

Present: Neil Armitage, Lawrence Bbasa, Sarah Blyth, Jumani Clark, Joel Claassen, Sheila Clow, Deborah Constant, Shari Daya, Greg Distiller, Nico Fischer, Tim Gebbie, Shane Godfrey, Freedom Gumede, Thulani Gxubane, Jane Harries, Fleur Howells, Catherine Hutchings, Michelle Khan, Maria Keet, Mariola Kirova, Dirk Lang, Karen le Jeune, Andrew Lilley, Tim Low, Helen Macdonald, Mark Massyn, Mandisa Mbali, Frank Matose, Duncan Mhakure, Kelley Moulton, Shaheen Mowla, Natasha Muna, Saul Nurick, Celeste Ryneke, Christine Swart, Maureen Tanner, Cathy Ward, Herman Wasserman, Amanda Weltman, Jennifer Whittal, Sahal Yacoob and Gina Ziervogel

Apologies: Pippin Anderson, Carryn de Moor, John Dunne, Roshan Galvaan, Inga Hitzeroth, Salma Ismail, Jeff Jawitz, Patricia Kooyman, Thereza Lorenzo, Heather Marco, Frank Matose, Tom Moultrie, Ulrike Rivett, Neill Robertson, Jonathan Shock, Marieke van Zyl and Bernhard Weiss

In Attendance

Shirifa Hellaby (Academics Union Organiser)

1. Welcome and Apologies

Kelley Moulton (President of the Academics Union) extended a welcome to everyone and apologised that the meeting had to be postponed due to events on campus.

Apologies from members who have been unable to attend were received and noted above.

2. Confirmation of the 2018 AGM Minutes

There were no alterations to the Minutes which were sent to members via email. The Minutes were approved by Tim Gebbie and seconded by Nico Fischer.

3. President's Report

In Summary:

Kelley informed the meeting that the Academics Union has had a busy year—active in the work of the Union, for other people and for campus generally.

It is within this framework that a report would be given on some of the things the AU has been involved in this past year.

The Union remains involved through many of the University structures, committees and have been very involved with Grievances—far more than it has in previous years.

a.) Participation in University structures

(i.) Institutional Forum (IF):

The Institutional Forum (IF) and Transformation Forum are in some state in a flux. The IF has in the past year undergone a change in its membership to better represent the changing landscape at UCT, specifically the

introduction of a number of Unions in the Pay classes 1 to 12 space and to try and align it a little bit more with its statutory mandate, which has been a criticism that many of us have raised in the past, namely that it was lacking in structure; lacking in understanding in what its mandate was and therefore operating much as a rubber stamping mechanism for other bodies.

Although we have not struggled this year to maintain a quorum as has happened in previous years, there is still some lack of understanding of the powers of the IF, its function and its responsibilities and also in terms of its oversight role in respect of transformation; what the differences are between the IF and the Transformation Forum, their mandate and how they operate. This is a space that would continue to remain contested in part because there has been a proposal by the Black Academic Caucus (BAC) for a fundamental revision of the University Transformation Forum into a University Transformation Committee with higher levels of power.

One of the difficulties of the IF, is that the moment it appeared to get going and to work on its mandate, the next cohort of students are elected, and we land back at the beginning.

(ii.) The Transformation Forum

As indicated earlier, the BAC has lodged a proposal with the University to change the Transformation Forum (TF) into what it refers to as the University Transformation Committee (UTC), which would be a 'high level committee with broad oversight over transformation issues at the University on behalf of the University Council.' The BAC envisage that a proposed UTC would have similar powers over transformation issues as other high-level committees have, for example, the University Development Committee, the University Finance Committee, the University Research Committee and the University Student Affairs Committee.

The BAC recommend that this proposal should define the University's transformational framework and ensure that this underpins the work of all the other University committees. The UTC would have power to draft policy, have oversight over policy, to monitor and flag equity gaps in the functioning of the Committees of Council.

