away rather than waiting until a section meeting a week later. Indeed, the fact that she did not say anything until the meeting, and wanted to talk about problems suggests that she had planned to raise the issue in front of everyone.

Also, I mentioned that a basic rule of communication is to raise concerns one to one and offer praise in a group setting rather than chastise in group setting.

Also, Pat stated in our one to one that she was very well aware of the importance of avoiding confrontation.

Also, Pat never acknowledged that the error in the table was not my fault.

Pat had herself left us with a lot of work for which we were left to figure out at one time and her work was done in a very poor manner which I started to revise. I had done a lot of work at the expense of my own to get the outputs done. I did not chastise her at a section meeting. In fact, she may have been away because of a difficulty outside the work place. Therefore, why should she attack anyone.

Nov. 2, 2004

Last week another odd event occurred.

I returned to Victoria from three two and one half days in Vancouver on Wednesday Oct. 27, 2004. Approximately 15 minutes after arriving at the office, I received a call from the coop students regarding a meeting which was to have started already out at Camoson college. I arranged to meet them and called a cab. As I was rushing out to the waiting cab, Dave told me to get the printer from my office first and deliver it to Pat Blumel. I said that the cab was waiting and could she not get it. Dave said no, I had to take it over to her office now. He came with me to get the shared printer and he carried it to Pat Blumel's office, where upon she wanted to know why Dave was carrying the printer and not me. Dave took up the reply and I went to get the cab.

Later that afternoon (5pm or so), Dave called me into his office and said that we had to meet with PB and went on to explain that PB was a frustrated manager. We were to meet with her the next morning. I asked to not attend because I was (am) so busy and that I have already spoken to Dave the manager about setting this common printer up on a shared machine so that it need not be moved. In fact, I had suggested this many times over the two and half years in this position. Dave said that he had told Pat Blumel to

'drop it' however, she would not and therefore there has to be a meeting between the three of us. Apparently, the idea of the meeting was so that Pat Blumel could tell me that the machine will now be on a shared machine so that I could not move it any more.

Another issue regarding the printer was that upon moving it from Franks office to my office (Frank had gotten it from Pat Blumel) a small tab had snapped off. I told Pat Blumel about this right away and said that I would glue it back together. However, I had not glued it back on by the time it was moved back to Pat Blumel's office. As well, the tab on the other side had also broken off unbeknownst to me.

This minor repair was a result of an large old machine which is in high demand being moved to address the needs of the section. As mentioned, many times we (Frank and I) have asked that the machine be put in a common area on a shared connection....in fact we asked Don Laprise to look at making the connection.

However, I am being blamed for negligence and for being wantonly irresponsible and therefore subject to rebuke from my co-workers.

The next morning, instead of waiting to be called into a meeting I went into Pat Blumel's office to say that I understood that she has an affinity with the printer and that I understand that she was upset. She said she had been cursing my name and that she had to manually hand feed each page because the tab was broken. I told her that I have had to manually hand feed the printer as well, the last few time I used it, (which I had told Dave about several months earlier). The broken tab was not the reason for the manual feed. I finished by saying that it was good that we are getting a new laser color printer upon which we both agreed.

I told Dave later that I had spoken to Pat Blumel and that all was well, therefore avoiding having a meeting with just the three of us.

Still, I have been asked to glue the tabs back on but do not want to do this on my own time with my own materials therefore am speaking to Marvin.

Also, our section has had another meeting since the last one when Pat Blumel attacked me. At the end of the meeting, I took the opportunity to thank Pat Blumel for having come to my office to apologize for her out-burst. She said that she was sorry that she had to (what ever that means????). I took it as a sincere recognition that she would work diligently to not attack again but rather to speak in constructive terms however as the recent event shows, she still has a long way to go.

Written Nov 8, 2004

Later on Nov 2, Marvin and I went over the situation. Marvin stated that a meeting between Dave, Pat and I would be an effort to single me out and therefore inappropriate. Regarding gluing the printer tray, Marvin said that I was not obligated to do so. If I was

required to glue it, questions of who was responsible for the machine would have to be raised. Since the repair of the machine had become an issue, it was understandable that I not go ahead with repairs.

Although I had hoped to speak with Dave about the printer and the proposed meeting we have yet to meet.

