This chapter explores transformation at UCT. It does this through briefly reviewing the changing demographic profile of academic staff, exploring how academics perceive the university as a workplace (in terms of their experiences of race, gender, class, and power), highlighting policy imperatives, reviewing transformation initiatives, and providing an evaluation of the overall transformation at UCT.

**Statistical review**

Over the last 25 years, the profile of UCT’s academics has changed dramatically, as the university has employed increasing numbers of both women and black academics. However, when the statistics are compared, change still appears to be fairly minimal. In 1983, white academics accounted for 96 percent of all academics, in 2003, they accounted for 79 percent, reflecting a change of 17 percent over 20 years. The number of men academics has dropped from 82 percent to 72 percent over the same period, reflecting only a 10 percent increase in the number of women academics over the last 20 years. Graphs 3 and 4 below illustrate changes in the academic profile between 1983 and 1995, and between 2000 and 2004.

Although overly exaggerated on the graph, the post-apartheid period has clearly seen the greatest change in the racial profile of academics. Between 1985 and 1990, the percentage of black academics grew by two percent, and between 1990 and 1995 the growth rate was still two percent. Between 1995 and 2000, the percentage of black academics increased by eight percent, however between 2000 and 2004, this had levelled off a bit, with the percentage increase dropping to five percent. This increase between 1995 and 2000 may be attributed to what Gibbon and Kabaki (2002) describe as some of the “most aggressive strategies” to the changing of historically white institutions’ employment patterns (Gibbon and Kabaki, 2002: 209). However, the post 2000 slump is a little disconcerting and the institution should reflect on what may account for this.

In terms of gender, the percentage increase of women has been less than that of black academics in each phase. Between 1985 and 1990, women academics increased by just under two percent; between 1990 and 1995, the proportion of women remained fairly static, with a large increase in 1995, which brought the period increase up to just under 1.5 percent; and between 1995 and 2000, the proportion of women appears to have remained static with negligible increase. However, between 2000 and 2003, the percentage of women academics had already increased by two full percentage points and it seems to still be rising. See graph 4 below for more details.

(Graph 4: UCT academics by gender 1983 - 2004)

This illustrates that between 1995 and 2000, most of the academic profile change is due to the increase in black academics, whilst between 2000 and 2005, although black academics still account for the majority of the changing profile, the percentage of women have also increased considerably – the highest percentage increase over the whole 20 years. This may also require investigation by the institution, as whilst an increasing percentage of women academics is positive, it may be problematic if women are being employed rather than black academics (particularly, if white women account for the majority of the women category).

**Contemporary profile of UCT academics**

The contemporary profile of UCT academics will now be examined in greater detail to reflect on the actual positioning of black and women academics within the institution⁷. The table below illustrates the number of academic staff on both the permanent staff and on three-year (T3) contracts.

**Table 11: UCT academics by gender, race, and academic rank in 2004.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(University of Cape Town, 2004a: 13).

Amongst all permanent and T3 contract academics, just under 20 percent are black; with African staff amounting to 7.2 percent, Coloured staff 7.5 percent, and Indian staff 4.8 percent. Women academics account for 34.4 percent, with the remaining 65.6 percent being men. Furthermore, the racial breakdown of women is: 80.2 percent are White, 4.3 percent are African, 10.5 percent are Coloured, and 5.1 percent are Indian. The breakdown for men is: 80.6 percent are White, 8.8 percent are African, 5.9 percent are Coloured, and 4.7 percent are Indian. Furthermore, Black men academics almost double
black women academics, whilst African men make up the greatest proportion of black men academics, and Coloured women make up the greatest proportion of black women.

Over the past four years, the proportion of senior academics has been growing (University of Cape Town, 2004b: 43). In 2004, the entire permanent and T3 contract staff was comprised of 30 percent senior lecturers, 23 percent associate professors, and 24 percent professors; whilst junior staff only accounted for 23 percent. However, there is significant differentiation in race and gender composition between senior and junior levels, as only 14 percent of all senior academics are black and 28 percent of senior staff are women.

The profile of professors is particularly interesting, as ten percent of professors are black and 11 percent of professors are women, whilst 20 percent of women professors are black and 13 percent of men professors are black. Clearly, the very top of the academic hierarchy is a glass ceiling for women academics, although interestingly black women professors and white women professors both account for just under eight percent of black academics and white academics respectively. However, black men professors account for a substantially less proportion of men professors (13 percent) and also account for 14 percent of black academics, whilst white professors account for 35 percent of all men professors and a massive 89 percent of all professors.

The race and gender composition of junior academics is also particularly interesting, and is somewhat of an inversion of the race and gender profile of senior academics. At junior levels (associate lecturer and lecturer), women account for 55 percent whilst men account for 45 percent. In addition, 56 percent of black women are in a junior position, compared to 32 percent of white women, 39 percent of black men, and ten percent of white men.

The discussion will now focus on academic staff’s perceptions and experiences of the institution, before examining and evaluating institutional transformation.
Academics’ attitudes, perceptions, and experiences of the institution:

On the whole, the institution was experienced as positive and negative simultaneously. Positive experiences were mainly associated with the pride of working in a ‘world class’ institution, or for the ‘best’ department or faculty in the country, and because of the large number of rated scientists based at UCT. The ‘protestant work ethic’ was felt to pervade the institution and to ensure the maintenance of high standards amongst both staff and students. It was institutional achievements such as these that secured staff loyalty and commitment. Furthermore, the geographical location of UCT was also seen as a benefit, largely characterised as the ‘table mountain advantage’. However, significant criticism was levelled against both structural elements and the institutional culture. The valuing of staff, arrangements of power, and procedural inequities were key areas that can be described as having a negative effect on academics’ perception and experience of the institution.

Poor labour practice, institutional racism and sexism, rigid enforcement of hierarchy, and unclear relations of power were seen to fragment the workforce and to be institutionally divisive.

Labour practice:

The institution’s labour practice was heavily criticised: inequity in remuneration, the casualisation of academic labour, and issues of contractual ambiguity were of particular concern. Historically, the institution has been characterised by the racialised and gendered segmentation of labour as evinced by inequities in remuneration, promotion, and academic rank. Women and black academics gave examples of its continuation into the early nineties, for example:

I was on contract being paid R 3 000 a month and I chatted to a white man who was also on contract and he was being paid double what I was being paid (i21UCT:CW:H).

Another participant described earning less than her male colleagues despite the fact that she had a PhD and they only had masters degrees:
I was at the bottom of that rank despite being way more qualified than three fifths of them…and I felt like it was because I am youngish, I came in via a contract and because I am a woman (i19UCT:WW:S).

The institution responded to these two cases differently. In the former, action was taken and the situation was ameliorated through back-pay, whilst in the latter, concrete proof was withheld from the participant preventing any further action. Therefore, participants have also experienced inequity in grievance procedures through being denied crucial information and through not being aided by their human resources representatives.

The introduction of the ‘rate for job scheme’ was an attempt by the institution to remove inequity in remuneration, and participants such as the two above expressed satisfaction with this action which removed inequality from within their departments and made their salaries market-competitive, for example:

I was close to R50 000 off the salary for the medium, I was R6 000 off the minimum across the year, so they were paying me R500 more than the bare minimum they had to pay me…then we got ‘rate for job’…our pay got transformed from the 25th quartile of academic salaries in South Africa to the 75th (i19UCT:WW:S).

Whilst this indicates that junior staff salaries, in particular, had previously been low, it is crucial to note that both black and women academics appear to have been the one’s who experienced these inequities. Furthermore, it was not something academics had expected from an institution of UCT’s standing.

The second issue relating to labour practice is the growing casualisation of academic labour, whereby staff were employed on successive contractual basis with little benefits and security. An examination of institutional statistics reveal the extent of casualisation of academic labour. In 2004, there were 135 academics employed as tutors; 234 on one-year contracts, 91 on two-year contracts, and approximately 60 on three-year contracts (University of Cape Town, 2004a: 13). Together these staff accounted for 42.7 percent of all academic staff. Even without the T3 contracts, temporary staff accounted for 37.8 percent of all staff. In addition, 25 percent of these posts were held by black academics and 45 percent were held by women academics. Whilst these proportions are a little
higher than further up the academic hierarchy, the proportion of black academics is still low.

Participants felt that contract work itself was entangled with racialised and gendered meanings. For example, a participant expressed discontentment with the difference in qualifications between permanent and contract staff in his faculty (EBE). He discussed how most of the contract staff who were black and women had PhDs, whilst many of the permanent white male staff had only a masters degree. Another participant concurred,

At the end of eight years, I’m still on contract. I have a PhD and an MBA, most of the white guys in our department do not have their PhDs…they’re straight out of masters and they’re appointed on permanent staff (i17UCT:IM:EBE)

Another participant experienced perpetual contract work, “I’ve been at UCT for over 20 years and 16 of those were on short-term contracts…I think its also a sign of how they viewed the work I was in” (i15UCT:WW:CHED);

Although this was not an issue that was raised at Wits, many UCT academics were concerned about the growing trend towards casualisation and the tenuous position contract staff find themselves in:

There are professional tutors who have very insecure conditions because they’re on year-on, year-off contracts, they have no medical aid, no pension benefits, they don’t have right to sabbatical leave…they’re in dead end jobs that aren’t going anywhere (i14UCT:WW:H).

Whilst this is a reflection of the changing nature of academic work, compounded by financially-induced restructuring, it is crucial to note the way in which contract work appears to affect black and women academics in particular – illustrating the continuities of the apartheid workplace regime in higher education. This is aptly captured by a participant who is exasperated because “this is academic apartheid!” (i17UCT:IM:EBE).

