

Present: Zuleiga Adams, Imran Allie, Pippin Anderson, Neil Armitage, Sarah Blyth, Susan Bourne, Richard Bradstreet, Stefan Britz, Justin Brown, Helen Buchanan, Fatemah Camroodien-Surve, Ros Chapman, Sheila Clow, Brandon Collier-Reed, Vernon Coyne, Shari Daya, Carryn de Moor, Monica de Souza Louw, Ana Deumert, Greg Distiller, Peter Dunsby, Elmarie Edwards, Sebnem Er, David Erwin, Nico Fischer, Jacqui Friedling, Divine Fuh, Roshan Galvaan, Tim Gebbie, Shane Godfrey, Suki Goodman, Inga Hitzeroth, George Hull, Catherine Hutching, Salona Hutchman, Peter Johnston, Emma Kalk, Debbie Kaminer, Rochelle Kapp, Michelle Khan, Mariola Kirova, Michelle Kuttel, Dirk Lang, Chris Lennard, Karen le Jeune, Mike Lambert, Dirk Lang, Andrew Lilley, Tim Low, Nolundi Luwaya, Nkululeko Mabandla, Helen Macdonald, Rashida Manjoo, Heather Marco, Mark Massyn, Mandisa Mbali, Frank Matose, Andiswa Mfengu, Duncan Mhakure, Kharnita Mohamed, Kelley Moulton, Shaheen Mowla, Maanda Mulaudzi, Natasha Muna, Gwamaka Mwalemba, Joyce Mwangama, Leigh Neethling, Fred Nicholls, Laura Nkula-Wens, Gideon Nomdo, Numusa Ntinga, Saul Nurick, Clive Oliver, Grant Oosterwyk, Alexander Paterson, Lauren Paremoer, Kutlwano Ramaboa, Ulrike Rivett, Neill Robertson, Fiona Ross, Jacques Rosseau, Signe Rosseau, Celeste Ryneke, Suleiman Salau, Rebekka Sandmeier, Anneliese Schauerte, Anton Schlecter, Moreblessings Shoko, Kaveer Singh, Sonja Spamer, Anna Steynor, Hussein Suleman, Christine Swart, Maureen Tanner, Francois Toerien, Carla Tsampiras, Mohohlo Tsoeu, Walter Uys, Marianne Van der Schuren, Thomas van Heerden, Tracy van Heerden, Meryl van Noie, Gerhard Venter, Adam West, Jennifer Whittal, Harald Winkler and Sahal Yacoob

Apologies: Salma Ismail, Astrid Jarre, Maria Keet, Romy Parker, Roman Roth and Johanna von Holdt

In Attendance

Shirifa Hellaby (Academics Union Organiser)

1. Welcome and Apologies

Kelley Moulton (President of the Academics Union) extended a welcome and thanked those members for making the time to meet with the AU Executive at a period which is a busy one for everyone.

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

Kelley requested that members type their name in the Chat section of MS Teams, which is in lieu of a hard copy of an attendee register.

2. Confirmation of the 2019 AGM Minutes

There were no alterations to the Minutes which were sent to members via email. The Minutes being an accurate reflection of the meeting were approved by Jacques Rosseau and seconded by Catherine Hutching.

3. AU President's Report

In Summary:

Kelley informed the meeting that unlike in the past where she would provide a detailed report, an AU Executive decision was taken for her to condense this section to provide additional time to discuss the proposed renegotiated wage agreement for the 2021 salaries.

Kelley indicated that the Academics Union (AU) has had another busy year and had no inkling what 2020 would bring.

Kelley informed the meeting that she would focus on the most pressing challenges that face the academic community at UCT and to devote most of the time discussing members' views of what is being asked of academics and how the AU should represent members going forward.

a.) Participation in University structures

Kelley informed the meeting that she will circulate the reports of the specific Academics Union participation in University structures and these include the Institutional Forum (IF), the Transformation Committee, the Academic Freedom Committee, the UCT Retirement Fund, the Nominations Committee, the Staff Development Committee, the Occupational Health and Safety Forum, the Language Policy Committee, the Transportation and Traffic Management Forum for members to read at another time.

There are reports from all of the AU sub-committees and representatives that are made available on the AU Vula site for members' information and the Union would welcome any engagement around those reports, which can be sent to Shirifa or to herself and a discussion can be facilitated in that way.