Written March 3, 2005-03-03

On March 1, 2005, the population section had another meeting. It appears that the purpose of these meetings is to have each member explain to the others the various projects that they are working on. During this meeting Pat Blumel pointed at me to tell me that I was to go to the data services section to look at a dataset that she had thought would be good for me to look at. I had just finishing explaining that I had had a discussion with D. McRae about that data set and about getting at the actual administration data itself because that is what would be useful because it is more timely. Even though I had just explained this , Pat Blumel wanted to make sure that I would do what she had suggested anyway. Since she is not my boss and obviously did not understand what had been discussed, I asked if she was allocating. She explained that since I was supposed to know about migration that I should try to perform my job. I suggested that she then go talk to Don McRae about the dataset if she did not believe me. Dave then interjected saying something about not getting into a spat.

Later in the meeting, migration came up again and I mentioned that Pat had suggested that I look at a dataset that she knew of in Data Services. Frank then explained how that dataset was not relevant.

After the meeting, Dave O'Neil came in my office and angrily asked me to follow him to his. He said that the door must be shut and proceeded to reprimand me for having suggested that Pat Blumel should talk with Don McRae about the dataset.

I told Dave that the dataset was not adequate and still she insisted that I look at it. He said 'regardless' at which point I interjected saying that all Pat need do regardless would be three simple things; she should not turn off programs on my computer or anyone else's, she is not my boss and therefore should not pretend to be, and she should think before she yells which she has done several times.

I asked if Dave was going to talk to Pat – he said he will.

March 7, 2005. Monday morning.

I went to Dave's office to ask his opinion about a new way to calculate InterNational In and Out migration to the RD level. After agreeing on the next step, Dave asked that I close the door and he pulled out two pamphlets: 1) Standards of Conduct for Public Service Employees and 2) Employee Benefits – BC Employee and Family Assistance

Program. He said that he gave these to Pat Blumel and that he wanted me to get them as well. He also stated that he felt that Pat would not be antagonistic at further meetings. She had asked Dave if she should apologize, and Dave said no, so long as the future meetings are constructive. Dave also stated that he wanted to avoid doing anything formally as it would mean a lot more work for him.

I had stated that I had done nothing wrong in questioning Pat about allocating work for me to do and saying that she should go see Don McRae about the dataset.

Dave suggested that the next time I say “I don’t think this is appropriate. Can you handle this.”

Dave said that he did not see my response coming and that he thinks Pat bosses people around because that is her style.

Dave thought that my response was a personal attack. I asked Dave how my questioning her about her pretending to be my boss could be considered a personal attack. He said that that was not a personal attack but rather that I was very firm. I agreed that I was firm because she is not my boss. I then asked how my suggesting that Pat should talk to Don McRae about the data set could be considered a personal attack. Dave said that that was not a personal attack.

I pointed out that I thought that the whole thing had handled itself and was over and that Dave’s reprimand was not necessary. Indeed, if there was a time to get involved in reprimanding negative behaviour it would have been at the meeting when Pat attacked me in October. As well, Dave should have corrected Pat upon her insistence that Dave reprimand me for taking the color printer.

Dave also mentioned that Pats position is grossly undervalued.. Dave seemed to think that this made it alright for Pat to act the way she does and that this is her style and therefore acceptable.

It appears as though Dave is allowing, encouraging, and protecting Pats negative behaviour.

When Pat exhibits negative behaviour, Dave ignores her, but when I stand up to Pat, Dave reprimands me.

Appendix E – Encouraging Constructive Dialogue: Guiding Methods of Interaction Toward a Positive Work Environment

Paper written For Dave O’Neil and Marvin Paxman (March 8, 2005) in an attempt to improve the workplace environment.

The following is a write-up of the discussion with Dave and Marvin regarding behaviour between members of the population section, whether at section meetings or not. The discussion was requested at my behest in order to work towards consistent and positive methods of interaction between members of the population section.

At the meeting, I covered the following:

I would like to focus right away on what I think would be the positive outcome of this discussion by describing a section meeting as an opportunity for people to openly share what they are involved in, in an effort to improve the quality and timeliness of our services. I hope that by encouraging an environment where ideas can be shared, disagreed with, and occasionally agreed with, we will be able to do our jobs even better.