The Union Executive is concerned that the proposed UTC structure does not have any representation from Unions, not just the AU, but all the Unions and instead rely on representation with two members on Council, from Deans and Faculty Transformation officers. The proposal was uploaded onto the Union Vula page and recommends members review it and provide feedback via Shirifa, as it will come up for discussion again at the next TF meeting.

(iii.) Other University Committees

The AU continue to serve on the following Committees: The Academic Freedom Committee , which has also been the subject of some vigorous debate in the last year; the UCT Retirement Fund, the Time- Table Committee, the Staff Development Committee, the Occupational Health Forum; the Language Policy Committee; the Transportation and Traffic Management Forum and the Nominations Committee.

On behalf of the Union, Kelley extended her appreciation and thanked the members who represent the Academics Union on these committees. The Union values their time, expertise , commitment for attending and reporting back to members. These reports are available on Vula, under the Resources tab related to this year's AGM.

The Union currently has a vacancy on the UCT Retirement Fund Committee as the representative on this Committee resigned from UCT and we would appreciate receiving nominations, particularly from members in Actuarial Science, given that role is of a very specialised nature in what is discussed there.

(iv.) Relationship with University Management and other Unions:

The Union has had an overwhelmingly more settled relationship this year with the University Management in comparison with previous years. We have had regular meetings through our Consultative Forum, which takes place quarterly and through the HR-AU Collaborations, which are smaller, less formal spaces in which we discuss individual issues and cases.

The Union has had a lot of success in resolving issues through those two spaces. These forums are used to raise members' concerns and we do receive a steady stream of those, either in the form of questions or concerns through Shirifa. The Union wishes to encourage members to continue alerting it when issues arise within your Faculties or departments that need attention or that the Union could raise with Management to try and seek resolution.

In general, the Union's relationship with Management has been collegial and productive this year. The Management team has undergone some changes this year, most recently including the addition of Sue Harrison as the DVC for Research and the new role of the Chief Operating Officer, who has management responsibilities for the HR Department, Finance and Properties & Services, being filled by Reno Morar, who was Deputy-Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences.

The reconfiguration of portfolios which have resulted will probably take time to settle, but we get the sense that the leadership is concerned about the morale of academic staff—staff in general, but also that of the academics and is committed to seek appropriate solutions for the issues that are raised by the Union.

However, while they are open to resolve our issues, things still move at a glacial pace. As usual, we struggle with that while we have this collegial and trust-based relationship, but at the same time, it costs us in terms of our 'strong arm power' slightly. At times our issues lag because we have a little bit less leverage as a result.

We have definitely seen more careful consultation with the AU in areas where consultation was absent last year but at times it can be described as more superficial, where it is more of an information giving activity and we continue to push back strongly in those spaces.

v.) Union landscape:

In terms of the Union landscape in general, the Union landscape in the non-academic space is very unsettled at present.

While the Employees Union (EU) has sole bargaining rights for staff in Pay classes 7 to 12 and bargains in a coalition of Unions representatively in the Pay classes 1 to 6 space, the coalition Unions want to extend their bargaining space to the Pay classes 7 to 12 environment. Although the EU will retain the majority share because they have the highest number of members, the fact that existing agreements are being negotiated or revisited, does raise concerns for the AU as well.

The coalition Unions, at a meeting the previous week, have sought permission to bargain in the Pay classes 7 to 12 space as well.

Under Barbara Mapara, the new the Director of Employees Relations in Human Resources, there is a push for creating a single bargaining forum for all Unions, including the Academics Union.

We have not supported this, mainly for the reason that we think our members' interests are quite different to those for staff in Pay classes 1 to 12. The AU believe that areas of mutual interest are around parking and Discovery Health and these can be addressed collectively when Unions ban together to try and negotiate with the University, rather than creating a forum that would lock us in to protracted bargaining.