Kelley indicated that during this time of Zoom and online meeting exhaustion, the AU would like to thank the members who represent the Union on those committees. The AU values their time, expertise and commitment in attending and reporting back to the Union on the work of those committees.

b.) Relationship with University Management

The AU has continued to enjoy a collegial relationship with Management through the Consultative Forum and although the AU are still concerned with the glacial pace of change on some issues that have been raised through that forum. The AU use the Consultative Forum space to address members' concerns or to seek clarity on matters of interest for our membership and we do encourage you to continue sending through issues that you would like to have raised in this forum to Shirifa, our Union organizer.

c.) Emergency Remote Teaching

In the context of Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) that we find ourselves in this year, the AU has, also in addition to those forums had representation on both the Teaching Online Task Team and on the Postgraduate Online Task Team where we have been able to feed our members' concerns back to Management on an ongoing basis.

This is where the AU has taken the key themes that have been raised by members in our general members' meetings, which have been very well attended during the latter half of this year. The AU took the themes raised here to Management and these have mainly centred around staff burnout, mental health & wellness, our inability to take leave which is linked to health and wellness and concerns around managing the workload of academics.

We have highlighted the need for clearer communication around what is being expected of academics, of shifts in the academic calendar, in how decision making has been made, and particularly, we have also highlighted the gaps in the information that is sometimes sent to students and academics and the difficult position that places the last-mentioned in.

The AU has also raised the fact that information and opportunities for feedback and discussion do not make their way all the way through to academic staff and the importance of discussion forums in Faculties that make sure that staff at all levels know what is expected of them. We have raised concerns about how the University plans to measure performance and deal with promotion; and have asked Management to come up with clear guidelines on how this would be done for both 2020 and 2021.

The AU managed to get clarity on some issues better than others and certainly in 2021 we are going to see a continuation of many of these issues, which we will continue to pay attention to and raise on behalf of members.

d.) Soft Funded Academic Research Staff (SFARS)

In terms of SFARS the AU has unfortunately seen the impetus from Management stall on passing the proposed SFARS policy. This could be as a result that efforts have been put into ensuring job security for SFARS given the enormous impact of Covid on many of their funding streams.

Members of the SFARS Committee have continued to engage with DVC Sue Harrison around trying to push for the SFARS policy to be passed.

Kelley expressed her thanks to Shane Godfrey and Nico Fischer for their leadership in this area, and for their patience and sometimes obstinance to ensure that progress is being made in this space.

e.) Three-year wage agreement

Kelley informed the meeting that membership would recall that the AU signed a three-year wage agreement with Management in 2018 under which we agreed to the review of the Pay Policy and of the scarcity allowances that are paid to certain Faculties. These discussions are on-going, and the AU has not seen much action or change on either one of these issues for the majority of the year, although there has been some information that has been circulated around the scarcity allowances in the scarcity allowances space and there seem to be a kind of reinvigoration of at least the meetings to try and ascertain in moving that forward.

It becomes extremely important as we move into 2021 as the current agreement comes to an end and the issues need to be resolved in the next 6 months.

f.) Grievances

Kelley informed the meeting that the number of grievances has continued to grow in the last year and again the AU has seen a number of cases, which have been enormously complex, some of which have stretched for longer than a year.

The members of the Grievance Committee are very committed people and can say that they have protected the interests of quite a number of our members through their dedicated service. Often members are unaware of the work of this committee until they require the Union's assistance or unless they need to get support going through a grievance or disciplinary process.

Kelley informed the meeting that this work takes up an enormous amount of free time—by this is not intended to mean free time that the AU have available, but time for which they are not remunerated and would like to thank specifically Tim Low, for his leadership and commitment to this group and also Maureen Tanner, Mark Massyn, Shaheen Mowla, Tim Gebbie and Ulrike Rivett for their service to this committee.

g.) Membership

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

The Union has easily maintained the thresholds in representations for Senior lecturers and above but have a low membership among the lecturers and are seeking ways to increase their visibility and cohort amongst this group.

Kelley reminded the meeting that she has sent out a call for new members along with a flyer which lists what the AU does for members. Kelley encouraged members to reach out to the AU if more information is required or if they require a copy of the flyer to pass onto other staff.