It is therefore important to address the specifics of inappropriate and appropriate behaviour in terms of what can be done in the future. The exercise is, of course, to always turn these negatives into positives.

As mentioned before to both Dave and Marvin, there are just three specifics regarding behaviour that I would like to address. Each specific behaviour is explained first as a general negative followed by specifics then by positive suggestions.

1) To reduce antagonistic behaviour towards section members at meetings – raising ones voice, making accusations, reprimanding - but rather think before speaking. Try asking questions and work towards being able to encourage good work. Positive remarks are welcome.

2) To minimize using meetings as a forum to tell equals what to do or pretend that we are the boss of our equals – pointing, naming the person, stating what should be done whether phrased as a question or not – but rather interact with equals as equal. Try treating all employees as people who are equally interested in providing the best service possible. Treat others as we would have them treat us.

.... and lastly

3) Even outside of meetings, try to reduce antagonistic behaviour and minimize telling equals what to do - turning other peoples computer programs off when a shared file is being accessed, raising ones voice, reprimanding. Try explaining the situation and ask for assistance.

It is hoped that by working together we can all contribute to a positive work place. If we can turn the method of interaction from one of antagonism to something constructive then we will all be better served.

Appendix F – Projection Paragraph

As the deadline approached for the completion of the PEOPLE project (annual population projections), I had asked a co-worker (Jennifer) about a statement in the projections paragraph that claimed that for an area there would be 8 dependants out of every 10 people in the year 2031. That would mean that there would only be 2 out of 10 people between the ages of 15 and 65. I could not believe that this could possibly be true and went and asked Jennifer how this was calculated and if this statement was true.

She could not explain to me how the figure was calculated but assured me that the statement was true. She said that if the ratio of the number of dependants (both children and elderly) added up to .8 that meant that 8 out of ten people were dependants, and that only 2 out of 10 people would be of working age. Because time was short and she is suppose to be the expert in this, I accepted her decision.

I wrote similar statements about the number of working people versus dependants into approximately 50 paragraphs randomly throughout the ~240 areas projection paragraphs. However, I eventually found an area where when you add the children to the elderly dependency ratios you would get over ten out of ten. This was obviously wrong and I went to Jennifer about this and she suggested that the inaccuracy had to do with rounding errors.

I found this hard to believe nonetheless, because that would mean that there were no people of working age. I therefore went about figuring out how the calculation was made and found that the ratio meant for every 8 dependants there would be 10 people of working age. Therefore, if the ratio added up to be slightly over 10 then there would be slightly over 10 dependants for every 10 people of working age.

I explained this to Jennifer so that she understood how the calculations were made and proceeded with finishing the write ups with the corrected meaning, choosing to fix the wrong statements after. This mistake cost me at least over one days work both in the time spent trying to figure out the correct meaning as well as searching for the wrong statements (this was particularly time consuming as they were dispersed throughout the areas basically requiring that I check every paragraph again) as well as the time to rewrite the sentences.

I told Dave about the rewrite and the correct interpretation of the numbers and the extra time it was taking because of the mistake.

Also, I should add here, that on Monday May 30, 2005 just one day before our scheduled completion date, Dave came to my office and asked that I change the projection for North Thompson because a known expert in the field had called our estimates into question. Dave said that it would only take a minute to change the numbers and that I should do so.

I explained that it would take much more than a minute and that it would impact the rest of the teams work (processes would have to be repeated). This exercise cost us over a half day of extra work in addition to my requirement to fix Jennifer's incorrect statement which I had not yet finished.

Two days later, on June 1, 2005, Jennifer came to ask me when I would be finished my portion of a project. I said that I felt comfortable that I would be finished by the end of the day and asked how her portion was coming along. There had been problems with pstats which Keith was working on and also it was my understanding that Jennifer was also working on her portion of the write-ups. She asked many more times about when I would be finished and I continued to say what I had already said, but, she would not say how she was doing.

She became very upset and began yelling even though I had said many times that I felt comfortable about finishing by days end (2 more hours). She yelled across the partitions from near her office that I was supposed to be finished already. She wanted me to be sure that I would be finished by the end of the day.

I was astounded by her becoming so upset. I replied that I felt comfortable about finishing by the end of the day but that I could not be sure that the Director would not ask me to do something for a minister or that even a consultant might not phone with a request that the numbers be adjusted.