A concern is that it took so long for the demands in the Pay classes 1 to 6 space, which meant that staff only received their increases in April or May, and this is not a situation we would like to occur again.

The Workplace Forum is a place where all Unions meet to discuss issues of mutual concern and interests, but this forum has been virtually dysfunctional this year and has not once reached a quorum. For the AU this is an instructive example that underscores our commitment not to form a single bargaining unit. The AU will continue to monitor developments there.

One of the things that is interesting about forming a single bargaining unit, which would be discussed later, is that the AU has low representativity in the lecturer band and for all ranks above this, we are over the threshold of 50% of academic staff. What this means for the lecturer space, is that it would be likely that Unions like UAWU would have traction in being able to negotiate to seek members. It would be one of the issues that would pull the AU into a single bargaining forum if UAWU's membership increase too much to the detriment of ours in the lecturer category.

vi.) Other activities:

a. Soft Funded Academic Research Staff

We have seen some progress in the Soft Funded Academic Research Staff (SFARS) category, where a draft policy was circulated to members in late 2018 and feedback provided. This policy was overwhelmingly supported by SFARS members with a few important criticisms and caveats which have been fed back to Management.

Kelley indicated that with the support of Sue Harrison, we will also see some energy and impetus as she has experience in the SFARS funded environment and has some clear ideas of what she thinks is a work-able solution. The Union is hopeful that there will be an agreed policy in place for SFARS during 2020 and would hopefully being able to back-date some incentives to the beginning of 2020.

Kelley expressed her thanks to Shane Godfrey and Nico Fischer for their leadership in this area, for their patient obstinance to ensure that progress is being made in this area and ensuring that the interests of SFARS members are at the top of the agenda.

b. Pay Policy and scarcity allowances

Kelley informed the meeting that the AU has done some work on the pay policy and scarcity allowances space too. As members recall, the AU has signed a three-year wage agreement with Management the previous year. One of the things the AU agreed to is the review of the Pay Policy and of the scarcity allowances that are paid to certain Faculties. These discussions are on-going and would hopefully be completed by the end of this year as well.

Under the same three-year agreement, the AU made the previous year is to set increases at the Western Cape CPI + 1% for academic staff. The AU has recently been provided with the figures of the Western Cape

CPI for June, which is our baseline figure. This has set inflation at 5.3%. So, 5.3% + 1% created into a pool, gives us the quantum which we can then distribute amongst the ranks to try and deal with the differentials issue and in comparison, with our market analysis.

The AU Bargaining team has just commenced work on this and will report back to members what the proposed spread would look like.

Kelley appealed to members to submit their non-salary items within the next two weeks so the Bargaining team can consolidate these. These non-salary items should be sent via Shirifa. A poll can be done amongst members and then presented to Management.

c. Grievances

Kelley informed the meeting that grievances is one of the Union's area of activities, outside the consultative forum. The number of grievances have continued to grow in the last year. Many of the cases the AU is seeing are enormously complex and some have stretched out for over a year.

The AU Executive is pleased to inform members that it has been happy to successfully protect the interests of many of its members, some of whom are past and current recipients of this service.

Many of our members are unaware of the work done by the Executive Committee members serving on the Grievance committee and only do until they require assistance. In fact, non-members are equally unaware of the benefits of the Union until they require assistance.

The Union support staff through grievances and disciplinary processes, which take up an enormous amount of time but also a great deal of emotional energy to try and support people through what is often the most difficult time in their careers.

Kelley conveyed her thanks and appreciation to Tim Low, for his commitment and to that committee. Tim is the head of the Grievance committee and he is involved, in some measure with every grievance the Union receives.

Kelley also conveyed her thanks to Maureen Tanner, Mark Massyn, Shaheen Mowla, Catherine Hutchings, Maanda Mulaudzi and Ulrike Rivett in their absence for their service to this committee. Kelley indicated that the Grievance committee is one that is hard to leave, and there is a number of people, who although they have stepped down from the AU Executive Committee, continue to provide their service in this way.

d. Membership

Kelley informed the meeting that membership remains largely stable and the Union represents about 50% of eligible staff.

