

Goldsmiths Precarious Workers' Bulletin

Bulletin No. 5
Nov 19



By *Justice for Workers*

Casualisation of academic staff is one of the key issues of this strike. Casualisation refers to the tendency of academic work to be split up into smaller, part-time jobs on fixed contracts. More and more academic workers face a precarious existence, expected to carry out more work for less pay, and in many cases unsure how they are going to pay their rent when the latest four-month contract runs out. If we don't win this strike, the immiseration of academic workers will continue and intensify. This will cause more stress, more overwork, less time for research, and less time to engage meaningfully with students. In the longer run, these developments will make academic work impossible for anyone without significant wealth of their own. This will aggravate the racial, gendered, and class disparities that already mar academic work. This strike is crucial in reversing this process.

In this situation, it's easy to think that we need to focus on winning this strike and setting all other concerns aside. However, the problems facing academic workers are broader, and they just can't be separated from the struggles of other workers in education. Learning doesn't just involve students and academics; facilities need to be cleaned and maintained, buildings need to be opened and secured, food needs to be cooked: there are hundreds of other workers involved in running the university. If we are going to speak about casualisation in higher education, it would be a mistake to limit this to academic workers alone. Cleaners, security guards, receptionists,

administrative and library workers, and many others are also facing the same kind of stress and anxiety that comes with being constantly asked to do more work for less pay and with less security.

Many of these workers are feeling the squeeze more sharply, subject to harsher exploitation, to bullying and intimidation from management, and are marginalised by a system that categorises their labour as "unskilled" and their bodies as replaceable. As a community of education workers, we need to struggle together to build the kind of university we want to work, teach, and learn in.

Many of these workers are organising and fighting back against this exploitation. The cleaners, receptionists, and security guards at Goldsmiths have won an astounding series of victories in the last year (though there remains a lot to be fought for). Outsourced workers organising with the IWGB union at UCL are taking sustained strike action this month, fighting to be brought in-house on terms and conditions in line with the rest of the workforce. These events are taking place against a backdrop of years of outsourced workers organising their own unions and movements, often small, worker-led, and prepared to use strikes, community organising, and direct action to win. These initiatives have been hugely effective, winning improved conditions for workers where other, more established unions have been unable or unwilling to do so.

Students at Goldsmiths have also struggled fiercely in the last years for decent housing, for better mental health services, for meaningful participation in the running of the university; in other words, against the casualisation and precarity of their own existence. Most recently, Goldsmiths Anti-Racist Action (GARA) undertook the longest student occupation in UK history to combat institutional racism. For GARA, the struggles of facilities staff are crucial to their campaign. While committed to an active anti-racist approach to curricula, pedagogical methods, and student services, students recognise that to fight racism in higher education also means supporting the struggles of facilities workers, who are overwhelmingly racialised and whose exploitation cannot be separated from this fact. Student activists have also insisted on defending these workers' fundamental democratic right to organise with the union of their choice — including the IWGB, with whom Goldsmiths security guards took forward their in-housing campaign — and actively supporting the base union initiatives that have emerged from their struggles.

There is already a powerful and coherent response emerging to the generalisation of precarity and casualisation in higher education. Different groups of workers and students have developed new tactics and forms of organisation, and have been successfully building meaningful solidarity across the limits of the roles assigned to them by the institutions. Student and worker organising bridges the structural divide of the workforce by pay grade imposed by recognised trade union representation. Where established unions have been slow to respond to outsourcing and casualisation, these groups have fought back with confidence, courage and creativity. In the last round of UCU strikes, casualised academic workers and students were at the forefront of the struggle and played a major role in imbuing that strike with creativity and militancy.