A little while later, after she had some time to calm down, I said that I was going out to get a coffee and asked her if she would like one too. She politely declined.

June 2, 2005

Dave O'Neil could not make it into the office so he called the co-worker who had a history of negative behaviour towards me to tell me that I had to get a particular job done that day.

The portion of the project that had to be done that day had taken 4 days to do the previous year, but because I had automated the process, I had told Dave that it should be done within a half day. Indeed, it took less than an hour as it worked so well.

Also, it should be added that I had been asking Pat Blumel for concordance files so that we could tell which areas were exactly the same so that the write-ups could be reused for the correct areas. I have been asking for this for years but every year I have to do this manually which also takes extra time.

Tuesday, June 7th 2005

After the weekend, I went to Dave O'Neil's office about Jennifer yelling at me and about Dave O'Neil calling Pat Blumel, who has a history of yelling at me and telling me what to do, to come and tell Jennifer and particularly myself that another task had to

be done by the end of the day. I said it looks like I answer to Jennifer, who answers to Pat Blumel who answers to Dave O'Neil.

I pointed out that the yelling by my co-workers towards myself appears to have been instigated by the section manager, because he phoned Pat Blumel and had asked her to tell us and in particular myself that I had to be finished by the end of the day. Dave O'Neil became upset and called Marvin in.

Dave O'Neil told Marvin and I that Jennifer had been given responsibility over my work. I was surprised and replied that no one had told me. I asked what if the Director had wanted me to do something or a consultant called for changes? Dave O'Neil replied, if the Director, Don McRae, wanted me to do an emergency task he would have to first go through himself, the manager, and my co-worker (Jennifer) first. I was very surprised.

I requested that this arrangement be made clear before hand rather than me finding out in this manner, and that in fact since my co-worker and I have the same classification and that I have been here longer, that we should be treated as equals.

I also insisted that Dave O'Neil, the manager, be the manager as my less experienced co-worker may not be familiar with best practices of a manager. I also pointed to the importance of projects being layer out clearly so that team members (everyone in the Population Section) know what is expected of each other. I requested that he call me and not Pat Blumel about my tasks schedule.

I also requested that we have pre and post production meetings so that all the tasks would be clearly laid out with time lines.

Because there have been so many problems with how projects are handled since Ruth retired, I have been taking Project Management Courses (Professional Project Management, and Advanced Project Management) through the BCPSA...great courses. I think that this section would benefit greatly if we all took these courses.

August / September 2005 – Population Projection meetings.

Thankfully, Dave O'Neil, Jennifer Hansen, and myself started to have meetings in preparation for the next Population Projection run (I had asked that we have pre and post production meetings to improve operations). After the meetings with Dave O'Neil and Marvin Paxman last June, I assumed that Dave O'Neil was the manager of the project and that Jennifer and I were equals, equally interested in sharing the chores and equally interested in helping each other get the job done. Dave O'Neil called the meetings and they were in his office and he had started getting the information into a Project Planning program.

At the first pre-production meeting, Jennifer said right away that there was a problem with my task of completing the write-ups of the projection paragraph. I said that it was not necessarily my task, since anyone involved in this project should be able to explain the projection. She continued to insist that it was my paragraph and that she was

not doing it. I suggested that these meetings were an opportunity for us all to try to do as much as we can so that we can work together to get things done.

At the second meeting I brought a list of my tasks and asked that they be included. After the third meeting the font for the tasks was large enough for me to read and I suggested that I could help out in more places. For example, I suggested that I could edit Jennifer's work as she was going to be editing me work as well as other tasks. Jennifer wanted me to write out the projection paragraph for each region of the province (~240 paragraphs – one for each area) in order to practice for next year. I was told by her and the manager that these write-ups would not be used but I would have practice writing them so that I could do them more quickly next year. There was no mention by Jennifer or Dave of the reason it took extra time to do the write-ups (which anyone could do) the last time was because Jennifer had made an error in explaining what the dependency ratio numbers meant. Therefore, I raised the issue of the dependency ratios but there was no recognition of the error.