The Union has easily maintained the thresholds in the ranks of Senior lecturers and above but have a low membership in the lecturer group and it has to think how the AU can increase its visibility, and grow its representation amongst this group.

As will be seen in the Treasurer's report later, the Union is generally in a good financial position. The AU continue to be concerned that the University might discontinue its contribution to the Union's cost, especially given the proliferation of Unions but that has not happened yet, and it supports continuing to reserve the funds

to withstand a shock like that, if it does come. The AU thus propose continuing our current membership fees at 0.1% of CoE.

e. Future challenges

Kelley indicated that in terms of where the AU sees its future challenges, the current climate on campus attest to the fact that there are no doubtedly challenges ahead for both UCT and other tertiary institutions; the incredibly low economic growth in the country is a dark cloud that hangs over all of us and this will certainly deepen the challenges of funding and austerity that is already being experienced within the University and particularly on staff.

The numbers of academic resignations increased dramatically over the last few years. HR reports to the Union anecdotally that the University is not losing academics to other institutions, as much as they are lost to overseas jobs. This means that this is a real threat for us.

The AU has continued to be enormously concerned about the impact of an increasing workloads on its members, an increasing demand on academics generally and the impact this has on their productivity, their health and well-being. This remains a priority area for the AU to continue engaging.

The AU is also concerned about the lack of balance between staff and student issues and this is something that has persisted for a number of years. Recently, the AU have also experienced some hostility from some members of the University senior leadership group to two representatives of the Union or concerns that we raised. This is something the AU will monitor because this sort of hostility entrenches division and breaks down communications within relationships that are otherwise stable.

Kelley indicated that challenges are also expected to continue in the SFARS space and although strides were made in having a policy, financial instability caused the closure of well-established and respected units during the last year and a much greater scrutiny on individual SFARS salary funds, financial sustainability and an increased reporting requirements in terms of their operational stability. This is another space that the AU would continue to have to do work on.

As the last few VC desks and days attest, the University is still a volatile space where protests relating to the insourcing of vendors are not resolved; the response to gender-based violence has galvanised our community and also at times, impacted on the safety of those on campus and on the academic project. Those developments are still unfolding, and the AU will report back as soon as they know anything more. The AU's understanding is of now, Deans have been tasked with the responsibility of resolving the impact of the shut down the previous week.

Kelley acknowledged and thanked the members of the AU Executive for their service during the last year and they are: Tim Low, Andrew Lilley, Christine Swart, Maureen Tanner, Sahal Yacoob, Nico Fischer, Shaheen Mowla and Tim Gebbie.

Kelley also conveyed her appreciation for the contribution of those Union members, like Shane Godfrey, who the AU pretends is an AU Executive member and regularly calls on him; conveyed her pleasure that the AU Executive will go into 2020 together as a team.

Kelley conveyed her thanks to past AU Presidents, Ulrike Rivett, Bernhard Weiss, Tom Moultrie and Maanda Mulaudzi for always being available to provide institutional memory, advice, support and a heads-up for something they think is coming down the pipe. Kelley indicated that this relationship is valuable for her.

Kelley conveyed her thanks to Shirifa Hellaby, the Union organiser, whose service in that role is often unseen but valued; thanked Shirifa for being enormously patient, for being efficient and for also keeping the AU Executive Committee members in line.

Kelley lastly thanked the members for their support, indicated that the AU is pleased to support them and wishes everyone well over the next year.

Members in the meeting acknowledged Kelley's report with applause.