The centre of the struggle against casualisation has not come from the established unions, but from the most exploited and marginalised workers and students and the organisations they have formed. This is a stark fact. As union members, these struggles should not only challenge and inspire us to step up our own organising, they should also make us attentive to the depth of the crises which they are in response to. Workers active in the established education unions need to

make a choice: to join forces with these emerging movements and develop ideas and practices that allow us to form a strong and militant movement together, or to remain peripheral or even obstructive to the movement against casualisation and precarity. In the long run, the latter will inevitably lead to a hollowing out and ossification of these unions, as active members become disillusioned and drift away. The ambivalent response to UCU's calls for solidarity from many committed student activists at Goldsmiths is proof of this. Students and casualised workers will support the strikes of their colleagues and lecturers, but rightly expect a meaningful voice in the direction of the union and the focus of its actions. UCU is in a unique position at Goldsmiths; it is the union with the most clout and the greatest capacity for strike action. This means its struggles often form a flashpoint for the concerns of broader sections of the university community. If UCU is going to count on the solidarity of these sectors, it needs to struggle for them too. Solidarity is mutual, or it's not solidarity at all.

We need to build towards an organisational openness that allows us to struggle meaningfully together. This means adapting the organisational forms we have developed into ones that are more responsive to one another, whatever the role we are assigned by the employers. There are certainly risks involved in this. At institutions like Goldsmiths, unions are closely involved in the management of industrial relations, and this has won many important concessions. There may be a reluctance to risk this balance of power by expanding the struggle in unpredictable directions. There may also be skepticism to changing direction in response to a surge in militancy and activism that will inevitably also face an ebb further down the line. However, the long term marketisation and austerity in higher education is likely to chip away at the slow and steady negotiating power of unions regardless. While it is indeed likely that militancy will ebb and flow, this is all the more reason to be bold now, when the chance presents itself to learn and grow.

To do so will take work and thought, but there is no reason why organisational pluralism and a diversity of tactics shouldn't be a strength. Think of what we could do at a negotiating table with more union reps than managers. Think what could be won with a strike of *all* workers at Goldsmiths, with the active involvement of student activists. Imagine the new kinds of learning and research we

can develop in an environment of active and meaningful solidarity between cleaners, security guards, students, academic workers, and everyone who keeps the university running. It might be a reach, but the organisations and practices we develop here can have repercussions across the sector. This is worth fighting for, and it is probably our best shot at building the university we want. The fact is that we are not in dispute with an employer over the fair distribution of profits: we are in dispute over the fair distribution of loss. Institutions like Goldsmiths face systematic underfunding, and are forced to compete in a higher education “market” that is inevitably

stacked against them. While excessive pay for senior management and questionable investments locally are certainly part of the problem, the reason we are facing immiseration as workers is a specific set of state policies that result in worsening conditions and the undermining of education as a public good. These are political questions. This requires something more than straightforward, sectional trade unionism, it requires a political response that builds collective power. **The struggles of outsourced workers, casualised academic workers, and student activists are the best opportunity in years to do this. Let’s not waste it.**

“After paying my rent and the bills, I have around £250 to live on. I have had to take a number of part-time jobs over the years in order to sustain myself financially, including paying my £2000/year PhD tuition fees. This has an important impact on my PhD writing as I am often unable to dedicate enough time to it – this being another source of great anxiety. The precarity of my working conditions is made worse by the fact that departments are often unable to guarantee the number of hours they will give to ALs until the last moment. This year, due to an administrative mistake, my contract had to be amended in emergency at the very end of September. I lost two hours of teaching – corresponding to about £200/month and to find a replacement part-time job to sustain myself at short notice was difficult and stressful. We are often asked as ALs to do small unpaid tasks that seem invisible to the permanent members of staff. e.g. helping finding essay/exam questions, helping with organising VLE pages and uploading documents, informally training new AL colleagues for the courses we have already worked on. This is particularly striking when it comes to marking. As an example, we are currently paid to spend 35 minutes to mark a 3,500 words essay (30 mins for a 2,500 words essay) and we are told to write detailed and personalised feedbacks to improve student satisfaction. I therefore always end up spending far more time on their essays than I am actually paid for. When teaching I try to make sure my anxiety does not impact on my students and on their learning, and I devote a large amount of time to preparing for my classes. I am however aware that my job is unlikely to become permanent and that I probably won’t manage to become a full-time member of staff. I try not to let this prospect affect my morale too much, both as a teacher and a researcher, but that’s often quite hard.”
(anonymous testimony given to Goldsmiths Workers Action)



Letter from Goldsmiths Cleaners

The following letter was composed by Goldsmiths cleaners and Justice for Workers and was sent to the Warden Professor Frances Corner on 25 November 2019. As of 2 December 2019 no response has been received.