I also pointed to the importance of including the revision to the provincial migration projection to be done mid way through the run (March) because this meant that I would be redoing the sub-provincial migration figures so that they would add up to the new provincial totals to 2031. I was told that this rerun would not likely result in much of a change. However, in the past it has impacted my work greatly and I still wanted it included because of the potential risk to timeliness. When I first started, Ruth had me do the write ups until the March provincial level projection was done and then I would do the sub-provincial projections based on this. Now, essentially, I have to do this task twice. I also pointed to several other tasks that should be included and also pointed out that some tasks could be completed before the run began so that everything was ready. I thought that we were just getting going on getting the project planned out but the meetings were discontinued. Dave O'Neil told me that Jennifer no longer wanted to have these meetings.

Appendix G – PED criticism

On July 20, 2005, I was asked to ground truth the results of the population estimates for the Provincial Electoral Districts (PEDs). I had been given a paper copy of the tables with the results of the estimation procedure. The tables showed the PED names with columns of the years with the absolute and annual percent change. Since I has no know of where the PED area names referred to, I searched for and eventually found the PED boundary shapefile for ArcView(GIS) and attempted to bring in the digital spreadsheet, but there were problems with the area names and the shapefile was missing some PEDs. I regularly find that there are problems with the geography.

When I put the PED total population estimates into the GIS to compare them with the previous years estimates by CDCSDs and by LHAs, it was easy to see that the results of the PED estimation procedure were very wrong. Areas that were exactly the same for the different boundary sets had very different estimates of population change. For example, the New Westminster PED is exactly the same area as New Westminster CSD but had completely wrong numbers. Indeed all of the Lower Mainland showed very different results.

I asked Dave O'Neil and Jennifer to come and see the results. When Dave O'Neil saw how I had done the comparison (using GIS instead of the paper copy) and the results, he became agitated and critical. He said that he would never do the project this way and that there were too many colors and that I needed to redo all the maps with fewer colors by dumbing down (in geography generalization is not affectionately called dumbing down) the interval data all the way to categorical for areas with over 2% change in population totals.

I pointed out to Dave and Jennifer that if one area were changed (e.g. New Westminster) then all areas would change and therefore it is a waste of time to redo the maps until the model had been adjusted. Dave O'Neil agreed but regardless he wanted the maps redone to his specifications and a full report on a co-workers desk in the morning. Here again, there had been little to no planning. Curiously, I was not invited to be involved in the methods or the modeling for this project while everyone else in the pop section was and therefore I had no idea about the time line again.

Instead of focussing on the obvious problems with the procedure that had come up with such wrong numbers for the PED estimates, Dave focused on 'the look' of the maps. It appears to me that he becomes agitated when fundament flaws in the logic behind the methods are exposed by myself. I worked late to change the map colors as per Dave's specifications, but found that valuable information was lost. Therefore, I changed the maps back to the way I had done them in the first place so that he could see the difference. Again, a GIS is far superior to using a paper copy to examine the data. Adopting new tools and techniques may be difficult but we should look at this not as a way of displacing procedures that people have become comfortable with, but rather as a way improving efficiency and reducing error.

The next day July 21, 2005, Dave O'Neil asked where the full report was and I restated that a change in one area would result in a change for all areas. Since it was obvious that the method had produced wrong results, it would be necessary to change the areas in question (e.g. New Westminster PED) and that the exercise would have to be rerun anyway and would give different results for all the PEDs in the province.

Nonetheless, I had redone the maps as per Dave O'Neil's specification (staying late again) and also redid the maps the way they had been done in the first place because important information had been lost using Dave O'Neil's dumbing down method and I wanted to show him this. Dave O'Neil agreed that the dumbing down exercise was not worth it.

It appears that whenever I show an improved way of doing things to Dave O'Neil and a co-worker at the same time, Dave O'Neil gets agitated and defensive; however, if I show him without a co-worker present, he is far less defensive and agitated. I requested that I be included in the methods in the future whenever possible. Sometimes it takes time to adopt new ways. I just could do without the criticism.

I also asked one of the programmers write a simple routine in VB (it took less than 5 minutes to write the macro) that would use the GIS to automatically check for differences between the results of the estimation procedure against the estimates for other boundary sets. Therefore, instead of having a human who is not familiar with the boundaries (e.g. PEDs) check a paper copy of a table of the results of the estimation procedure, it could be done in seconds by anyone (i.e. the people involved in developing the methods and model).