Kelley informed the meeting that growing the membership among the junior ranks is important for the AU to continue to negotiate on behalf of those groups.

h.) Membership fees

As members can ascertain from the Treasurer's report, the Union is still in a good financial position. The AU continue to be concerned that the University may discontinue its contribution to the Union's cost, and therefore support continuing to reserve the funds to withstand an impact of that.

Mark Massyn will circulate a more detailed Treasurer's report. The AU has a decent reserve and propose continuing our current membership fees at 0.1% of member's CoE, which will adjust or not adjust when a wage increment is negotiated with Management.

4. Salary negotiations

Kelley reminded the meeting under the three-year agreement that was signed with Management in 2018, the AU, as with all of the other Unions agreed to set increases for the 3 years, which includes 2021 at Western Cape CPI + 1% for academic staff.

As members are aware, Management formally notified the Unions a few months ago in writing about their intention of as they term it, of an envelope to envelope staffing budget between 2020 and 2021 that cannot increase. Management's intentions were also discussed at various other staff and Management forums, as well as in DSA's and other Dean's committees.

However, the AU configure the agreement that it is important to ensure that the bottom line is exactly the same between the 2020 and 2021 budgets.

Kelley informed members that she had sent them a copy of Management's position paper. The AU attended a meeting with Management on 5 November, which was the commencement of formal renegotiations for the year. It was the expectation that Management would present the AU their position paper that provides a justification why they were seeking to renegotiate the existing signed agreement. The AU did not receive it at the time as they came to provide the Union with another finance presentation and the last-mentioned then requested this in writing, which came to the AU on Tuesday 17 November, which was circulated to members on 18 November. The AU also set up a forum for members to comment on the content of that document.

From the side of the AU and also from a personal viewpoint, what is most disappointing about Management's position document is that it entirely addresses the issue from a financial point of view. It does not attempt to put staff in the centre of the conversation, and it does not do much to recognise the enormous commitment that academic staff have shown over the last year in keeping the University's core business running. It does not contain any consideration around workload, burn out, leave or any mechanisms to which Management can seek to address some of those concerns as a counterbalance to the financial ask of the zero percent increase. It does not say it directly, but it contains a clear implication that if the labour unions are not willing to agree to a zero percent increase on an envelope to envelope staffing costs, there will be retrenchments or the consideration of retrenchments as a strategy to contain staffing costs.

Kelley indicated that in her personal view, the document is tone deaf given the very difficult year that the Union has had. Also considers that it is unfortunate that Management has not taken this opportunity to provide any creative proposals as a starting point for discussions on what could be done to try and manage academic workloads, to create a space in a calendar that is virtually unworkable from a research productive point of view but also attempting ways to try and stimulate academics' productivity rather than to address this purely from a financial bottom line perspective.

The Bargaining and the AU Executive Committees request the views and input from members on how to take this forward.

The Bargaining committee has come up with a creative set of possible non-salary demands that we can use as counter point to the ask of Management.

In the view of the Bargaining committee, non-salary demands have enjoyed less attention over the last few years and hope to see these more coupled with this negotiations of the wage agreement to see how some space can be created within the agreement to ensure that certain of the non-salary demands are addressed.

The proposed non-salary demands can be circulated to members after the AU has received feedback from members on other suggestions you may have. Some of these centre around managing workload, suggestions to try and create space for members to get back to research, for clear guidelines for taking leave, etc; the issue of Discovery Health because we have heard members' concerns around this.

The Bargaining committee propose to circulate these non-salary demands as a POLL to see which of these receive the most support from members. The preference of the Bargaining committee would be to go with a smaller list of clear demands that the AU can use to seek Management's agreement on.

Concerns, questions and views from members on salary negotiations and on Management's position paper:

Question from a member:

This is to thank everybody for their incredibly hard work and in relation to the position paper, I agree that it does not have anything creative in it. The other concern I have is that there is not clarity either on what types of multi-pronged approaches are going to be taken towards this. If we know there is going to be generalised under-funding from the government, what are the VCs in combination doing to address that? We have asked this question several times and there never seem to be a direct reply. Secondly, the other thing which is not clearly articulated in that paper is where they are talking about staffing costs, does that include management's or is it only academic and support staff? It is not clear what is defined there as staff salaries. That would be important for us to know because if we are all expected to tighten our belts and put in more hours, then surely the same applies to everybody who is working at the University?