Dear Prof Frances Corner,

This is an urgent message to you about the situation we are facing as cleaners at Goldsmiths.

We are overworked. Almost every shift we have, we are expected to complete more tasks than is possible in the time we are given. For example, in the big buildings where there should be 6 or 7 people, we have just 2 or 3 people cleaning three or more floors. And when the lift breaks down we are having to carry heavy equipment and rubbish up and down the stairs.

Even some of the managers have admitted that the work isn't getting done, and sometimes they tell us just take the bin and go! So the rooms don't get cleaned — clearly this isn't just our problem but a problem for the uni.

The workload is so excessive, it is making a big impact on our health and wellbeing. So we have come up with some practical ways you can address this problem. Take it from us, these measures would really help address the situation:

1. Reassess the workload

> Hold a meaningful consultation and ongoing monitoring process involving cleaning staff, Facilities and Estates management, HR and trade unions

2. Stop adding inappropriate tasks like emptying the sanitary bins

> This task should be done safely by PHS. Recently managers have been telling cleaners to do it without proper equipment and safety precautions

3. Allocate more hours so that the work can be done effectively and safely

> Many of us still only have 20 hours/week in our contracts. This makes it harder to get all the work done, and limits our job security

4. Allocate more contractual hours without making us “apply for our own jobs”

> Even to get the split shift, we have had to write a CV and cover letter, as if it was a new job. This process is time-consuming and humiliating as we know our work

5. Remove the 35-hour/wk limit

> Most of us are not allowed to work more than 35 hours/week. This just removes the flexibility that is required when additional cleaning is needed or when we are short-staffed e.g. when colleagues are away on leave

6. Give people a choice between split shifts (3 hours + 4 hours) and a straight 7-hour shift

> Many of us live far from college, so travelling twice means 4 hours travel per day just to work 7 hours total. Give individuals the choice, then we can make it work

7. Reinstate the overnight shift for those who want it

> A few of us used to have 11pm-6am shift which we were able to fit with care responsibilities. It's also efficient to do certain parts of the cleaning when buildings aren't in use

There have even been cases where we are asked to do extra tasks *after our shifts end*. And I'm sure you are aware that the bullying that happened under ISS has continued, with managers taking out their frustration on us, bad-mouthing us in our records. Despite in-housing we are also being pressured into working while sick.

Clearly the current structure is not working. Please listen to us and implement these changes. Only then can Goldsmiths really present in-housing as a success story. If not, it will be very clear to the wider community that the university is still operating a two-tier workforce.

Yours sincerely,

Goldsmiths Cleaners



Open letter to students from casualised academics at Goldsmiths

We are casualised academics working across Goldsmiths writing in response to the recent email sent by the college's warden Professor Frances Corner addressing the UCU strike action. We are greatly dismayed to find out that the warden has decided, against the actions of her predecessor, to deduct money from hourly paid academic staff during the upcoming strike.

Many of us, who depend on our income from teaching to get by, find ourselves in a state of financial disarray as a result of this decision. We are entirely unclear as to the motivations behind the warden's decision. These deductions are likely to recover an insignificant amount of money for the university next to the toll it will cost hourly paid staff. Moreover, this decision seems to have been calculated as a punitive measure to prevent and deter casualised members of staff from taking part in trade union activities.

For many of us, the threat of these deductions, which will hit us during the seasonal period, have compromised our confidence in standing with our permanent colleagues in this nationwide strike action. We work tirelessly and passionately for this institution and care a great deal about the learning conditions of our students. It is our right to participate in actions that directly address our interests as casualised academic workers in HE.