The third issue of concern was contractual ambiguity. Participants who have significant contact with new staff were alarmed by the extent to which contractual ambiguity exists, with new staff not being clear on what basis and with what degree of permanency they are employed. For example,
[they questioned] the nature of their contract, some people understood themselves to be on permanent positions and found they weren’t…other’s didn’t understand why they were getting these benefits and not these, so what became apparent was that a significant amount of these people didn’t have a clue about their status in this institution, which was an alarming set of signals, both on the part of the institution...and people’s sense [or relative lack] of agency (i17UCT:WW:CHED).

As mentioned above, this reflects an inadequacy on the part of the institution to ensure that job descriptions and conditions of employment are fully known by its employees. Furthermore, it indicates a sense of exclusion whereby black and women academics were deprived of crucial information, did not know what the appropriate channels were to find out this information and perhaps, did not have anyone in their immediate surroundings that they felt comfortable enough with to raise these concerns.

Whilst most discussion centred on academic labour, it is also of significance to raise participants’ concerns over the maltreatment of those workers whose jobs had become outsourced through restructuring. Supercare (cleaning) and Kagiso-Khulani (catering) workers were the most cited examples. In the case of Supercare, a participant noted that with the change in employer came a change in the demographics of employees: previously, coloured women predominated and now mostly Xhosa women were employed. This is of significance, as it illustrates a change in the racial division of labour, where African women predominate the bottom ‘non-core’ positions in the post-apartheid era. Academics also expressed concern over the way the institution had handled this situation, and also the inability of the UCT community to adequately respond in solidarity with these workers (apart from the recent student movement).

This section has illustrated how labour practices have and continue to segment both the academic and the university’s labour forces, and how these changes continue to be entangled with racialised and gendered meaning. The ‘rate for job’ is an example of redress in terms of unequal remuneration, however the issues of casual labour, contractual ambiguity, and outsourced work illustrate a continuity of inequity that firmly reinstates questions of race and gender into institutional functioning.
Participants did not engage much with the idea of an overriding institutional ideology. However, in official representations, and discussions about students, seminars, and food, the idea that UCT was aiming to be a multi-cultural institution firmly arose. Furthermore, UCT also propagates itself as being a ‘World-class African’ institution. However, despite aiming to create a space in which people of varying racialised, gendered, and cultural experiences could feel safe, at home, and free to develop; participants described UCT as continuing to be a liberal institution where race, gender, class, and culture created differential perceptions and experiences of the institution.

**Race and institutional racism:**

Participants explained how race held significant salience within the institution, particularly at the level of academic staff. The majority of staff (of varying racialised experiences) engaged with how race continued to be a means of stratification maintained through assumptions, double standards, procedural irregularities and maltreatment of black academics within the institution.

Participants’ understanding of the institution was dependent on a variety of elements, two of the most common being: interaction with fellow academics and the overriding institutional culture – both of which were seen to be predominantly white and male. The institution, as a whole, was still fractured in terms of its understanding of race, reflecting a continuity of bipolar opposites whereby staff spoke of assumptions of black inferiority and white superiority, eurocentrism and afropessimism, and equity and excellence.

For example, a participant described the institution,

> if you really wanted me to sum UCT up, I would have to say it’s the bastion of the DA…and everything that that implies, so a…direction towards London, or Harvard…as the centre of all that is good in the intellectual world, a complete eschewing of the African experience, the notion that Africa is a basket case, some sort of sense of we, the we being us who are not black or if we are black we are part of the project, we are holding the whole thing together and keeping up the standards, that is never said but I think that that is a subtext that I find profoundly disturbing (i14UCT:WW:H).

The above quote explains how not only is there an endemic assumption of black deficiency but there is also the conflation of white and excellent, and an idea that the
‘white’ institution itself must continue to be the pillars of excellence within the country. This appears to be a key mechanism through which white academics justify their own inaction or resistance with regard to race-based change. Furthermore, the participant notes the expectation (and to some degree, a realisation) of assimilation of black academics, some of whom may have come to understand themselves as somewhat of an exception.

The following quote also illustrates how the institution posits equity and excellence as oppositional:

It is difficult to get the right type, in terms of manpower, it is difficult to transform quickly because you need to have the right calibre of people...it is not easy to attract world-class staff if you are only going to be looking into the African population because the world-class physicist...might be a German...so for you to be the best physics provider in the continent you must get that German...so as far as we’re concerned we’re interested in getting those types of people, other than trying to get a certain group of people, in order to show the government that we are transforming (i22UCT:AM:EBE).

Whilst there are clearly practical tensions for a country is building up its own manpower, assumptions that excellence must come from elsewhere serve to reinforce the idea of black and African as deficient and will impact on the institution’s informal employment procedures.

In general, black academics felt that the institution failed to understand transformation as an asset, and to see the potential and contribution of black staff and students. For example,

...to stop looking at them as disadvantaged and start looking at the potential assets that they may have to bring to our institutions...they [black students] have the biggest asset of all, a future in this country, now, that’s an enormous advantage and any teacher should be delighted to think and thrilled with what that means and how you might set about activating that potential...there are disadvantages, but I think that’s all that we’re seeing at the moment [and]...there is not enough effective support (i09UCT:CW:H).

In regard to employment, a coloured woman academic explained how white academics failed to think ‘outside the box’, seeking to employ black people because of narrow, short-term conceptions that transformation is only about demographic change. In this case, the bulk of (white) academics appeared to be in policy-compliance mode without having seriously thought through the transformation process, she explained:
everybody was very surprised that I voted for this [white] man and I was so shocked because I was absolutely clear...[transformation] is about the balance of race and gender but there is also a point at which you have to ask yourself, is it just about the person’s skin colour or you know his or her history or is it about his or her political practice. And you know I would rather appoint a white person whose political practice is good because you know that person is going to grow other black people, not just one…but several, and...I’m kind of looking at it holistically and in a long term perspective you know, so that was the way in which I evaluated those candidates (i21UCT:CW:H).

Black academics also felt that white people resisted change because of its perceived impact on themselves and their children, for example:

many of our white staff are concerned that their children will not get into UCT because of affirmative action policies for black students...they are concerned that their sons won’t have employment prospects in the current dispensation and with the designated groupings and these are genuine worries and I don’t think that you can just discard them...although black staff will say that there have been years of privilege...but you can’t discard those kind of fears, you have to work with them (i07UCT:IW:OTR).

Another black academic explained the difference in attitude between white and black academics as:

we’re at a point of entry and they are in the point of retirement, or they feel defeated by the change that’s occurred...you hear a lot...about what has been quoted as the ‘endangered white man on campus’, but there are still a vast majority with most of the power (i09UCT:CW:H).

Whilst there is a lot of frustration with how the institution perceives of change (expressed mainly by black academics and white women academics) there is also a degree of understanding of white men academics’ perspective, despite disagreeing with it. This illustrates that black academics have had more engagement with transformation and are able to understand it from a variety of perspectives, whereas there is indication that white men academics react to transformation only from a personal, individual basis.

White participants also criticised the common understanding of racism as an individual characteristic not an institutional feature, and how this prevented the institution from adequately taking responsibility for the past or the present – thereby preventing change.

the assumption is that individuals may or may not be racist but there’s very little acknowledgement that institutions themselves were constructed in very racialised ways and that that needs addressing, quite consciously and dismantling quite consciously (i14UCT:WW:H).

She continued, explaining the reaction of white senior academics to a transformation seminar:
senior members of our faculty and others like myself went to it and I thought it was extraordinary, I mean I thought there criticisms one could make, but it really was revelatory about institutional racism, issues around race, yet...the senior people in the faculty found it very threatening I expect and wanted nothing to do with it, so this is just a little story to suggest that in my experience there has never been, in thirteen years of working here, any attempt to deal explicitly within the work of our faculty to deal with the inherited baggage that we all bring whether we are white or black (i14UCT:WW:H).

This illustrates that although there are progressive white academics within the institution; the institution as a whole, and those in power, are unwilling to accept their role in perpetuating institutional racism, and thereby continue to reinforce the institutional exclusion of black academics. Furthermore, participants discussed how the institution failed to acknowledge the push-out factors that cause black academics to leave. A misperception that was widely criticised was that ‘black people just chase money’. Participants explained how there was a failing to understand the impact of institutional culture and situational constraints, and a failing to realise that external-pull factors lure all people, not only black academics. Therefore, the institution needs to acknowledge why it is failing to retain black academics.

White participants did speak of contextual issues, such as black-on-black racism within Cape Town, as factors that deterred members of the black [African] elite from settling. For example,

the problem with transformation is that doesn’t really apply... particularly to black African staff if the table mountain advantage is countered by language and culture hostility...there is a lot of racism in and around Cape Town...black-on-black racism, so the university might be a wonderful place but if when you go out in the shopping mall and you’re standing at the shop and nobody serves you then you are not going to stick around in Cape Town for very much longer, and I think for the new black middle classes, the sort of you know, um, Sandton shopping mall environment, the Rosebank places have become more cosmopolitan, multi-racial...sort of a place than we have in Cape Town, so I think for a lot of people who are part of that new black middle class, Cape Town is still an antiquated place, and I mean that’s a difficulty you can’t do a great deal about that (i04UCT:WM:OTR).