Response by Kelley:

Yes. This has been raised in the forum that we opened already, and we will certainly go back and ask Management for a statement on whether senior management are also committing to a zero percent increase. We do have some data which we are busy interrogating on the growth in certain sectors of Management and the administrative space, senior managers, PC13PG5. We have done some analysis within our committee which shows that this group since 2010 has grown from 35 people to 50, which is obviously a clear burden on staffing. The bargaining committee had already planned to ask for more information on that particular concern, which we will circulate amongst our members.

Questions by a member:

I have two questions. If Management cannot pay the salary increase, can they pay us in time? In other words, to free up some time for academics to flex their consulting muscle to make up that increase in private consulting. My other question is what is happening at similar type institutions? What is the salary increases for example, at WITS, Stellenbosch and the University of Pretoria and how is UCT is looking compared to those institutions? Also, a thank you to all your hard work.

Response by Kelley:

We do not know what is happening at other institutions. Our executive is in the process of reaching out to the contacts that we have at institutions that do have staff unions but also into the sector more generally and we will also report back on that.

The VC and the Finance department have indicated to us in our negotiations that UCT is better off than some other institutions in that we do have the available cash reserves to weather the shocks that have come to us. Their argument is that this is due to UCT's fiscally responsible Council-approved finance policy that makes sure that we have reserves on hand to be able to carry the University for a period of time, even if there is no income forthcoming. In our view, the issue is that although Management says that the staffing budget needs to be increased by zero percent, this is not because UCT is bankrupt. In fact, UCT will in fact still be banking some budget surplus at the end of the year even with a disastrous budget. It is true that it will be banking quite a bit less than what it had anticipated in its budget. We are also concerned that this is another year that Management has come to staff with the same conversation around a financial crisis, yet, the University is in a satisfactory financial position. This is an important consideration in how the Bargaining committee will frame its response to Management's position paper.

Question by a member:

Request clarity on the issue of freeing up consulting time as it unclear whether UCT actually polices staff's time. I do not fully understand what the suggestion is because if our deliverables remain the same, UCT can say whatever it wants about time, because all that really matters is that we have to deliver—when we keep our managers happy when we are evaluated and for some people getting ready for ad-hominem promotion.

Clarification by previous member:

If UCT is unable to give staff an increase, it is notionally stipulated that we are supposed to work 40 hours a week. I know it is not defined but that is a notionally --which is 8 or 9 hours a day. If they cannot give us an increase, we can negotiate that we would work from 08h00 until 15h00 a day and that we have the authorization to generate supplementary income privately. If they do not have the cash, which is what they are implying, then the other currency is time. How you would use that time, is up to each individual. For instance, some people could choose to gun for ad-hominem, if that is their objective. I know there are members of staff whose expenses will increase in 2021, like school fees, etc. Ad-hominem is less of a short-term objective than supplementing their income by

applying their minds in the private sector. And as long as Management understand that this might be happening in 2021 then your KPI should be adjusted accordingly.

Responses by members in the MS Teams Chat section:

- Good idea regarding time for consultation work. It should also be made easier to use industry funds, that allow it, to be used for salary contributions, i.e. remove UCT red tape
- I still don't understand how UCT can plan for profit in 2021
- If the workload is not reduced, then the time will not be free. The only way to reduce the workload on academics is to provide replacement teaching resources. This does not seem likely.
- The capacity to consult is fine for those who can consult, for those who can't what is the suggestion? The workloads will not reduce and the only way to free up work will be to dump work onto other staff members? How do we address lack of time/need to consult that benefits all academic staff?

Question by a member:

There are a lot of comments in the forum that you opened in Vula, Kelley and we won't be able to go through it all in our meeting and was wondering if you could at some stage summarise those because some of those are very interesting. These range from medical aid costs to parking issues and all sorts of things. I would encourage members to have a look at that and make comments there. It is not difficult to make comments and if these could be presented to us at some stage and see how people are going to design responses, it would be useful.