However, the decision to deduct from our pay will inevitably make it very difficult for some of us to be involved in actions that are unanimously supported by staff across the college. This is a direct reflection of how casualisation disenfranchises precarious academic staff. We are disproportionately exposed to punitive measures taken by management to mitigate the effectiveness of strike action because our livelihoods depends on the modest pay we receive for our vital work.

Many of us already feel marginalised in the university because our employment status distances us from departmental processes that shape our working conditions. The decision to deduct from our pay and to deter us from showing solidarity with our colleagues takes advantage of our peripheral stature in the university and sews division across the teaching body. So much for One Goldsmiths!

We demand that the warden immediately rescind the decision to deduct our pay and show respect for the lowest paid teaching staff in the university.

Furthermore, we are disturbed by what seems to be the warden's lack of understanding of the issue of casualisation and how it currently plays out at Goldsmiths. She says:

“On working conditions, we are determined to provide the best possible experience for our staff and in turn ensure that our students receive the best teaching and learning opportunities and care.

Addressing casualisation of staff is key to this. At Goldsmiths we do not use zero-hour contracts and we will build on this by working with unions and colleagues to explore ways of providing employees with the job security they need.”

Firstly, casualisation does not simply refer to the use of zero hour contracts but refers to an institutional dependency on temporary fixed-term hourly paid teaching staff to carry out the majority of front line teaching. Graduate Trainee Tutors, Associate Lecturers and Lecture Fractionals are an increasingly large segment of teaching staff at Goldsmiths College. We experience employment insecurity and are paid far less than we are worth to the university. The college could not operate without our discounted and discontinuous academic expertise and pedagogical competencies.

If the senior management team was serious about providing the best possible working conditions for academic staff and in turn the highest quality of teaching for its students, it would not have issued such a glib and misleading response to the reality of casualisation. Instead, it would have acknowledged the scale of casualisation and the direct effects this has on the learning conditions of our students.

The existing model for calculating time paid for seminar preparation, tutorial contact-time, marking and administration on hourly paid fixed term contracts has not been renegotiated since 2013 (when it was established). This is the case even though there has been an exponential rise in student numbers and classroom sizes. Since we prioritise the learning and pastoral needs of our students, we are therefore almost always working far more hours than we are paid for. Concretely this means we are marking assessment scripts for free, carrying out tutorials in excess of our contracted hours and preparing seminars throughout the week in our free time. But while we try to maintain our pedagogical and professional integrity in the face of these prohibitive conditions, we are fundamentally unable to carry out our teaching duties in the way we aspire to. If you have ever had insufficient feedback on an assessment or had too little contact time with a tutor, this is most likely the result of casualisation.

In addition to this, the university has started to review the implementation of a policy established in 2013 that regulates the terms, conditions and treatment of hourly paid academic staff. In the course of this review, UCU has uncovered widespread discrepancies in the way casualised academic staff are paid and treated across the university. This includes many instances of non-compliance with this policy in different departments. This means that since 2013 many hourly paid academics have been incorrectly or differently paid across the university. Only in the last year has this come to light. Without meaningful efforts by the college to address these discrepancies systematically, it has been left to staff members to individually pursue casework to have this situation rectified and to claim compensation. Meanwhile since 2013, cohorts of casualised staff in different departments have been under-paid for their work without any knowledge of this taking place. This is an institution-wide problem and is the direct result of casualisation.

For all of the reasons listed above and many more we support the strike. If Goldsmiths management truly wants to provide casualised employees with security, it should begin today by fulfilling the promises of its own policy and agree to review the Contract Hours Calculator so that it better reflects the reality of teaching in Goldsmiths in 2019. Students deserve better teaching conditions and we deserve better working conditions.