This perception was raised by several senior white academics and interestingly no black academics. It highlights several key assumptions: that the institution, itself, is a ‘wonderful place’; there is no acknowledgement of institutional racism or that the institution has a role in trying to transform black academic’s experience; it also highlights
that race-based transformation is narrowly conceived of as increasing the numbers of black staff who would easily transcend or assimilate into the ‘culture’ of the institution.

White academics worked with ‘black as similar’ and ‘black as dissimilar’ at different times depending on the situation. However, the intention was usually felt, by black academics, to be exclusionary. Expectations of similarity meant that white academics could excuse themselves from engaging in race-work, whilst expectations of dissimilarity were bound up in assumptions of deficiency, and could be invoked to defend double-standards and other mechanisms of exclusion at work within the institution.

Staff felt these assumptions of difference often directly led to double-standards within the institution. This was seen to be the case especially with regard to the equity/excellence debate, where certain faculties distinguish between ‘designated’ and ‘specialist’ posts with the underlying assumption that designated are for black and women academics, whilst specialist posts are largely reserved for white men— an assumption that both black and women academics were very critical of. For example,

we have now this...thing of designated jobs, now that’s a position where we only employ black people or women and then we have specialist jobs, and that alone is offensive to me because it means that somebody who is a specialist isn’t black or a woman because the blacks and the women get employed in the designated, why do we do that? (i12UCT:WW:EBE).

Double-standards were also seen to exist where development initiatives target only black and women academics and not white men – thereby reinforcing the superiority-inferiority complex. Black academics expressed anger at the assumption that white men were the self-appointed custodians of intellectual credibility. For example, an Indian academic explains how senior academics discuss employment equity:

all the time it is linked to quality, quality must not be compromised, and...whenever you talk about bringing black people, women on board you have to now link it with, so long as we don’t compromise on quality. Now we employ a lot of white people now we never say so long as they are the right quality, so we just assume that quality assurance is there (i24UCT:IM:EBE).

Black staff also spoke of having to constantly go the extra mile to prove themselves worthy of recognition and reward because of the assumption that they are inferior. This is captured aptly in the following:
it seems to me that if you are black, you have to do monkey tricks, you’ve got to…always prove that you are good, your qualification doesn’t matter much, you’ve got to prove yourself (i24UCT:IM:EBE).

Black participants discussed how these double standards often played themselves out as procedural irregularities. A particular example given was job reservation, whereby adverts are written to the specification of an already selected candidate – so that they are guaranteed to be the best person for the job. Black participants felt that in the bulk of these cases, the pre-selected candidate was most likely to be a white man. For example,

you find the heads…frame a job ad to meet the profile of a certain person who they know, say it is a management position and the person who has been earmarked does not have a degree they will not state degree as a primary requirement in the ad, instead they say degree will be advantageous, or they just write experience and then if they don’t have any particular person in mind, they advertise the same position and we see them coming out clean as to what the real requirements for the position are (i23UCT:AM:OTR).

Black participants also spoke about rigidity in employment, whereby a new employee is sought to fill the shoes of his or her predecessor exactly – staff felt that this effectively excluded very capable candidates with different leanings and prevented expansion of the academic discipline concerned.

Networks were also seen as a vital mechanism through which there is job reservation for white men and job exclusion for others. The power of networks was seen to be influential both in hiring and promotion, and was seen to be a conservative force in favour of white men. For example:

it [ad hominum promotion] is tightly controlled, but the DVC is just one person among 13 or 15 heads of department who come from the same faculty and who might be very good colleagues of the staff member in question. They may have had dinner together on a Saturday evening. The deputy vice chancellors are normally outsiders, sitting in on the process, so the network still works, yeah, the network gets the last laugh (i23UCT:AM:OTR).

Staff also spoke about several instances where there has been maltreatment of staff based on their ‘being black’. One such example follows:

when she [black woman academic with a PhD] went to Bremner…they sent her to the cleaners department, the admin for the cleaners…She was just so hurt because she came back home, she came to an institution where she thought she may be held in some way as a black woman returning and she just got all this horrible treatment (i21UCT:CW:H).
Other examples cited are the difficulties some black staff experience with students who say that they cannot understand them. Two such cases where stated where the academics concerned had ended up resigning.

Another example, where a black woman academic was earning an insufficient salary to cover her expenses and asked if something could be done, was re-construed as black women demand unrealistic salaries.

she said to them look this is my income, this is my expenditure I don’t know how I am going to do this. It’s not as though she didn’t do her homework. It’s not as if she got her letter of appointment and exploded, she actually sat down looked at it…She went into the embarrassing moment of having to ask me how much I earned…only after she had done all that did she go and say I would need to earn that much more, would that be possible?...All of this was supposed to be confidential negotiations but then some how it leaked and there were rumours were going around the university that, yeah, when black women with PhDs… get appointed they kind of demand unrealistic salaries (i21UCT:CW:H).

Other criticisms that were raised included a lack of critical engagement with the meanings and historical legacies of colonialism and the salience of race. For example,

the Anatomy Museum of the Anatomy School at Med School has still got pickled skulls, you know skulls in formaldehyde…I think that nobody should deny the past and sort of airbrush things that are offensive about the past but they do at least need to be assessed critically. So those sort of things are problematic for me because they are indicative of an attitude that sees continuity and is not critical of that past, or else is profoundly historically ignorant, which is also a problem for a university (I14UCT:WW:H).

A contentious issue, at the time, was the naming of ‘Sangano Square’, as a white participant explained:

there is a brand new chemical engineering building out there and there is a big plaza, and we are going to call it Sangano Square, Sangano is a Shona word that means gathering place, like a Lekgotla sort of a thing, symbols and culture, so that black students can feel ‘oh not everything is named after some pale male (i06UCT:WM:EBE).

However, several black South African participants queried why a Shona name was chosen and not a name in one of the indigenous South African languages.

Black participants also discussed how managers and academic leaders did not know how to engage adequately with race,

like HODs not knowing how to work with ‘race’…like talking about black people and then there are ‘black people’, and you know they don’t realise the impact of what they say on the people who are present (i21UCT:CW:H).
Black staff also experienced frustration, seeing transformation as having been a one-sided reconciliation on the part of black academics, with very little or no reciprocal engagement from white academics.

which is a problem...in how we have reconceptualised reconciliation, it seems to be one-sided that those who suffered in the past must continue to be patient, even after ten years we are expected to be patient, and those who benefited continue to benefit without giving up some of the benefits (i16UCT:AM:H).

Some black participants expressed feeling that they were institutionally included because they were black, and that they wanted to be acknowledged as human and not only as ‘raced’. In addition, such participants were often put into situations that made them very uncomfortable and ‘forced them to assimilate’ into status quo decisions. Staff also expressed frustration that allegations of unfair treatment or irregularities were always individualised without acknowledgement of the continuities between cases. For example,

there is always a reason why that particular story that that person is trying to tell you is then individualised and reduced to a particular circumstance. But the stories keep repeating themselves across different contexts and you can’t carry on not listening to them and I’m talking particularly about the experience of black staff at UCT. The stories of their experience of trying to get a permanent post here are not nice and each time that they get voiced they get marginalised to a particular situation...And then they don’t get seen as being the general experience. So we need to get the message across that there is a general experience and there is a general perception of what it is like to be a young black staff member trying to make their place here at UCT, and it is not a nice picture (i20UCT:WM:EBE).

This reiterates an earlier point, that racism is perceived as an individual and not an institutional characteristic. Amongst participants who acknowledged institutional racism, there was also consensus that it was a ‘hush-hush’ topic and as a result issues often got swept under the carpet.

In general, participants spoke to a lesser degree about the role of non-South African black academics. However, white participants acknowledged that they had made great contributions, held potential for activating the role-model effect, and could contribute to cultural diversity thereby aiding South Africa’s fight against xenophobia. Other staff felt that non-South African black staff were less critical of the status quo because of their tenuous and insecure position within the institution (based on the need to obtain work permits). A silence in these findings (although not directly explored) is the absence of the Mamdani affair in participants’ recollections of the salience of race within the institution.
Gender and institutional sexism:

Most of the discussion around gender focused on black women, white women, and white men. Much of what was discussed about white men illustrates a cumulative experience of race and gender\(^7\). White men were seen as using both structural advantage and institutional culture as a means of asserting and reasserting dominance and control, whilst women were excluded and marginalised through these means. Women did, however, deconstruct the category of women and identify multiple experiences of womanhood.

Much of the discussion that emerged focused on institutional culture. However, there was some identification of structural factors that impact on women’s experience of the institution. Women identified how inequity in remuneration, low occupational rank, low status, and a lack of access to sites of voice all contributed to academic exclusion. Before the equalisation of academic salaries per rank, women academics experienced inequity in pay, which impacted most heavily on women who were the only income earners, the principal earner, or who had dependent children - as the following example illustrates:

I realised then the only reason why I was coping financially was because I was in a double-income household…because my rent was shared, all my other stuff was shared and she [single woman] had to pay the entire bill (i21UCT:CW:H).

Women spoke principally about how they perceived the institution as male-dominated and about how this impacted on their experience of institutional exclusion. Women participants frequently referred to the ‘boys’ club’ which was seen as comprising of ex-male students from Bishops and Rondebosch Boys. One woman had a particularly good illustration on how staff’s, but particularly men’s, lives were very insular. She described the “three square kilometres in which peoples lives are situated” as the “Rondebosch triangle”, within which UCT academics had gone to school, to university, lived, and worked (i19UCT:WW:S).