Recommendation by a member:

Two things I want to raise as I went through the comments that I could manage yesterday evening. With regards to parking, if we are not using the parking, why are they charging us for it? I also want to inform the AU and the members that on behalf of the EBE Faculty as Acting Dean at the moment, I have requested that there is a standard rollover of leave without motivation. I put that through to Management and I think HR is considering having a meeting with me, which I am happy to have. But I think the AU needs to be informed about this that EBE is doing that and obviously other Faculties may or not choose to follow suit. They may not be able to do a blanket rollover of all our leave. I have taken 1 or 2 days today and they may not be able to do that and give me another 20 days next year. But we can then negotiate for a cap and I would settle for nothing less than 10 days.

Response by Kelley:

The AU in our consultative forum has been engaging HR on the question of leave and leave rollover. It seems completely outrageous that in a context of a year in which there has been no time to take leave and in another one that comes shortly after in which it seems to be even less time to take leave that we should lose leave days. Certainly, the Basic Conditions of Employment Act, as I understand it, allows for a carryover of a certain amount of leave. We are engaging HR, but the rollover of leave would also be one of the things we hopefully demand in our non-salary demands, as long as members support it. I think there does need to be a better framework for managing how that happens. We have had so many line managers write to us to say, 'It's not that I do not want to give my staff leave but simply there appears to be no place for a mechanism through which I am able to do so.' It is good to hear that you as Acting Dean of EBE, are pushing forward on that and we, the AU can definitely follow up strongly on that issue.

In terms of the parking, my understanding is that Management is not charging us for parking anymore. This is obviously a plus and a minus in that when we are not paying for parking there is also a gap in the University's budget where all our parking fees used to go. If members are being charged for parking, that is certainly something we need to hear about but to my understanding, that has already been done away, certainly for this year.

It is useful to note Shane Godfrey's comment in the Chat around the policy of private work. Kelley indicated to the meeting that she is concerned about this. If we start pushing back in that way around working hours and workload, we do open ourselves to being policed in a way I think academics, at this point, are not policed. I would not like ourselves to move towards a time and attendance system where we have to account for every minute of the day and then that has to be policed by those amongst us who are HoDs or section Heads. There is certainly a risk in pressing too hard on that, although I think the considerations around managing work time are important.

Response by Shane Godfrey, a member on the AU Bargaining committee in the MS Teams Chat:

UCT has a policy re. private work. I think their response would be that if you can find time to do consulting work there is nothing stopping you. The problem with the proposal is that a broad argument we are making is that academics are overstretched and overloaded. It will therefore be difficult to argue that time should be carved out for consulting work.

Feedback from a member in the MS Team Chat:

Could the frequency of sabbatical leave be reconsidered/restructured under COVID teaching conditions?

In terms of the above comment, Kelley requested feedback from the member, but as the member had some technical issues, this is what was conveyed in the MS Team Chat:

That compensation could be framed in something other than financially. Rethinking the frequency of Sabbatical can help us regain time lost with for research with the additional loads as a result of online teaching.

Kelley enquired from members in the meeting if they were supportive of a 0% increase and the majority of those who responded in the Chat indicated they were not.

Views from a member:

There are multi challenges reading through the document. The first challenge is that we obviously cannot push back with regards to renegotiate it. If they come with a formal position, we cannot say, "No, sorry. We are not going to renegotiate it." That is difficult already and because they are renegotiating on financial terms only, also makes it very complicated. I think what I would suggest, to really think through who the negotiation partners are because my concern when I read a paper like this, it means that the people who have written the statement do not really understand what we do. And this is very often the case at UCT because a lot of people are not academics and so the intricacies of our job is not always clearly understood.

I know it is not an easy task, but I would also like members to express their opinion on who we negotiate with because the way the document sounded, it did not come from Lis, who is in actual fact our direct Manager. It comes from Finance and that for me is a real issue. We should not allow to be negotiating with by the Finance department and I think that would be a very strong statement from members because it is a first step to actually push back to Management and say: "If we are talking with anyone as a negotiations team, we need to talk with the people who are actually our line managers and actually support us and understand us in our work and to whom we are responsible. We are not responsible to the Chair of Finance; we are not responsible to the Remunerations Committee." We account to the DVC Lange, as far as I understand it and that is the person with whom we should be negotiating with.

There is the first line to be drawn because we will sit in a very different position, because there will also be a great understanding of what sustainability means and that it is not a zero-sum game.

Zero percent for me, is also a huge pressure because what they are currently saying is that it is a game that has been played so many years. This notion where you are making the students pay for your salary because that

means we need to increase the student fees because that will be the next argument. That will be in the next meeting. There you academics are, and you are making the students increase their fees.