This letter was sent to Goldsmiths students on 24th November and signed by 70 casualised members of academic staff. Names of signatories can be found at:

precariousatgold.wordpress.com/2019/11/23/open-letter-to-students-from-casualised-academics-at-goldsmiths/

Security Campaign Update

This is a crucial moment for low-paid/support workers at Goldsmiths, and for the movement against outsourcing. The security guards are being told to wait while management works out the terms of their in-housing. But many are asking, “why are we not being involved in the process?”

Their campaign started when, following the success of cleaners’ demand to be brought in-house, security guards called for in-housing to address their exploitative working conditions. These include increased workloads, arduous shift patterns, unsafe solitary night patrols, and lack of proper holiday, sick pay, pensions and maternity/paternity leave. Workers had organised around some of these issues in recent years, but outsourcing company CIS had blocked their efforts. Workers unionised with the Independent Workers’ Union of Great Britain (IWGB) and launched their campaign in February 2019, using demonstrations, flyers and regular meetings to raise a collective voice against exploitation. Such tactics have been developed by the IWGB over the past 8 years — it was started in 2011 by migrant, BAME, outsourced university workers and is a growing grassroots union that supports the most marginalised workers to take power in their workplaces.

When Goldsmiths Anti-Racist Action (GARA) formulated its full list of demands cutting broadly and deeply into institutional racism at the university, it included support for the in-housing demand of security guards, and for Goldsmiths to officially recognise the IWGB. The union publicly expressed support for the GARA campaign. GARA students also worked hard to get a security guard and their IWGB rep access to a Council meeting in April, to raise their demands at a higher level. This two-way BAME student-worker solidarity demonstrates a powerful route to building a new politics on campus that exposes and attacks the university’s racist and neoliberal structures.

GARA won commitments from SMT on all its main demands, and in September 2019, Goldsmiths Council approved the in-housing of security staff. Already by this point, a group of security guards had worked with the IWGB to produce a proposal of terms and conditions that would genuinely address their problems. The workers, the union,

Justice4workers and the SU worked to ensure that Goldsmiths management saw this proposal, but we never received so much as a formal acknowledgement of it.

Two months on, the university is ploughing ahead with the security in-housing without meaningful involvement of workers themselves. Goldsmiths has set up an in-housing steering group and an in-housing project board, which have both now met on multiple occasions to plan the process, without giving the workers themselves any say in how their work is organised. Clearly, the university management is taking no real steps to avoid the problems that arose in the in-housing of our comrades in the cleaning staff (see Cleaners’ In-Housing Update below). Aside from holding ‘consultations’ with the workers, which are in fact one-way communication of the future terms, it is clear that the university is deliberately blocking any direct, meaningful participation of workers or of the IWGB in the in-housing process.

The success of the in-housing demand at Goldsmiths, not to mention the same at Senate House (University of London), and the recent strike of nearly 300 outsourced cleaners and security at UCL, show that building workers’ power, generating wider solidarity and publicly calling out institutions are what creates real change. Because if left to management, they will take every opportunity to simply reorganise exploitation, maintaining the two-tier workforce and further entrenching casualisation and precarious work at Goldsmiths.

Cleaner Campaign Update

On 1st May 2019, following their successful campaign, cleaners were brought back in-house as members of staff at Goldsmiths. However, over the past seven months Goldsmiths has consistently failed to listen to cleaners and address urgent issues faced by the workforce, including: workload, shift patterns, hours, toxic management and unnecessary barriers such as a 35 hours/week limit.

The cleaners are massively overworked and the areas they are expected to cover in the short time allocated are impossibly large. The working conditions have not been alleviated from what they were under ISS, before in-housing, and these unjust expectations are affecting the health and wellbeing of the workers. There is pressure to work while sick, with staff having to go to work when they should be at home recovering from serious ailments and injuries. To address this issue the cleaners are calling for meaningful and ongoing consultation to reassess the workload with Facilities and Estates management, HR and trade unions.