Women spoke of their experience of the ‘boys’ club’ and how this challenged them:

women have always found the sort of locker-room humour of meetings extremely tiresome…as an environment its completely a male-dominated and masculinised environment and…women therefore have the task of eking out new academic identities for themselves which are respectable
and more tolerant of them and not as surrogate men but as women who are colleagues (i09UCT: CW: H).

A male participant echoed:

it does of course depend on how long you’ve been here and what kinds of inroads you’ve made into the circles of control...There’s the euphemism of the old boys’ club and its often used by women staff as well as people who are from the designated groups, who say that it’s hard to break into the circles and find a worthwhile place (i05UCT: CM: OTR).

Women felt that an important factor differentiating men’s and women’s success in academia and research, was women’s reproductive role, for example:

obviously someone who’s supported at home, or relatively supported at home, compared to someone who is the supporter, then you’ve got double, triple, quadruple time to be in the same place, so I’m very interested in that whole gender division in academic work and culture that explains why so many women opt out of research [and] into administration (i09UCT: CW: H).

Women staff also spoke about how they are expected not only to manage double or triple shifts within the household but also within academia. Inequities in teaching load were stated as one of the defining characteristics differentiating men and women academics’ work. Additionally, women were also burdened with the nurturing of students within the institution.

Women academics discussed how their mother-role infiltrated the workplace: they were the one’s who bore the burden of gender by managing double or triple shifts, their careers where stunted by their role as mothers, and their male colleagues stereotypically cast them in a mothering role. For example,

I have a child, everybody will ask me how do you cope with having a child and being a lecturer? My colleague who also had a child, nobody is asking him how he is coping with having a child and being a lecturer (i12UCT: WW: EBE).

Despite this apparent awareness, the institution was not deemed to be child-friendly in terms of its response to women academics with children.

I had to bring her because it was from 4/5 to 7 and I pick her up from school… and I thought if there is any reception that I can take her to [women’s function] surely would be one of them. I got the most, like [facial expression of disdain]. I left after half an hour... Maybe I shouldn’t have brought a two year old... but actually I thought come off it you guys, this is a structural factor of my life and I have no where to take her. Anyway, so... I just sort of find that sort of institutional context very unfriendly (i19UCT: WW: S).
Despite this, participants did acknowledge that the crèche was a great help in managing their work and childcare needs. However, in general, women felt that not enough consideration was given to the impact of motherhood on women academics, for example:

there is a complete unwillingness to address the problems women face or the challenges women face...Most women who are working as lecturers, not all there are some quite extraordinary women who manage to do it all but they're a minority and they're a rare minority. The reality is that most women academics stay at the low levels of the academic hierarchy because they don't actually have the time to develop their careers, because they have other responsibilities like running a household, looking after children, very often taking care of very aged parents…I don’t think those issues are addressed seriously at all (i14UCT:WW:H).

In other instances, the institution was not only unaware, but was actively dismissive of women’s concerns, labelling them as inconsequential:

when I talked about the fact that we have sexual harassment at student level, at academic level, at support staff level; I was told that if I showed the leadership of this faculty the one woman who earns less because she’s a woman...and that’s what is seen to be the case...The reality is who would fire a professor if he earns 12 million bucks a year in research, if he harasses a couple of people in the department. That’s the reality...If you are a professor there is very little between you and god, who is going to discipline you? It’s a structure, it’s the organisational setup (i12UCT:WW:EBE).

Not only is this man (in a leadership position) not taking action to ensure women’s comfort and safety, but he is actually perpetuating the problem by being uncritical of other men’s behaviour and how it may be inappropriate. Another example reiterates this point:

it was made clear by our HODs that these workshops are not there to discuss issues such as sexual discrimination. Now the point for me is, how do you transform if you don’t address the big issues that stop transformation? And sexual harassment is a problem in this faculty, even if its not seen (i12UCT:WW:EBE).

Networks were also experienced as impenetrable, women and black academics explained how these always favoured white men as the following quote illustrates:

we [EBE] have a 100 academic staff, 24 of which are professors, 2 of which are women and 2 of which are black.. Now somehow this means to me, personally, that either all the women who are working here are lazy, because they never manage to get to professor level, and neither do the black guys. And if you look at the promotion rate over the last 5 years, you will also see that most of the people who have been promoted are white men. Now for me that is a real question…why are only white men performing? (i12UCT:WW:EBE).

As discussed earlier, women also explained that even where parallel women’s networks exist, they are unwelcoming as they foster the divorce of one’s reproductive role from one’s productive role (the man in a dress attitude), and they were not sympathetic to women’s situational context (that is, having children).
Therefore, most women participants felt both structurally and culturally excluded from the institution. Despite this, in certain nuanced spaces, women found men academics who were particularly sensitive to women’s concerns. For example,

I could speak to him about the difficulty I have deciding whether to have a child or not because that is a huge issue. As a black woman who has walked a long path to get to where I am now, and needing to walk further, what happens if at this point I decide to have a child? And, you know, he was so compassionate about it and he gave me stories of his daughter and other students of his who have made, you know, certain decisions and he also spoke from his own experience…So he was quite open about the information he had…So there was this gender thing that I could actually talk to him about. And of course he didn’t say to me don’t have a child or do have a child, he was just saying these are some of the realities from my experience that I can share with you (i21UCT:CM:H).

This example is very encouraging but is also very rare. However, it is important, as it illustrates the emergence of alternative masculinities within the institution, with transformative potential.

The majority of discussion on gender focused on women as being in a position of exclusion, with white men, in particular, viewed as the one’s with the power to exclude. However, there was some deconstruction of gendered experiences, as indicated above, and also in terms of the vocalisation against prejudice and discrimination. A white woman discussed how, despite gendered suppression, her socio-economic privilege of being white enabled her to challenge the institution’s injustice:

perhaps I would make a statement with regards to that [act of discrimination] but I’m sure that a lot of women, or a lot of the black staff members who feel that they are depending on their jobs, [would not]…I have a certain freedom because I feel like I can leave tomorrow if I need to because I have also a family structure where I can rely on the structure for support but I think a lot of people aren’t in that situation they actually really need this job (i12UCT:WW:EBE).

Furthermore, women participants’ discussion reveals some acknowledgment that black women bear the brunt of institutional discrimination: as academics, administrators, and support staff. In addition, black men often expressed the concern that there had been an over-employment of white women and a large under-employment of black women, in particular. These are crucial issues that the institution needs to engage with further.
Institutional hierarchy by class and age:

The institutional labour force was described as fractured and disconnected. Pay and status classes differentiate staff along the lines of academic, professional and support staff (PASS), and outsourced staff. Furthermore, differentiations within each of these categories also serve to fragment and compartmentalise interests, such that the labour force encompasses workers from most of the socio-economic classes. For the purposes of this report, the overwhelming focus shall be on academic staff.

The ‘class’ structure of academia differentiates between junior and senior staff who have varying degrees of status and influence within the institution. Junior academics experience a marginal position which is also reflected in poor labour practices, whilst senior staff are perceived as fiercely defending the status quo. Concern was raised over the increasing trend of casualisation and ‘professional tutors’ whom the institution has no loyalty to, for example:

I think it is an appalling labour practice and…it also makes it very difficult for people to get on the ladder of an academic appointment because they’re in these cul-de-sac dead-end jobs that aren’t going anywhere…There is no sense that if you have been a tutor in a department and doing well and even done some lecturing, there is no sense that you should even be groomed for the next job that comes available (i14UCT:WW:II).

Black participants also discussed how the institution’s expectations of academics kept them largely self-focused on completing their higher degrees and writing publications. Therefore, intra-institutional mobility is seen as a factor that reproduces the class structure of academia, and that effectively serves to keep ‘class’ interests separate. It is able to have this (unintended or otherwise) effect by keeping academics’ interests individualised, and thereby preventing cross-class identification and support:

it’s a strange thing where academics don’t get up and shout about issues. They generally accept the status quo or if they do talk about it between themselves, it goes no further. Which is a worrying culture because I think academics by nature are individualists. They’ve been trained to be specialists in a particular field…so they are very generally involved with their own matters and so very few get out of that and will actually engage with other issues of a broader concern unless it impacts upon them (i05UCT:CM:OTR).

Black participants were of the perception that the nature of intra-institutional mobility led to less identification with social issues, and that as academics move up the hierarchy they lose their passion or identification with the institutional grassroots struggle. Black
participants see this as being reflected in the ‘lack of interest’ academics take in workplace issues that do not affect them directly. From this it is evident that some academics perceive mobility to lead to assimilation into the mainstream institutional culture. For example,

Well I think the higher you are in status in the university, whether it is professorial or associate professor, you reach a level where you sometimes feel you’ve reached the pinnacle of your status and generally you’d want to protect that turf. I think often you find both white and black who’ve reached that level would - the race thing is less important for those folk because they’ve reached a status and a class where their experience in terms of wealth, status level, etc is at its highest level so they would be less disposed to deal with issues of transformation. You know, and the frustration is that black staff themselves who ought to be the agents of change once they reach a certain level they no longer become interested or no longer take up the issues with as much passion or concern as they ought to...so the class issue of protecting their own turf and interests becomes the controlling paradigm (i05UCT:CM:OTR).

However, socially concerned academics explained that they faced some tension in deciding where to place their activism, as they were not able to participate everywhere. For instance, a black woman participant explains “I chose the classroom as my activism”. (i21UCT:CW:H). Therefore, from some participants’ discussions, it would appear that many staff have chosen the classroom and the (public) community as the target of their transformative activism rather than the institution itself. Participants who do engage with institutional transformation also described how this often curtailed their progress within the institution, for example:

if your concerns extend into issues of trying to change the space in which you work, the environment, trying to make it more collegial for people who have been previously excluded for what ever reasons, race, gender and so on, then you find it quite a testing environment. You find that things are quite challenging and you’ll find that you become more and more alienated in your attempts to make the changes, and you become branded in various ways, its just one of the risks of being outspoken in this area (i05UCT:CM:OTR).