4. Draft 2018 Audited Financial Statement

a. Draft 2018 audited financial statement

A copy of the draft 2018 audited financial statement produced by Nolands (Mowbray branch) was circulated to members via email. Mark Massyn (Treasurer) provided an overview.

b. Income and expenditure Summary:

- i. The AU membership has increased by 8% during the last year
- ii. The expenditure has increased by 13% but this is mainly linked to salaries and legal fees
- iii. R75 000 was spent on legal fees in 2018, which was carried over from the previous year as a result of the services of a lawyer to assist in negotiating salaries.
- iv. The surplus in 2018 was R551 175
- v. The AU received a grant of R368 735 from UCT
- vi. The interest on the money invested was R160 363
- vii. The reserve at the end of 2018 was R3.9m
- viii. The reserve might seem a huge, but the AU surmises that although the Union has received a grant of approximately R300 000 from the University annually, this grant might come to an end in the near future; further the funds would not last long if the Union would have to subsist only on its membership fees.
- ix. Kelley has alluded to the increase of cases the Grievance Committee is involved in; which takes up a great deal time of those AU Executive committee members who serve on this committee.
- x. Tim and Kelley has each spent between 200 and 300 hours per year on cases they are involved in and the AU Executive Committee will review this, as it is not sustainable.
- xi. The AU Executive Committee is looking into 2 options, namely: employing an external individual to assist with cases, or providing remuneration for those individuals serving on the Grievance Committee.
- xii. Due to the introduction of the above (xi.) measures, additional costs by the AU could incur in 2020
- xiii. As Kelley also indicated, membership remained constant, except in the Lecturer rank. The percentage of the other ranks are: Professor is at 54%; Associate Professor is 58%, Senior Lecturer is 56% and Lecturer is 32%
- xiv. The AU Executive Committee will not at this stage, review the membership which is 0.1% of CoE.

Members approved the audit report and are in favour of re-appointing Nolands as the external auditor for the next term.

5. Labour Relations Amendment Act 2018: Guidelines in terms of section 95(9)

Shirifa Hellaby (AU Organiser) informed the meeting of the following:

- i. At a meeting for all Unions in June, planned by the Registrar of Labour Relations, Union representatives were informed that the amendments to the Labour Relations Act (LRA) came into effect in 1 January 2019 and they request that all Unions comply with this.
- ii. The guidelines, in terms of section 95 (9) stipulates that all Unions must now change or update their constitutions to provide for this amendment.
- iii. Section 95 (9) pertains to in the event a Union wishes to call a strike, all members have to be informed about it and a secret ballot has to be done; further information on this is provided.
- iv. The Department of Labour (DoL) is attempting to discourage Unions from terminating or disciplining a member, when they either (a.) do not vote when a secret ballot was not done or (b.) do not want to participate in a strike action
- v. The representative from the DoL requested that the Unions inform all the members about this amendment and indicated if Unions do not comply, they can be de-registered.
- vi. The attachment received from the Registrar of Labour Relations was included in the documents sent to members via email.

Question from a member:

Does the AU constitution have the appropriate information and if it complies?

Response

Kelley and Shirifa responded to the above query that the AU constitution does comply

6. Election of the new Executive Committee for 2019-2020

Kelley informed the meeting that the current Executive committee members have made themselves available to serve another term.

There were no further nominations for the AU Executive from the floor.

| Name | Position | Faculty | Years/ months serving on AU | Standing for Re-election |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Kelley Moutl | President | Law | 5 | Yes |
| Tim Low | Vice- President | CHED | 5 | Yes |
| Mark Massyn | Treasurer | EBE | 4 | Yes |
| Nico Fischer | Elected | EBE | 4 | Yes |
| Andrew Lilley | Elected | Humanities | 4 | Yes |
| Christine Swart | Elected | Science | 5 | Yes |
| Shaheen Mowla | Elected | Health Sciences | 2 | Yes |
| Tim Gebbie | Elected | Science | 1 | Yes |

| | | | | |
|----------------|---------|----------|--------------------------|-----|
| Maureen Tanner | Elected | Commerce | 7 months, since Feb 2019 | Yes |
| Sahal Yacoob | Elected | Science | 4 months, since May 2019 | Yes |

Kelley indicated if members wish to avail themselves to serve on the AU Executive or the Grievance Committee, they can approach her.