The in-housing and subsequent shift restructure on 1st July 2019 implemented a strict reduction in available working hours, with most cleaners given contracts of just 20 hours per week. This effectively meant a loss of income for many who had previously worked much more in overtime. While a 20-hour week is suitable for some, many cleaners have requested extra hours and/or full-time employment through consultation with Unison and Goldsmiths. Despite this, many cleaning staff have been kept on limited contracts, even while there are regular overtime hours available that need filling. Goldsmiths clearly prioritises having a 'flexible' workforce over job security and stability for the cleaning staff. Cleaners have consistently called for more contracted hours to be allocated in a fair and simple way. Until now, to even be considered for additional contract hours, cleaners have been required to apply for their own jobs.

The issue of overtime is further exacerbated by the 35 hours/week maximum allowance, which inhibits any flexibility to fulfil additional cleaning required to cover sickness or leave, ultimately resulting in a further increase to the workload during the limited allocated hours.

Furthermore, current shift patterns do not suit all the workers and need urgent revision and

consultation. For cleaners that live far from college, 'split shifts' mean travelling to and from work twice each day, leading to significant travel time and financial cost. The cleaners are instead simply asking to be given the choice between split shifts or a single 7-hour shift. Previously, some cleaners worked overnight from 11pm–6am, which was suitable for those with daytime care responsibilities, and meant that some work was more efficient as it was undertaken when the buildings are not in use. A restructure instigated by ISS in September 2018 replaced this shift with shorter morning and evening shifts of only 3–4 hours in length. A number of cleaners would choose to reinstate this overnight shift. This is a request that could reasonably be met by Goldsmiths without affecting services, if only they were willing to fit the work to the needs of workers.

In addition to **insufficient hours of work**, **insufficient time to complete work**, and **inappropriate allocation of work**, cleaners must also contend with a **toxic culture of bullying by managers**. Many had hoped that the treatment of workers by management under (outsourcing company) ISS would not continue under Goldsmiths management. Instead, managers needing to meet impossible conditions take out their frustration on cleaners, and Goldsmiths are failing in their duty of care towards their staff by allowing this to continue.

There is a clear disparity between the statements that Goldsmiths has been issuing publicly, and its communication with workers. Cleaners had to wait until 21st August 2019 to receive the first written communication formalising their contracts. Up until then the workers had no confirmation of their terms and conditions of employment, the relevant operational processes and procedures that they would be working with, or the employment standards they could expect as members of Goldsmiths staff. When they did finally receive this information, the cleaners were disappointed to learn that their long and continuous service at Goldsmiths has not been reflected in their salaries, contrary to what had been indicated to cleaners in meetings with HR.

One of the benefits of in-housing is that it has given cleaners more confidence to call out this unacceptable behaviour. But several workers have told us, "Only the name has changed, nothing else," and it is clear cleaners are still not being met with the dignity and respect they have fought for and deserve. Goldsmiths continues to operate on a two-tier workforce. Communication through the quarterly meetings and the union has yielded little improvement for cleaners. On Monday 25th November, cleaners sent an urgent message to the Warden [see above] regarding the situation they are facing. This email follows a message sent on the 18th October from Justice for Workers, which appealed to the Warden for an inclusive in-housing process for security given the many persisting challenges faced by cleaning staff after in-housing. Many of these problems were caused by shortcomings of the in-housing process, not least the failure to properly include cleaners and their union representatives in the undertaking.

The limitations of the process which brought the cleaning services in-house are clearly evident in the meeting minutes of the Cleaning Service Project Board, recently obtained by

Goldsmiths Justice For Workers in a Freedom of Information Request (FOI). The Cleaning Service Project Board was established in January 2019 to oversee the in-housing of cleaning services. However, the minutes reveal that the consultation was insufficient and inadequate. Cleaners were excluded from the discussions, and union representation was limited to just one single meeting of the project board. Furthermore, there are a number of contradictions between official statements made by Goldsmiths, the discussions held in all-staff meetings, and the discussions held in these project board meetings during the in-housing process.