What if you do not give anybody an increase and I think that is where things start getting messy and I think that is why this is a real plea for members to really support that we are not going to negotiate with Finance but that we have to negotiate with the people who are our line managers. I know it may not be clear why this is such a big difference but having been on the other side of the negotiation, it makes a profound difference with who you are negotiating.

Response by Kelley:

Kelley informed the meeting that this is a real critical point and it was one where the AU was surprised to see when they showed up at the meeting of the 5 November to find that they were negotiating with Barbara Mapara who is the Director of Employees Relations as the chief negotiator on behalf of the University. The AU immediately raised a concern that they have always negotiated with the DVC for Teaching & Learning. Management's position is that Barbara is the chief negotiator on behalf of the management team who have members from the VC's office, from the Finance office that Lis Lange is also there and that the AU should not feel that we are only negotiating with Barbara but with the team.

Kelley indicated that the flaw in that logic is patently clear when one views the framing of the position document that has emerged.

Kelley informed the meeting that this is a critical point they will raise.

Responses and input by members in the MS Teams Chat section:

- Agreed - having some access to managing one's own time is one of the last few remaining old-school academic perks.
- In an environment when many people are losing their jobs and the government is calling for a zero increase in public service salaries, it seems unrealistic for us to demand increases. I do accept, however, that there may be other ways of rewarding academics.
- Many people in government did not work many months
- Academics worked x10 during all levels of lockdown
- No. I think UCT treats us as workers not assets. I am particularly concerned about staff mental health. The likelihood of burn out is increasing everyday but there is very little support and follow through
- Agreed - negotiate with our "line manager"
- Strongly support point. negotiate with DVC, not with finance or staffing
- I support point re. negotiation. Don't support 0%
- Not supportive of 0% Support that we should be negotiating with line-managers and they need to hear our concerns
- Academic staff seems to be at the brunt of everything at UCT. I do not support a 0% increase considering what we've been exposed to during the pandemic.

Views from a member:

I find it absolutely insulting and I am not in support of a zero percent increase and I would be surprised that anyone would be. All of our expenses would be going up next year and we are all tired, we are all exhausted. We are not able to take leave because we are all managing to try and cover each other in our departments where one person might be overburdened. It is almost impossible to take leave because I feel I am letting colleagues down and the University relies on that kind of loyalty. I think people put forward creative solutions but we have been in this position year after year where they just come with a financial document and view us as just numbers and their only sort of response to mental health is to tell us there is a helpline as if people are going to call that. It is just pure insulting and I would take a much harder line on this. I just feel like we cave in year after year. That is

my personal views. And thanks for all the hard work. This has never been easy. Year after year, you guys have had to go and bat for us and I am really grateful to be a member of the AU.

Comment from a member:

Feel we are heading for another three years of this and zero sucks and negative sucks but just to say that we are in a global crisis and if the South Africa economy dies; if CPI between 2021 and 2022 is minus 20, we might be looking at negative increases. We have an agreement tied to CPI which is supposed to consider these changes and CPI year is lower than last year but it's not negative and it's not zero. There is a lot of focus on zero and feel can we get to 2022 we do have to take cuts because that's where the economy goes, but I do not think we are there yet.

Response by Kelley:

The Negotiations team's position has been and is still that UCT is not showing us the justification why staff need to bear the brunt of the shocks in the system. It is interesting to us that one of the justifications in the position document is that residences as an operation, have lost a significant amount of money when two years previously when residences were making a profit, our Union argued that profit should be used to cross-subsidize to take us to the 75th percentile, the argument was made in the opposite direction. In other words, that residences operated, as does the research endeavour, as 3 separate 'silos' in the University's finances and therefore one could not borrow from one to the other. Yet, the opposite argument is being made now.

The other part of our argument is that our increases are tied to inflation [and so self-adjust according to the financial environment]. There may be other ways for us to create an envelope to envelope zero percent increase as opposed to each person's salary. There may be ways, for example, to forgo applying for exceeds and merit awards, which are around R20m per year of the budget. If our members chose to pause eligibility for these kinds of awards for a year that might be a creative way proposing to Management to counteract a zero percent increase.