Another black academic expressed how his decision to channel his activism within the institution had resulted in his being labelled a troublemaker, and how this had a direct impact on his academic career as he has continually been employed on contract.

In addition, black participants, and some white participants, also felt that the bulk of the student community were middle class, and that neither the institution nor students had sufficient linkages with working class and township communities – thereby reinforcing the elitism of the institution. Furthermore, staff also spoke of serious age conflict based
on what they described as the ‘old’ and ‘new’ values of South Africa, the underlying perception was that the view of older people is unlikely to change as they have lived a whole different life, however, most staff described intolerance when they encountered ‘old’ views from younger staff.

Arrangements of power:

The report thus far has touched on both individual and collective experiences of the institution, according to the salience of race, gender, and class. Underlying these experiences is the institutional structure and the arrangements of power. Focus now shifts to examine these in more detail and the implications that they have for transformation.

Staff questioned where real power lay within the institution. A common view was that the vice chancellor (VC), the deputy vice chancellors (DVCs), and the deans of the faculties ought to set the tone for the institution and institutional change. However, there was disagreement about whether, and to what extent, this was done. One position was that the VC has no real power, is not forceful enough, and is being used as a puppet or a figurehead. For example:

Ndebele, I think people are happy with him. He’s a pacifist and…he talks about transformation but he doesn’t have the guts and the will to drive transformation. I think he is just a figurehead. So [white] people are happy to keep someone like that, at the top, around. Whereas for most [black] people here, it would maybe be better if there was a white person in charge with more dynamism (I24UCT:IM:EBE).

Another participant identified power relations as being key. She described the institutional structure as a type of ‘survivor’ game with the VC needing senate and senior academics’ support to do his job, and thus the question of who to trust and who not to trust became a vital one.

one of the greatest criticisms of our vice chancellor is that he’s not been seen as actually leading this organisation…I think that is a very difficult game and…I think the powers at the moment lie with some of the deputy vice chancellors. There are one or two who I would say run the organisation, and then there are one or two deans who run the organisation with these deputy vice chancellors. So I think the Vice Chancellor is obviously our highest person but I’m not always, and that’s a very personal view, I am not always sure that he is the man who can call the shots (I12UCT:WW:EBE).
Other participants criticised his apparent absence on campus, stating he is a “great fundraiser but…does not have an institutional presence and is impersonal” (i23UCT:AM:OTR). Whilst there were differing views on Ramphele, the former vice chancellor, a strength that participants commented on was her personal approach:

for me, she was a really good vice chancellor. She invited all young staff…to have drinks with her and it was a really great event because, she did this for each faculty, because she kind of gave you her direct support and you kind of got to know her. And I wrote a letter to her personally and she responded personally…so that’s what I mean she was very much seen on the ground she was very much here…If you had something that happened to you, and you actually blew your lid, and you thought this is actually I’m going to resign, you could have gone into her office - that I don’t think could happen now, it is no longer possible (i12UCT:WW:EBE).

However, other participants were more critical about Ramphele, expressing that she was “not tactful” and “just sort of put a lid on very serious race issues…basically said they didn’t exist” (i21UCT:CW:H). Participants also had different interpretations of Ndebele and his leadership style, for example:

the vice chancellor called me to his office… I think he called in several black staff members, or maybe just young staff members, and just wanted to know from me how things were going and…what I thought could be done to make things better for me. That was very powerful for me, that he has that emphasis on relationships. Relationships with people is what is core for him…I know he is getting some very good advice about organisational politics, power and transformation issues. I know that…he is not just doing things, he is thinking about them, he is working through his issues, he has a system, he has a philosophy and a practice. So I completely see where he is coming from and I have such admiration for him, and, it’s a very different atmosphere at the university because of his presence (i21UCT:CW:H).

Despite their different views, participants were clearly emphasising the importance of a personal approach that broke down institutional barriers and that included, affirmed, and valued staff who in everyday context do not have voice or who are institutionally marginalised. Participants, in general, had more to say about the DVCs and Deans who appear to be regarded as the one’s with institutional power. For example:

I can’t say where our vice chancellor…where he is, but certainly his leadership, his senior lieutenants don’t seem, to me, to have any real commitment to transformation of this institution (i14UCT:WW:H).

Participants had mixed responses about the deans, with some feeling that their deans were successful agents and truly committed to change (for example: Health Science, CHED and Science) whilst others stated “our dean, well he is part of the problem” (i24UCT:IM:EBE). Furthermore, it was largely felt that senior and middle management have untold strength and influence because of their power to hire, fire, and promote – in
short they were seen as the people who had the power to make or break transformation at the institution. As the two examples below illustrate:

obviously we want to work with people who are of the same kind, who are like us. And that, you know, makes it quite hard for an equally capable black person to come in because most of the time, if not always, the head of department will be a white male. And a white male at most would like somebody who is also a white male. If they can’t get someone who meets that profile, they will be looking for a white female, at least they can relate to. Maybe they might not be able to talk about rugby with them on a Monday morning, so you know, if they could get a white male that would be best. So its got more to do with the feel rather than real substantive issues with people’s experience and qualifications, so it is a difficult one, it is very difficult (i23UCT:AM:OTR).

With regard to promotion:

it is a very tightly controlled process but human factor plays a big factor. I have been there, I have seen it…You find some promotions really are meritorious and some you ask yourself the question just what happened there, because the person would have not met most of the criteria.. with a very poor research criteria, not much resounding teaching record, you find such a person being promoted to professor or senior professor and then you ask well what happened there? So there will be those cases, some without PhDs and what you’d seem almost always such variations would involve white males, not a female or a black person…So human factor plays a role even though the system is very tightly controlled and it is highly rigorous (i23UCT:AM:OTR).

Participants gave many such examples of procedural inadequacies and irregularities, mainly consisting of: lack of transparency, lack of consultation, lack of responsibility, insufficient checks and balances, loopholes, irregularities in selection committees, one-sided leadership, breakdown of confidentiality, and informal caucusing. In the majority of these cases, it was white men academics who stood to benefit. All of this illustrates that there are many continuities with the past, and little active institutional structural and procedural change. Black participants were critical of the responses they got from middle-management about the continued exclusive hiring of white academics: “middle managers have mastered the art of deception and avoidance thereby making it difficult to have an impact and to get real answers” (i23UCT:AM:OTR).

Participants also felt that there were multiple and competing arenas of power and that, to a large extent, committees were a mere smokescreen to distort the real arrangements of power. This caused immense frustration amongst those who were lobbying for institutional change, just to find they had again been sidelined into some ineffective committee.

I think that the way this institution is run is quite Byzantine that there are competing circles of power and that there is a committee structure that is very opaque and vast numbers of
committees…and so governance is not straight forward and I see many of those committees as a bit of a smokescreen to be quite honest with you (i14UCT:WW:H).

However, in contrast to the above, there were also expressions of optimism that described positive mechanisms of change; instances in which there had been small, individual-level change; a focus on relationships; and innovative leadership. Staff described being held and motivated by the institution through mentoring aspects such as the New Academic Practitioners’ Programme (NAPP) and the Emerging Researchers’ Programme (ERP). These will be discussed in more detail in the following sections.

From participants’ discussions, it is clear that insufficient change (in terms of structural and procedural change) has led to system reproduction. It appears as though issue avoidance, turf defence, an ambiguous decision-making context, and alienation and marginalisation of those who seriously challenge the status quo, all effectively reduce the capacity of the institution to respond to change. Much of this is historically embedded within the university’s structure and purpose as an elite and prestigious institution, and compounded by its ties to the colonial project in pre-democratic South Africa and its contemporary quest for global recognition and status. It is crucial to also note the impact of the changing nature of academic work, the predominance of managerialism, and the de-democratisation of universities, as well as the context of change in post-apartheid South Africa, as impacting upon institutions’ capacity, potential, and actual change.

**Academics’ perceptions and experiences of transformation**

The previous section described participants’ perceptions and experiences of the institution. These provide us with an indication as to how the institution is doing in terms of the continued or changing salience of race, gender, and class within the institution. This demonstrated that whilst there was overwhelming continuity, there are certainly areas in which change has emerged. This section takes a more focused look at transformation within the institution by briefly exploring general transformation attempts, specific programmatic responses, and providing an evaluation of transformation at the institution.
General transformation attempts

From the eighties, there has been a drive towards transformation at UCT. However, formal responses began to take shape in the nineties, with the establishment of the University Transformation Forum (UTF), the creation of a Transformation Office with a Transformation Officer, the establishment of an Employment Equity Unit, a portfolio of Deputy-Vice Chancellor for Transformation, the restructuring of Council, and the establishment of an Institutional Forum in place of UTF (University of Cape Town, 2000: 1 – 6). However, there was acknowledgement that delegating ‘transformation’ to the Transformation Office, and allocating responsibility for the staff profile to the Employment Equity Unit, allowed for a problematic distinction between transformation and planning to develop (University of Cape Town, 2000: 5).