The majority members of this meeting accepted those members standing for re-election.

7. General Discussion

A question from a member

- i. As gender-based violence is on the top of the agenda, and you assist us with the grievance procedures, what is the situation with sexual harassment amongst staff and how big a problem is it? Is it an exploding mushroom problem or is it relatively small?

Responses from the AU Executive:

Kelley: statistics on gender-based violence is notoriously problematic, in general and in the University also. Our Union only gets to know about cases that is referred to us by members so there are also many cases that are brought by the University which we would have no purview over, but I think we can say with certainty that the incidence of sexual harassment cases that have been brought to us, have definitely increased. In general, another trend, is that sexual harassment cases are viewed very seriously and will, almost by default, go to the Committee of Inquiry (Col) so that phase of PIC, which is meant to be the test of whether there is primo facie evidence, would be referred on from there regardless. From the AU perspective, the Grievance Committee is hesitant to represent members once it gets to the Col stage in dismissal offences and sexual harassment is one of those.

We remain involved and safeguard in terms of policy—to follow the policy and procedure, but there is an overlap with staff wanting legal advice from statisticians or criminologists.

Our tendency has been to refer staff who are facing Col charges for legal representation at that stage.

Tim Low: The University is also changing its policy to deal with such cases, and they intend to speed up the processes, which is often the difficulty. The Grievance Committee has not had much cases involving staff on staff, but more those involving staff with students and these are often the biggest issues.

Kelley: The University is in the process of setting up a specialised Tribunal for sexual related matters, which is an improvement. I think that both specialised care for those people who are reporting and specialised attention to these issues we know worldwide, is best practise. This is useful. The University is also currently, reviewing its Discipline policy more generally in terms of academic staff as their aim is to bring it closer in line with a uniformed policy for all staff. The Grievance Committee is very supportive of reviewing the Discipline Policy in part because the two-step process of PIC and Col is enormously cumbersome. It is very difficult for people who are involved in it...and in our view, to have a one-step process where there is a proper hearing and it is dealt with, rather than feeling you have to go through the process of being prosecuted twice. The AU Executive will report further on this when it comes out, as it is currently in the University leadership structures. We have been able to comment on it, and we think it is a really good improvement on the current situation, but have not seen the final draft.

Questions and concerns raised by members:

- ii. Request that the Union ask the University to cancel exams and any official functions after 5pm particularly due to the current situation as it is not only safe for us, but also not safe for the students.
- iii. When will students write tests in the already packed calendar?

Responses from the AU Executive:

Kelley: Aware that this issue had been dealt with, as it was one of the demands by the students and we will continue to monitor the outcome.

Raising the issue of safety—of people who use public transport to get home is absolutely relevant and is one which we continue to raise in the Consultative Forum.

We can put this on the list of non-salary demands, which you, members can vote on.

Tim Low: Tests happen after 5:30, according to the policy. Unless we have a study and a test week, which is about the only way to deal with it, because the next thing is that we will encroach on our weekends. I am aware that the Commerce Faculty is quite keen and cannot wait to start using Saturdays to get tests written. Whatever decision is going to be made in that regard, there is going to be some change. I am aware that if you are a postgrad accounting student, they use Saturdays as the test day. I certainly will not be supporting a decision for staff to work on Saturdays. Our work is bad enough on a weekday, and one needs to have a bit of a break.