While in-housing is a positive step, so far many of the difficulties faced by cleaners are yet to be alleviated by the in-housing at Goldsmiths. Urgent attention is required to end the discriminatory treatment faced by cleaners, and to ensure that the in-sourcing of security and receptionists is handled more effectively. Until such ongoing injustices in the workforce are fully addressed, the college's self-aggrandising "One Goldsmiths" branding slogan continues to ring hollow.



Photo detail: 'Who keeps the cube white?' banner at the Justice for Workers inhousing demonstration at the opening of Goldsmiths Centre for Contemporary Art September 2018

GARA demand updates

Goldsmiths Anti-Racist Action (GARA) occupation of Deptford Town Hall came to an end 26 July after 137 days, having won extensive demands to combat institutional racism at the university. It has also brought to the campus and the local community a new force of anti-racist energy. The occupation may be over, but for GARA, this is just the beginning.

During these 137 days, GARA hit the national press and won the support of activists and campaigners all over the world, including US revolutionary activist Angela Davis, former mayor of Sheffield and MEP Magid Magid, Vicky Foxcroft MP, and campaigners against campus militarisation at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. In the final week of occupation, the Senior Management Team (SMT) threatened and took legal action against Black and Minority Ethnic, Muslim, LGBTQ and disabled students (this was not the first time that SMT had done this). So much for Goldsmiths' reputation for "progressive" politics. It did this to force GARA into leaving the occupation without signed commitments from SMT on the demands. Regardless, GARA stood its ground, in spite of the court-order threat of police and bailiffs, and within days won new expressions of support from around 150 student officers nationally, over 300 staff at Goldsmiths, and over 1500 supporters around the world.

GARA and supporters successfully ramped up the pressure on Goldsmiths to sign the contract, committing them to an unprecedented series of actions. If you haven't read GARA's statement in full please do: <https://tinyurl.com/t6zc7gu>

In an effort to hold Goldsmiths to account here are the most recent updates on the demands.

Reform of the hate-crime reporting centre and new complaints procedure:

The meetings have been very slow and not as productive as they should've been. It was agreed that we will have someone in the university help with this in a more concrete way - on a part time basis. We will also have two new academics join

the group. Members on this group include the welfare and liberation officer: Mona, the campaigns and activities officer: Beth, 1 member of SU staff, Howard, 2 members of GARA and university staff (including the director of HR and director of Student Experience).

Opening Deptford Town Hall to the local community:

Some limited number of local organisations such as Deptford First have begun using the space and GARA have met with the warden to discuss the scope of future use of the space. On the 5th of December there will be an open call to various other local organisations to discuss and map out how they envisage use of the space.

Security in-housing and recognition of IWGB:

The university has a security in-housing project board and steering group, both with UNISON presence. Only one student representative is allowed on the project board, (none on the steering group which manages the details of the security in-housing) which was first offered to the SU president but is now held by the part-time campaigns officer. IWGB presence on any of the boards is refused on the basis that they're not a recognised union by the university. Their recognition is therefore prevented by the agreement between UCU and UNISON.

Mandatory anti-racism training for all staff:

There has been a working group set up to discuss the formation of this training that has only met once in July. GARA and the SU were told they'd meet again after a month but haven't been contacted for 3 months and only in October to be told that the next meeting is at the end of November then that was changed to mid-December. This delay puts into jeopardy the signed agreement between GARA and SMT which states that the training will be rolled out in the 2019/20 academic year. Members on the group: Mona, Joe (SU president), 1 GARA rep, UCU and UNISON reps, as well as other university staff.

The racist SEAtS surveillance software will not be rolled out to any more departments until assessed and a decision made.

1 GARA rep and 2 sabbs sit on this board. GARA and the SU were asked to be a part of the work to launch a consultation with staff and students on

whether SEAtS should go ahead or not but were not involved in the drafting of the brief nor in the selection of the external organisation that will carry out the consultation. The university has spent around £40,000 to launch the consultation only to prove to themselves that SEAtS should continue. In the brief is included a 'myth-busting' exercise on the nature of SEAtS. No departments are currently running the pilot programme or will do until the data impact and equalities impact assessments are completed and released.