Furthermore, the institution also created an Employment Equity Fund that was used to finance Contract Development Posts (CDP). These were additional temporary posts used to hire black and women academics, with the aim of addressing shortages and providing these staff with permanent employment prospects (University of Cape Town, 2004a: 27). However, this scheme had several shortfalls such as an absence of career progression for some candidates and no permanent position available due to faculties not factoring CDPs into their planning (University of Cape Town, 2004a: 27). During this time, UCT also transformed its top leadership structures and appointed the first black woman vice chancellor in South Africa, in addition to transforming the leadership of faculties through appointing new deans with several black and women academics amongst them.

The above paragraphs set the context of transformation at UCT and what follows details contemporary policies, procedures, programmes, as well as participants’ perceptions and experiences of institutional transformation.

Between 2002 and 2004, UCT amplified its official drive towards academic staff transformation. The Employment Equity Plan 2004 – 2007 details six key initiatives that the university has embarked upon: donor funding for employment equity, an institutional
climate survey, selection and recruitment strategies, equity-funded posts, academic staff
development initiatives, and a joint consultative forum on employment equity (University
of Cape Town, 2004a: 26 – 28). The participants in this research had differential degrees
of knowledge and opinions about these initiatives. However, most of those who knew
about these initiatives remarked that there had recently been significant renewed impetus
around transformation.

In addition to the six initiatives above, participants also mentioned the following
transformation initiatives: the Vice Chancellor’s Transformation Road Show, the new
Employment Equity Plan, transformation workshops, and senate cooption. Whilst there
was fairly widespread knowledge about these initiatives, those with the most knowledge
were academics who were somehow involved in the transformation process.

Two problems identified in 2000 were the fact that transformation had become divorced
from planning and that transformation was often reduced to mere employment equity
(University of Cape Town, 2000: 5). As a result of this, the Senior Leadership Group
(SLG) met to reformulate the institution’s involvement with transformation by
reconceptualising, strategising and developing a new institutional plan. This yielded the

As a result of this new approach to transformation, the vice chancellor embarked on a
road show to present the new transformation agenda to the various university
constituencies. Few participants mentioned this initiative but those who did were glad for
the identification of key objectives and goals to work towards. However, participants
were also critical of this, stating that the documents were far too long for anyone to read,
and they also criticised the lack of measurable objectives which illustrated a committed
rhetoric but not the same commitment to practice.

Other participants still felt the institution lacked clarity, even on the meaning of
transformation, for example, “they have not really defined transformation for the
university community and said this is what we mean and said this is how we are going to do it” (i23UCT:AM:OTR).


The release of the new employment equity plan was widely described as a document that was ‘less political and more realistic’ as it aimed for achievable equity targets rather than those that would look politically impressive. There was a large amount of criticism from black participants at the slow pace of anticipated change, for example: “yeah you can see it is small changes, we are never going to get anywhere”; “to call this transformation is an insult”; and “it’s very conservative, but realistic, they say” (i24UCT:IM:EBE and i05UCT:CM:OTR). However, some participants did appreciate the seriousness with which the institution was calculating its targets as it showed that the decision-makers had been thinking about the process:

so let’s be realistic, they say, let’s look at who’s going to be retiring, who wants to take voluntary or early retirement, look at, you know, the possibility of posts becoming vacant or money becoming vacant from donor funding to create new posts for black people or people with disabilities, or women to come in and lets try to, um, change the profile in that way. But if you look at the numbers, they’re not going to create radical change over the next three years but they’re hoping to create change. I think, you know, UCT has only now cottoned on after decades of talking about it, that there ought to be some urgency and seriousness about it (i05UCT:CM:OTR).

Black and women staff were excited at some of the new provisions within the plan, such as the fact that the line manager should take responsibility for employment equity and that equity committees had to be formed:

this time around they made a provision that from departments and faculties to administration departments, all must have an employment equity committee and the department will determine the composition of the committee so that is left to the individual department…and that committee will oversee employment practices in that particular department. So it is a very new thing…and we think that it might add value to the process…There has been quite a lot of excitement about it and most departments have implemented it and chosen committees. Now with each position, each new position that arises in a faculty or department, it will meet and look at the profile, the staff profile and then make a determination of which profile they will be looking for in their appointment so a determination would be made (i23UCT:AM:OTR).

However, there was a little scepticism expressed regarding the degree to which heads would be held accountable:

they have not set rewards and punishments for those who don’t comply. So, for example, we have an Employment Equity Policy now but actually its very silent as to what would happen to…a head
of department should they not meet their equity targets, should they not even have an employment equity plan. It says nothing about those, as far as I am concerned this policy has no content to it, it has no real meaning to it (i23UCT:AM:OTR).

Some black participants also felt that there were insufficient mechanisms for redress:

the only form of redress is people in the system like me who see something…some kind of job reservation. What do I do, I can’t really call up the dean and say why is this person [appointed]. He is going to tell me that they were looking for a specialist for that position and this person was the best for the post, he had the right credentials, so what can I say (i24UCT:IM:EBE).

However, there was much enthusiasm from participants around the development of equity and transformation committees at the department and faculty level:

what we’ve done we have a sub-committee that is looking at how do we transform as a department and…then we’ll report to the faculty and from there into the university. So what we’ve looked at, we’ve reviewed how we hire, what are the criteria, so we’re looking at all the issues… So it is a matter of being aware that one has some preconceptions, so one has to then make decisions and say ok I must put aside any preconceptions and so on, so those are things that we are discussing very seriously, so that we can get a selection panel that is in terms of hiring for the department, that is as unbiased and transparent as possible (i18UCT:AM:C).

The new policy specifies that certain funding for equity posts, so that faculties know upfront that their chosen candidate must be an equity appointee (University of Cape Town, 2004a: 27). Participants gave some examples of how this bore out in practice:

as I understand it is that where two people apply for a post, a white person and a black person even if the white person is best qualified in the traditional sense of the qualification and experience, that there is a huge imperative on the department to select the black person and then to provide developmental opportunities so that they can get those things right. And part of what I understand is that it is challenging the notion of best, because that person is going to bring skills and knowledge and cultural capital that the white person doesn’t have. It is quite a crude way of talking about it, but the effects of that are starting to be felt in our own unit. I think it is really good, I think it is not easy it threatens all of us in one way or another but it is also hugely generative, its really taking seriously the challenge (i17UCT:WW:CHED).

Another woman participant also elaborated:

two jobs came up recently, one of which the dean had said, you know, should be an equity appointment…It emerged that, at the end of the day, the people on the committee were very keen, were very supportive of the idea that this must be a post where we make a shift that we actively seek an appointee you know who…is black…But despite agreement there was still a white male [who] came in on top…What do you do…where your best candidate is not demographically…and interestingly our dean actually insisted and she put down her foot and she said I don’t care, we made an agreement that were going to make a real commitment to make an equity appointment here and we’ve got to make one (i15UCT:WW:CHED).
The idea of equity committees and final decision-making power lying with the dean emerged organically within the faculty of Health Science, and their successes are now being tried out institution-wide:

The faculty [health science] cleaned up the recruitment process, it has employment equity conveners who sit on selection committees and advise on the process and the dean signs off all new appointments and that’s changed things dramatically because if the dean is unhappy with the committee decision he sends it back and refuses to sign it and they can do what they want, he just won’t allow it if it deviates from the plan (i07UCT:IW:OTR).

As is evident from the above examples, leadership plays a crucial role in the success of these policies. However, not all participants had faith that their dean would act in accordance with the policy. In fact, in some faculties, staff did not even know who their representatives were, for example:

faculties, they are supposed to have employment equity committees and I just heard through the grapevine I think its X and Y in our faculty. So it’s not widely known who these people are. If you ask any staff here, they would think that maybe there is a committee like that but no one will know who is on it, who they are. Why these things are not open discussion, known, transparent, where we [are] going? Why we are going there? It is problematic (i24UCT:CM:EBE).

Although this policy was newly implemented (at the time of research), and there were several problematic areas, there was still a sense of enthusiasm and motivation, and participants who were now a part of the process were undeniable happy about having a voice within the institution.

*The Institutional Climate Survey*

The Institutional Climate Survey was conducted amongst all staff (academic and PASS) in 2003. Its purpose was “to provide baseline data on staff perceptions on the institutional climate and to use the findings of the report as a generative tool in soliciting further feedback from staff” (University of Cape Town, 2004a: 26). The findings were very interesting in that they pinpointed key facets about the institution, such as: levels of racial and gender discrimination were higher than expected, PASS staff experienced considerable discrimination from academics, and African women were least convinced that management acted fairly and did not feel that they benefited the most from transformed opportunities (i01UCT:WM:OTR; i06UCT:WM:EBE and Louw & Finchilescu, 2003).
Participants discussed how the institutional climate survey identified the key positives and negatives of UCT, giving it a good basis from which to move forward. The strength of this initiative was seen as being the fact that findings were disaggregated and disseminated to faculties, and that the VC had required a response to this feedback from faculties. This was seen as a process of engaging with, and increasing the communication around, transformation. Other participants criticised the methodology, stating that of course a representative sample, which is 80% white, would tell you that people are happy at UCT!

As a part of the feedback loop in response to the institutional climate survey, transformation workshops were organised to discuss workplace issues and transformation within units or faculties. At the time of this research, only a few of these had taken place and hence reflection on these is based on a limited sample. Most participants welcomed the opportunity for open communication but also criticised the nature of these workshops. Staff discussed how academic and PASS staff tensions arose as the most significant tension, however, staff were sceptical of this, stating that given the nature of the workshop, it was one of the only tensions that could be articulated readily.