I had suggested that the estimates procedure go first into a GIS and that since estimating population for different areas is a geographic exercise, that geographic software be used right off the bat. When I described the automated approach to Jennifer and explained how this would take care of the problem with the current methods, I was told that "there are always problems and that I just had to get over it," (where upon she shouted to Dave O'Neil who was near by) "right Dave". I said that I don't agree, but rather that improvements should be considered.

Appendix H – First Contact with BCPSA

From: Gore, Carol PSA:EX
Sent: August 18, 2005 10:53 AM
To: Munroe, Warren MSER:EX
Subject: RE: Feedback - Innovations Inventory

Warren: Thank you for your e-mail. I would definitely like to speak with you about the issues you're facing and discuss possible means of addressing them. I'm sorry to report that my day today and tomorrow morning are basically lost to meetings, but may I call you tomorrow afternoon? If you haven't a confidential place to speak, perhaps we can meet instead. If you wish to leave me a voicemail message today, my phone number is 387-0385.

P.S. Is your manager aware of the difficulties you're experiencing?

-----Original Message-----

From: Munroe, Warren MSER:EX
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2005 3:39 PM
To: Gore, Carol PSA:EX
Subject: FW: Feedback - Innovations Inventory

Hello Carol,

I am interested in finding ways to help create a positive work environment. Are resources available that you could point me to?

Thank you,

Warren

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Erika PSA:EX
Sent: August 17, 2005 2:22 PM
To: Munroe, Warren MSER:EX
Subject: RE: Feedback - Innovations Inventory

Warren you appear to be in a possible harrassment situation and I urge you to contact your Client Services HR Consultant Carol Gore to discuss it and possible steps that could be taken to remedy the situation. Good luck and all the best,

Erika

-----Original Message-----

From: Munroe, Warren MSER:EX
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2005 1:49 PM
To: Taylor, Erika PSA:EX
Subject: RE: Feedback - Innovations Inventory

Hello Erika,

Since starting to work here 3 1/2 years ago I have made many improvements to the way my job is done. In the latest project, I was able to get contractors to make a program that can make queriable websites of all of our data. This has resulted in a great time saving and allows us to be able to focus on the quality of the data. This project and the others have been embraced by many but not so by others. These others have been leveling personal attacks at me because of these innovations. It has gotten so bad that I am looking else where for employment, but would rather stay and see these improvements through. Help.

Warren

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Erika PSA:EX
Sent: August 17, 2005 1:22 PM
To: Munroe, Warren MSER:EX
Subject: FW: Feedback - Innovations Inventory

Hi Warren. Sorry for my delay in responding to you as I have been off on holidays.

Could you provide my with additional information as to what type of assistance you are looking for in order to link you up with the appropriate person.

Thanks,

Erika Taylor

Corporate Initiatives and Solutions
Leadership and Learning Centre
BC Public Service Agency
(250) 387-0460

For more information on our services visit our web site at

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2005 9:34 AM
To: Taylor, Erika PSA:EX
Subject: Feedback - Innovations Inventory

MessageType: Problem
Subject: (Other)
SubjectOther: Organizational Performance & Development
Username: Warren Munroe
Ministry: Minister of Labour and Citizens' Services
Program:
UserEmail: Warren.Munroe@gov.bc.ca
UserTel: 387-0334
UserFAX:
ContactRequested:

Comments:

Is there assistance available to help create a positive, supportive, inclusive, and improvement-focused work environment?

Appendix I - List of Accomplishments

Population estimation model – improved BCStats estimates from 6% to 2% error - the number of people per household varies

Correctly predicted that the estimates procedure would have to be adjusted two years after the census to take out compound growth

Helped with the completion of the Regional Index by writing the narratives for almost all the regions and industries.

Initiated the development of a queriable website to provide users with population estimates and projections.

Initiated the development of a software program that would write the code (.asp) to create queriable webpages with table and graph outputs of all BCStats data.

Rewrote the program (from scratch) to estimate monthly interprovincial migration numbers using Child Tax Benefit data. For years the numbers were completely unreliable, but now that replicate StatCan figures.

Revised method for calculating International in and out migration figures by separating NPR net figures correctly.

Created a database structure that accommodates any dataset.

Learned several computer languages including .asp, .xml, sql, apl

Completed several courses through the BCPSA including project management, consulting, MSAccess.