Kelley indicated that it would be helpful if members could propose other strategies like these. A member enquired in the Chat would this mean be a freezing of posts. Informally, in the presentations, that it is another strategy that Finance has proposed. If you wish to keep your staffing bottom line, they said, you could select certain posts that you would freeze or a percentage for Faculty.

A personal concern is that we know from the Early Incentivised Retirement and Voluntary Separation that happened in 2016 work just cascaded onto other people. There does not seem to be a point at which we try to reclaim some of that capacity, and this is a problem.

As Shane wrote in the Chat, there does not appear to be a balance between the HR and the Finance side. Think that this is a really important consideration and in the Bargaining committee's response, aim to raise this and see if that balance can be restored, but it will be hard.

Response by Shane Godfrey, a member on the AU Bargaining committee in the MS Teams Chat:

We were told when they employed a COO that he/she would negotiate with the AU and would bring the finance and HR legs together, hopefully relatively balanced. But now they have not stuck to that. The problem is that whoever sits on that side of the table, their position is rooted in what the finance team tell them. It will be interesting to see how Lis Lange positions herself, particularly when we table the non-salary demands, which are directed at workload, leave, teaching, extra admin, etc.

Responses and input by members in the MS Teams Chat section:

- That compensation could be framed in something other than financially. Rethinking the frequency of sabbatical can help us regain time lost with for research with the additional loads as a result of online teaching.
- Sabbatical leave also puts extra burden on staff not on sabbatical leave at that time

- Agreed. Not supportive of 0% increase. Extra leave would be nice, but it's hard to take the full allocation as it is, so it might be an empty reward.
- I also find the "take leave, look after yourself, here is psych support" is not grounded in the reality of the academic working life.
- I don't support 0%. Attempts are made to 'guilt' us into 0%. I feel that we are made to feel selfish because our stance will "affect" other sectors/persons negatively. Also, after the year we've had, the lack of appreciation is quite apparent. A thank you email only goes so far.
- Why zero? Why not something less than the policy? But why zero?
- The economy is not facing deflation.
- I wonder whether there are other, more creative solutions around staff costs that are not either no increase or retrenchments. They may not be entirely brilliant, but might be a better option eg moratorium on filling vacant positions for 6 months or a year to increase churn, voluntary move into pt for senior staff to speed up transformation etc
- Would it strengthen the negotiations to negotiate collectively with other unions? Increases in salaries for some staff should not come at the cost of other staff - this fractures staff coherence and concerns and promotes a divide and conquer amongst staff.
- The fact that no increase, as some token of appreciation for pulling the university through the global crisis (and very well so), speaks volumes.

Responses and input by members in the MS Teams Chat section:

- Sounds like the bloated administration needs to freeze posts
- The problem is the 2/3 GOB salary are not in the faculty - 1/3 or so are academics. The AU and EU face different issues. AU are doubling up on working hours while a large number of administrators (no academic facing) and support services were effectively at home. So, treating the academics in the same boat as everyone else is precisely what management want.
- For that reason, I'm anti-freezing posts.
In terms of preserving the "academic project" (presumably their major concern), if there are too few of us it will affect the quality of teaching, supervision, research, etc.
- Academics have been subsidising UCT via many, many hours of unpaid overtime. If management wants 0%, then overtime should be paid
- My opinion is that management (by what they say and do) seem more concerned with political issues and ameliorating those types of issues rather than really being focused on the business requirements of the academic project faced by academics on the front line.
- But how to keep track and avoid the time sheet scenario?
- I agree that there are many things that are very different, but also things - like being able to support our families - that are the same. Kelley's comment about sharing information is important. There are also PASS staff who have picked up huge additional work burdens - so my point is that where it makes sense for us to share information and concerns to empower better conditions for all staff we should do so otherwise the continued outsourcing of work at all levels, the reduction of benefits etc. can continue unabated.
- If academics kept an accurate timesheet it would reveal the real situation!
- I'm anti-timesheet. We spend time thinking when not at our desks. I often get ideas in terms of my lectures, research and supervision after hours or at weekends. That Eureka moment isn't always 9-5?!
- Surely retrenchments are not a realistic threat for academics? They need us to do the work.
- So given the current situation, what do the AU members think a 'fair' percentage increase would be

Response by Kelley:

In terms of negotiating together, Management sought to negotiate together with the Coalition Union in the PC01 to PC06 space, the EU in the PC06 to PC12 space and with the AU. The AU vigorously resisted this because in part because as constituencies, there are some areas where our interests align but in others, what the AU does differs from those in other staffing groups. The AU decided to adhere to its current negotiation framework so that we

could specifically negotiate on our members behalf. We do maintain communications with the other Unions as there is a lot of information that flows between the three spaces and certainly closely between ourselves and the EU to ensure that one of us is not accepting an increase when others are not and therefore creating a vulnerability for us.