Women and black participants questioned how people who have experienced issues of race and gender discrimination could freely discuss these with the perpetrator in the room. One participant explained what, for her, would be a better set up:

> it is really difficult to talk about race and gender if you sit with 40 people in a room…if the university would really be committed on trying to find out what the problems…[they would randomly select staff] and go and interview them all, from someone who is not actually related to them, as in someone who is not their line manager and then I think that something worthwhile can come out. Because I can tell you that I was sexually harassed by my PhD supervisor and then there is no issue for me to tell you that because you have no power over me. Now if I sat with my head of department and my dean in a workshop how likely is it that I am going to say that this guy harassed me or I feel sexually harassed here (i12UCT:WW:EBE).

Another serious complaint about the transformation workshops came from a contract staff member who was excluded from the workshop because he was not permanent staff:

> I didn’t attend them because I was not invited…Only people who…were paid from the general operating budget, um my salary is not paid from the GOB because I am not a permanent member of staff. Although I teach, research do the same thing…Can you imagine how petty these [things
are...you are invited because you are a permanent staff member, it is its laughable but that is the reality (i24UCT:IM:EBE).

In this way, although workshops offer a space and site for issue vocalisation, it appeared that in practice, the nature of the discussion was effectively curtailed by the closing off of various channels for marginalised people to express their experiences. Furthermore, a member of staff also questioned how anything serious could emerge from feedback in the form of a one-page document.

*Senate Co-option*

The last issue that participants discussed was that of senate co-option, whereby 25 women and black academics were co-opted onto senate.

[senate is roughly] 86 percent white and male...so the decision was made to adopt, to co-opt onto senate black staff and women staff. It was a bit of a strange process, the deans nominated promising people and so 25 people were co-opted onto senate. I don’t know how that is working. One of the problems...is that senate is closed and so transparency really needs to be implemented, so you can actually monitor to see if the co-option has really made a difference (i07UCT:IW:OTR).

Black and women participants were hopeful that those co-opted onto senate would express their interests and contribute to change. However, others were less convinced, criticising the lack of transparency in the selection process whereby individuals were nominated by deans and were not publicised to the UCT community.

I think a lot of these people will be intimidated and not necessarily be a strong voice, a united voice. Also remember that the deans elected, chose them...so I don’t think they will necessary make a big change...Mind you, there are a lot of white females and they seem to be a lot more provocative in terms of questioning things than the black males academics in senate, a lot of the time (i24UCT:IM:EBE).

Whilst the account thus far has reflected on the new developments at UCT, most of which have been commended for their positive effects (although not without their own difficulties), it is also crucial to highlight two viewpoints (see the following two quotations) that also impact on this discussion. Both signify that the process of effecting transformation is difficult and that the institution is felt to be doing less well today than it did during the first five years after the formal installation of democracy.

I’ve seen some backward slippage and we hear more on the constraints on transformation. My suspicion is maybe that a great deal of transformation happened...in the first five years, including the establishment of the AGI and the Chair in African Studies. I think there...was a great push for
change at that point and thereafter it has become increasingly more difficult. Certainly…I think there is a lot less optimism, certainly, among black faculty than there was when I arrived five years ago. There is a lot of despondency, there is a great departure of black faculty with a whole project of its own (i09UCT:CW:Hu).

Several participants, who explained that their passion lay with transformation, discussed feeling increasingly tested in the contemporary period:

I’ve discovered more and more because my issues are around transformation, that UCT can be a very frustrating place to work in, very alienating, sometimes very hostile to certain people and certain groups of people. So, for me, currently, personally, I…think UCT would be a more difficult place to feel happy in, that you thrive in it. It may not only be the experiences of people who are black, it may be certain white people who feel alienated, and that’s just in a nutshell my experiences, that currently I would feel more tested in patience with UCT than I have been in the past (i05UCT:CM:OTR).

Never-the-less, UCT has an activist group, the Black Caucus, campaigning for more substantive transformation. It is an informal network of academics and PASS staff who challenge the pace and nature of transformation within the institution. The Black Caucus emerged from the Black Staff Association but with a wider base of support:

the idea from association to caucus was that we were meant to unite all black staff members who are in various Associations at UCT. Or unions’ cause we have NEHAWU, we have UCT’s Employees Union, we have Academic Staff Association and we have Black Staff Association, now that it is quite a number of those and so we wanted to get black staff from all those fora, from all those associations into this forum, which is informal to address issues that affect them. Key issues would be transformation, and of course equity (i23UCT:AM:OTR).

Another participant elaborates on the perspective of the Black Caucus:

[in] the Black Caucus, the main focus now…that strings people together is this transformation and equity issue. That it is not happening on the academic level, that it is not happening on the PASS staff level, it is not happening at the cleaning service level. It’s not a vigilance group, it is not black people per se, it is anyone who identifies themselves with change and transformation. We don’t feel the pace is fast enough and if you look at the figures…you see small changes, and if you project that in to the future you’re not going to see much change in ten years time…so we want to see a visible change (i24UCT:IM:EBE).

In comparison to participants’ experience of the institution as a racialised, gendered, and a classist workplace, these perceptions and experiences of transformation, in general, reveal some continuity but also a lot of change and enthusiasm around the institution’s future direction for change.
Programmatic Responses

As discussed in the methodology section, access to officials in Human Resources was largely blocked, and therefore the following data is what emerged from academic staff’s discussion. The discussion will focus principally on contract development posts as well as the New Academic Practitioners’ Programme (NAPP) and the Emerging Researcher’s Programme (ERP).

*Mellon and Atlantic Philanthropy funded Contract Development Posts*

Participants discussed that the institution received money from Mellon and Atlantic Philanthropies to fund contract development posts within the faculties of Humanities and Science. The Employment Equity Plan states:

Certain departments within these two faculties were prioritised because they were overwhelmingly white and or in need of more staff...appointments are being made according to a phased succession plan based on retirements and other anticipated vacancies. Appointments are being made one, two or three years before the vacancy occurs, at which point the appointee’s salary would be absorbed into UCT’s budget (University of Cape Town, 2004a: 26).

In late 2004, UCT also received funding from Carnegie and a ‘strategic fund’ that allowed equity funded posts to be extended to the Engineering and the Built Environment, Law, Graduate School of Business, and Health Sciences faculties.

Participants reviewed the impact this funding had on their staff complement, for example:

The idea being that we identify people, even at the post-graduate stage, nurture them through masters, PhDs, post-docs and then hopefully appoint them as lecturers...To put all of this into perspective the Atlantic grants altogether will I think allow us to make 20/22 or so appointments. At the moment, we have 20 black staff in this faculty out of a 160, so it will allow us to move from lin 8, more or else, to one in four. Good in the sense that we would be doubling the number of black staff but not so great that, that doubling will take us to a total black staffing complement which will be merely 25 percent of the total. So I think it gives one an idea of how much of an up hill battle it is, you know. One has to put this kind of effort and money into a programme but because we are moving off such a low base the progress is good but it still takes us to a position which is no where near where we would like to be (i08UCT:IM:S).

In addition, another participant explains:

By the end of seven years we would have recruited 27 new staff, but you see it’s 27, but it’s against retirement, so the overall staffing compliment of the staff doesn’t increase (i02UCT:WW:H).
It was indistinguishable whether any mentoring aspect was formerly linked to these incentives. However, the Mellon appointees had a Mellon coordinator who oversaw the programme, the Atlantic Philanthropies funding was explicitly for equity purposes, whilst the Carnegie funding was for an ‘integrated transformation’ initiative (i02UCT:WW:H and i05UCT:IW:OTR). However, it is possible that current and future candidates could be embraced by NAPP.

One participant also discussed another initiative funded by Mellon (the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship) which identified potential undergraduates and sought to mould them toward an academic career (i15UCT:WW:CHED).

New Academic Practitioners’ Programme (NAPP)

The New Academic Practitioners’ Programme (NAPP) began in 2004 and is part of a three-pronged approach to academic staff induction, including the Centre for Higher Education Development, Human Resources, and the Research and Innovation Office (i17UCT:WW:CHED). In 2004, NAPP took on 30 candidates, chosen from about 70 nominations submitted by deans and heads of department. There were 19 women and 11 men on the programme - of which 20 were black, ten were white, and there was only one white male (i17UCT:WW:CHED).

It is a skills-based programme that recognises the difficulties faced by new staff in adapting to the academic environment, and developing their research and teaching portfolios. The programme is funded by the National Skills Development Levy and its approach focuses largely on developing teaching skills. According to the NAPP website, workshops focus on developing one’s own professional portfolio, reflecting on diversity of language, group work, marking criteria as a tool for development of teaching and learning, technology as an aid to learning, and the inclusion of service learning (http://www.ched.uct.ac.za/napp/proginfo.htm:10/09/04).
However, the coordinators hope to provide these skills in an amicable and personal environment:

I don’t want us to have a programme that becomes a sort of a set thing that everybody who arrives at UCT is told they must go through. I want it to be a programme that people come on and that it is flexible enough to meet the needs of all the new staff who come on the programme… I want the programme to facilitate them finding their space here. So it mustn’t be a rigid programme, it mustn’t be a one size fits all, it must be a programme that can meet the needs of those individuals (i20UCT:WM:EBE).

Whilst the coordinators discussed that NAPP was not explicitly conceptualised as a transformative initiative, its effects are transformative in that most new staff are black and women academics and therefore, so are the NAPP participants. This element is reflected in the goals of NAPP, one of which states: “To orient new staff to the challenges which academics face in the context of a changing higher education environment, in particular the challenges of transformation” (http://www.ched.uct.ac.za/napp/goals.htm:10/09/04).