Questions or concerns from members:

1. I just wanted to find out if you have received any other cost recovery issue that I forwarded?
2. What is the policy if a non-member approaches the Union with regard to a disciplinary matter? Can he/she join? So, they can just join as from then? No back pay?
3. About the lecturer ranks, is there any way that new lecturers get contacted by the Contracts office—and the Union can then recruit them.
4. The rate of the increase of Discovery, compared to the rate of increase of CPI/our salaries, if we project it, eventually our whole salary would go to Discovery. I am not necessarily saying that we move away from Discovery. But, if Discovery is mandatory, is there a way to couple our increases, closer to Discovery's increase?
5. I think we are the only Union where our members have to be on Discovery and other Union members can opt out.
6. I am really cross at how long it takes for Building Maintenance to do things. It took me three months to receive a new lightbulb for my office. It was eventually sorted out, as I went to the Head of Maintenance, but why should I have to waste my time with this, and the secretaries spend hours on the phone with this. What is going on?
7. It is terrible. For me, what was going on there were fixing the bathroom above and the leaks were seeping into my Honours lab. And it's still not fixed, as I have been contacting them for about three months now and still have a hole in the ceiling.
8. I just wish to find out if others also have a problem getting their office cleaned, or is it just me?

Responses from the AU Executive:

Kelley: We have already raised the cost recovery issue that you put forward in the last consultative forum and it does not need to go on as a non-salary demand.

Kelley: Yes. We ask the non-member to join the Union. We do not have the capacity to serve the number of grievances that we currently have, so we are not able to service non-members. We have a good working relationship, for example, with the Employees Union (EU), so when grievances come to us, that should be in the EU space, we refer it on to them, and we remain involved to ensure that things move through, but we are not able to represent non-members.

Regarding back payment, not currently.

Kelley: Shirifa sends these out. I think people are nervous of joining Unions especially when they are new on campus and they do not know what Unions do for you. We have had a few HoDs who have received support from the Union via a grievance process. In other words, we have helped bring more into a constructive space to resolve and those HoDs, for example, have requested us to come and make a presentation to their department about what the Union does and how we can help. And if any member wishes to put this onto their department agendas, one of us would be happy to come and talk about what the Union does. We are also looking at revamping our flyers, so they look more eye-catching and have clear information. Talk in your department, talk to non-members and suggest they speak or contact one of us.

Kelley: I encourage you to go and read the Discovery Organisational Health Forum reports. Each year they engage on the issue of Discovery. In last year's salary demands, we have asked for the University to put its weight behind negotiating a better deal for its members. The answer from HR is that Discovery is simply not interested and in part, because there are so few other insurers who would take UCT on and this is because, at the time the comparison was done, which is a couple of years ago now, there was only two other Medical schemes that would take on UCT because of its ageing and very unhealthy population. And I can tell you, that since then, our diagnoses for chronic illnesses has skyrocketed. There is a presentation on Vula that shows that. The two Medical Aids that would take UCT both had low ratings for their service. In other words, they are not really great medical aids.

Discovery's increase is 10% or 14%. If you can think of a way to pressure UCT to giving us 14%, I encourage you to join the Bargaining Committee. I think HR is sympathetic, but, at the end of the day, there is a pool that pays salaries and my point about saying about Discovery, is that UCT has very little bargaining power with Discovery, because they know people are not clamouring to take UCT on.

Opting out is already in place for Discovery. When I last asked about this, academics who opted out of Discovery, opted out for a couple of months, then opted in again. This is what the data shows. We had the same opt out as for other Unions made available to academics, and I know that some members opted out, then opted in, but will clarify this and issue a communication.

Kelley: We will raise this issue again, as it's one which has been on our non-salary demands. I know that the COO is really concerned about the state of the things of these kinds of complaints. We are also raising the issue around the arrival of ambulances. We have had two incidents on campus recently where ambulances have taken a very long time to arrive. This is another issue we need to advocate for.

Mark: A comment on the maintenance issue. During the past year, a survey was done on maintenance and the backlog at UCT was running over R10m. They receive R2m per year out of income, so they managed to receive the shortfall, released by Council, over three chunks.

Calls have to be logged, and one of the ways of addressing these, is to make it a Health & Safety issue.

8. Closure

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 13h55

DRAFT