Reinstatement of two Palestinian scholarships:

These will be launched for people to apply for the year 2020/2021. Mona, the SU welfare and liberation officer will ensure the immigration and scholarships teams start the process early, because in the past Palestinians got their visas delayed and arrived to Goldsmiths late.

STACS - reinstatement of contacts hours:

The dispute has been taken to a stage three complaint. Students, alumni and staff have been meeting regularly and planning for hearings. Other than reinstatement of hours, the dispute includes reimbursement for lost hours.

More BME staff in the Wellbeing and Counselling teams:

One BME wellbeing advisor was hired and there is a new manager for the team who is also BME. No new counsellors have been hired. (This is obviously still not enough, given the current student population).

Deptford Town Hall statues:

Historic England visited with SMT, 2 sabbs and a GARA rep to have a tour around and discuss possibilities and GARA is currently waiting for Elisabeth Hill to get in touch again. This will be combined with the open conversation with the community for DTH access. This will be tied in with the work that the BME researcher will do and a call out proposal is yet to be released.

Larger prayer room:

Done.

Black history fund:

The SU with feedback and input from black GARA members drafted a paper (just to help with labour) and it was sent to SMT. The paper outlined the general principles and process of accessing the fund. SMT only responded to this a few days ago with some comments. The fund will officially launch in January.

Statement Acknowledging Goldsmiths' Complicity in Racism:

An email was sent out to all students and staff on the 23rd October which was drafted in collaboration with GARA. The statement is also present on Goldsmiths' website.

Additional anti-racism work:

One new researcher has been hired and another staff member was also hired to continue the work. Both work under Nicola Rollock. This however follows the deliberate exclusion of GARA and the SU from the Insider, Outsider report and the omission of detailed statements related to the occupation within it.

Setting up the Racial Justice Group:

We were told a "Racial Justice Group" will be set up to overlook all the work that is being done and to ensure accountability. It has been almost 5 months since the occupation ended and the group still hasn't been set up. We were initially told it will be a committee that will feed straight into Council (the highest decision making body at Goldsmiths), and then told it will only be a working group which will feed to management. (the same people who took students to court). Recently, Elisabeth Hill, a member of SMT, has blamed the UCU strike for the delay in setting it up (which is extremely untrue and disingenuous as this has been delayed for 5 months). Last thing that was promised is that the group will be set up in December 2019.

Upcoming dates:

Wednesday 4 December, 8am-2pm, **Shut it Down! iwgb - UCU joint strike** at UCL

Wednesday 4 December, 1:30-3pm, **Staff-Student Assembly on Precarious Workers and Casualisation**, Goldsmiths SU cafe

Note: Justice for Workers / Justice for Cleaners / Goldsmiths Worker' Action are all used interchangeably to refer to a group of Goldsmiths students and workers working towards fair working conditions for *all* staff.



Associate Lecturers (ALs) are mostly hourly paid - they are paid for their teaching hours, with a “multiplier” that is supposed to cover marking and admin work. This often comes down to just 20 minutes to mark a whole essay, even a long essay that assesses a whole semester’s work

We provide students with a quality education. We therefore expect teachers to give detailed feedback to students.

My 20 minutes are up and I've barely finished reading it! Should I write a quick comment and be done? Or work unpaid to give them proper feedback?



One paragraph of feedback on a 3,500 word essay???
How am I supposed to learn from this?

When students complain to their departments about the lack of feedback they receive, they are often told to be proactive and get a tutorial with their tutors. But these are the same tutors who are not paid properly for such sessions! Anyway why is the onus put on stressed students to have the self-confidence to ask more?! As Goldsmiths Anti-Racist Action have highlighted, levels of stress and of self-confidence are affected by race, gender, sexuality and mental health

The amount of one-on-one time students get with their teachers is not properly set out and paid for. A UCU survey found that some departments were paying ALs only enough for 6 minutes per student per module!