The process of NAPP has revealed much about transformation and about black and women academics’ experiences within the institution. One of the coordinators explains: “we want to use the programme for new staff to push the boundaries as to how welcoming UCT is to staff, and that is where we overlap fundamentally with the transformation agenda” (i20UCT:WM:EBE).

He elaborates on the intersection between new academic and black or woman academic:

many staff say, what am I supposed to do here? You know, I don’t get told what to do, nobody has explained it to me. So people who come into the academic world experience quite a sense of, there is no support for me and I have to battle through on my own. So it is not a surprise for us to hear those stories. But it takes on a new meaning when those people are the first black people in their departments. It takes on a new meaning when they are the first women in their departments or when they are marginalised as women or black staff in the department. So their struggles have a different dimension to them, because not only are they struggling in the same way that everyone else is struggling, they are also struggling to understand what is expected of them in this new environment and the new environment in a new way has got to begin to reshape itself and in some cases it doesn’t (i20UCT:WM:EBE).

He continues, explaining how contractual ambiguity within the institution is perceived as racialised:

the experience of black staff is that it happens to them more than to white staff, so the perception amongst black staff is that, we as black staff are coming in on these complicated contractual arrangements as opposed to our white colleagues who are coming in on quite clear-cut, simple
arrangements for their placement. And there is that perception that, there is like a difference between the way that black staff are being brought on board than white staff (i20UCT:WM:EBE).

Furthermore, there was considerable discussion which illustrates that, even if not the main focus, NAPP has a transformative agenda. For example, transformation was conceived as a dual process in which “you become transformed because you are now at this institution and how do you make this institution a different place because you are now here” (i17UCT:WW:CHED).

However, feedback from participants reveals a different perception, as illustrated below:

Despite its benefits, Marco found it somewhat disconcerting that the programme reinforces an adherence to the hierarchical structure of the institution.

As a young academic who believes in freedom of speech, it wasn’t great to hear that you should handle the university’s hierarchy with kid-gloves as they are the ones on whom your career development depends (Monday Paper Vol. 23: 29).

Despite this, the feedback from participants has been positive although the programme is still a little new to evaluate. The Monday Paper article is full of praise on how the programme enables academics’ teaching skills. The nuance of this approach is that it appears to be very well conceptualised and concentrates on ‘hard’ skills as opposed to the ‘soft’ skills focused on in many other transformation initiatives.

Although coordinators noted that they want to incorporate more on institutional culture, they felt they had already created a positive and safe space for the topic to be discussed:

This in itself illustrates that NAPP provides a nuanced space within the institution for alternative cultures to develop. In addition, the coordinators aim to have a transformative effect within the wider institution by changing the way new staff are treated. For example, “I have very many colleagues who have horrible stories to tell and I want to use
my knowledge of the programme to shape what happens to new staff at UCT” (i20UCT:WM:EBE).

Lastly, although the programme was only a few months old at the time of research, the coordinators knew that the thorough test of their success would only come a few years down the line:

it is almost like a thermometer, a barometer of how we are doing because if that group settle into rewarding careers at UCT, but if after a couple of years they end up accepting jobs elsewhere then we are going to be back at square one and I think it will be an important indication (i20UCT:WM:EBE).

Emerging Researchers’ Programme (ERP)

The second programmatic response reflected on is the Emerging Researcher’s Programme, which is offered by the Department of Research and Innovation as a means of research development (i17UCT:WW:CHED). The programme targets emerging researchers and is not viewed as a transformation strategy, as it does not exclusively target black and women academics and it is therefore open to all ‘emerging’ researchers. However, it will clearly have an important impact on all its participants’ research careers, particularly women and black academics, who historically take longer to establish themselves because of structural and institutional culture impediments. ERP is funded by Atlantic Philanthropies and was initiated in February 2003 although its official launch was not until June 2005 (University of Cape Town, 2004a: 28 and http://www.education.gov.za/mainmedia.asp?src=mvie&xsrc=890:25/01/06).

The programme has concrete goals in terms of assisting participants to complete “higher degrees and the production of sustained, measurable, quality research output”, in addition to “assist[ing] researchers achieve NRF rating” (http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/dri/erp/erp.html: 25/01/06). ERP is a long-term strategy, in which participants remain in the programme until they receive NRF rating or for up to five years (http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/dri/erp/erp.html:25/01/06). In addition, participants are paired with a senior research scholar who mentors them through the programme. Retreats, training,
and seminars are held to assist participants with their research, writing, and their supervision of higher degrees (http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/dri/erp/erp.html:25/01/06).

Although this programme is still new and only one participant took part in this research, there appears to be some very positive feedback. The participant was highly supportive of the programme, stating that it was the way she was held by this programme that made her decide to stay at UCT when she had considered leaving:

> it’s just another way in which I am feeling enabled in the institution… I felt visible and I felt valued, you know, and that was one of the things that made me feel ok I can stay at UCT because it was just that one thing that he said to me, that in fact we see you. we see that you are working hard, we see what you are trying to do (i21UCT:CW:H).

Furthermore, she explained how her mentor guided her not only in terms of academic development but also on social issues such as dispensing advice on both the positive and negative aspects of having a child at this juncture in her career. She expanded “he is like a very kind father in the workplace” (i21UCT:CW:H). Whilst discussion on this programme is limited, in that it is informed by only a single participant and that it is a very new programme, the feedback has been exceptional thus far.

Evaluation:

*General transformation attempts*

According to participants’ discussions, transformation was largely seen as a process that had been inadequately conceptualised, strategised, and supported within the institution. All this contributed to the slow pace of change, particularly with regard to race and gender transformation. A number of women and black academic staff experienced severe exclusion, and situations such as these require institutional attention in order for transformation attempts to be successful. Progressive staff at UCT have mobilised, through the Black Caucus, to shape the direction of change at UCT. Their progress has thus far been limited, based on the nature of the institution’s interaction with them as an informal network. However, the group is highly committed to seeing real substantive change and is likely to be an essential force behind the drive for academic staff transformation at UCT.
A number of participants reflected on the increased impetus for change during the period March to September 2004. Several black participants speculated that this may be due to the internal audit but hoped that it was not the only reason for the increased status of transformation on UCT’s agenda. Women and black academics felt that the space for change was being created, although to a large extent these attempts were seen to be fraught with procedural irregularities and seen to contain too few checks and balances. There was a fear that this new generation of initiatives would bear out in similar fashion to the existing committees, which were felt to be largely ineffectual and seen as a smokescreen distorting the real picture of the institution.

**Programmatic Responses**

Lastly, the programmatic responses reviewed showed real commitment to change, although this has largely been cast in skills development language and thereby focusing more on technical empowerment versus participative empowerment. Co-ordinators felt that these programmes were still in the conceptual phase and that evaluation would be premature, given that only a few participants have been recruited and that the programmes were in their first year of existence. None-the-less, the support shown towards the ERP in particular, highlights that through this personalised approach, subtle but lasting change within the institution may be occurring. Furthermore, this illustrates a concerted attempt to change the experiences of junior-mid level academics at the institution. As with Wits, retreats are held at exclusive venues which are likely to consume a significant amount of their budget (See appendix D for venue location).

Staff discussed how the institution had inadequately conceptualised and understood the meaning of race within post-apartheid South Africa. Whilst staff felt the institution was able to engage with this concept at a theoretical or rhetorical level, it failed to substantively implement change within this arena.
Conclusion

This chapter has discussed contemporary academics’ perceptions and experiences of UCT, and academic staff transformation at the institution. In terms of labour practice, it has shown how UCT has overcome inequality in remuneration with the introduction of the ‘Rate for Job’ scheme. However, it has also raised academics concerns over the implications of the casualisation of academic labour for black and women academics. In addition, it has also demonstrated the lack of clarity that new academics have in regards to their employment conditions.

Institutional racism and sexism have been shown to be continuities of the apartheid workplace regime. However, the institution has recently implemented several innovative attempts to transform academics’ experiences. Three such innovations are: senate co-option, equity committees, and transformation workshops. None-the-less, the chapter identifies some very serious allegations of institutional sexism that have taken place alongside these positive changes. In addition, participants also questioned whether sufficient checks and balances were in place to make these new policies highly effective.

The chapter also briefly introduced NAPP and ERP as two possible long-term progressive transformation programmes which could perhaps be used as models for academic staff transformation elsewhere. Lastly, academic staff activism, in the form of the Black Caucus, was also noted as a feature which could sustain the drive towards academic staff transformation at UCT.
Chapter Six Endnotes

1 Statistics for the period of 1996 to 1999 could not be obtained.
2 The researcher was not able to access 2005 data and therefore, this discussion is based on 2004 data.
3 Engineering and the Built Environment.
4 Although, cleaning and catering workers are no longer within the university's employ as they have been outsourced to Supercare and Kagiso-Khulani.
5 However, it was also not an issue that was probed in interviews with black academics.
6 This was the general finding but obviously, as already discussed, there were also critical and progressive white academics within the institution.
7 Much of which has already been discussed under the section on race and institutional racism.
8 See chapters two and seven for more.
9 This will be discussed in greater detail in chapters seven and eight.
10 To mention only a few.
11 It is important to note that the research at UCT was conducted during August and September of 2004, before the Hahn-Tladi incident and the resultant upsurge of transformation dialogue.
12 Unfortunately, I was unable to speak to any academics who had explicitly come into the institutions via these initiatives. Furthermore, a comparison of the role of funders in the success of a programme would be an area worth exploring more in the South African case.
13 Unfortunately, I was unable to interview any participants because of limited fieldwork time in Cape Town.