Query from a member:

What are your next steps? Will you respond now with a written document? Will you send this to us beforehand?

Response from Kelley:

The Bargaining committee had a meeting this morning and will draft a response to Management by next Friday, 27 November and intend to circulate it to members. The intention is to circulate the proposed non-salary demands within the next day and these constitute what was taken from the forums opened on Vula and also based on the many discussions that the AU has had over the past 6 months. These demands have been grouped under a set of HR focussed concerns that can balance the finance view to hopefully bring HR and humanity back onto the table. We will open a POLL where each cluster of non-salary items will be listed so members can vote to support or to rank their top three demands. The Bargaining committee is still attempting to look at the specific ordering of these proposed non-salary demands which would best represent what our members would like the committee to put their energies behind.

There is a turn-around time of 5 days so the Bargaining committee agreed in principle with Management, that after the representations are made, there would be a period of 5 days for each side to consult on the proposals. Envisage that the next meeting would be during the beginning of December or when the Bargaining committee would receive a counter proposal from Management in response to the AU's submission.

The AU Bargaining committee is concerned about the tight time frames for implementation and indicated that one of the issues we as members need to agree in principle on is whether we would hold off on an implementation date of 01/01 if there is not an agreement. This would be in recognition that negotiations take time over Zoom. The AU's concern is that in an enormously difficult year, they do not want to be in June 2021 without a salary agreement in place.

The Bargaining committee is working hard to ensure an agreement occurs soon.

Once the AU receive a set of dates to meet with Management these will be communicated to members, but at this stage no dates were provided. Aware that the next EU meeting with Management is scheduled for 27 November.

Kelley thanked members for the feedback in the MS Teams Chat and indicated that the AU would go through these and include these in the Vula forums so there can be some engagement with the ideas there.

Kelley assured members that the AU definitely read the posts in the Vula forums and will include these as quotations to use as members' voice to Management.

5. Election of the new Executive Committee for 2020-2021

Kelley informed the meeting that the current Executive committee members have made themselves available to serve another year and indicated that the AU also co-opt members to serve on either the Executive, the Bargaining or the Grievance Committees. If members wish to avail themselves for the above-mentioned committees, they can contact Shirifa.

Name	Position	Faculty	Years/ months serving on AU	Standing for Re-election
Kelley Moulton	President	Law	6	Yes
Tim Low	Vice- President	CHED	6	Yes
Mark Massyn	Treasurer	EBE	5	Yes
Nico Fischer	Elected	EBE	5	Yes
Andrew Lilley	Elected	Humanities	5	Yes
Christine Swart	Elected	Science	6	Yes
Shaheen Mowla	Elected	Health Sciences	3	Yes
Tim Gebbie	Elected	Science	2	Yes
Maureen Tanner	Elected	Commerce	22 months	Yes
Sahal Yacoob	Elected	Science	18 months	Yes

Ulrike Rivett approved those members standing for re-election and this was seconded by Pippin Anderson, Suki Goodman and Ana Deumert.

Kelley acknowledged and thanked Shirifa Hellaby, the Union organizer for keeping us all on track, on time, ensuring that all the committee reports are in and that the AU Executive all know what is expected of them. Shirifa's support to members, the AU and her as President is very much appreciated and absolutely valued.

Kelley also thanked all the members of the AU Executive for their service during the last year and acknowledge that this year has been difficult for them, with managing their own workloads, their home schooling, their children and all of their other concerns. Kelley conveyed her appreciation for what each one of them do in their own areas of interest but also in support of her efforts as President and for everything they have done during this year and for their willingness to continue for another year.

Kelley encouraged members to engage with the AU in person or in the forums.

6. Draft 2019 Audited Statement

A copy of the draft 2019 audited financial statement produced by Nolands (Mowbray branch) was circulated to members via email

7. Closure

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 14h00