



Academic Outreach

**A Review of the Centre for Civil Society (CCS)
University of Kwazulu-Natal, Durban**

SYNOPSIS

As is the nature of such endeavours, the review of CCS, which turned out to be a tricky and challenging task, was based on intensive teamwork between the panel and the chair (see “Review Panel”, Appendix C, page 27). The process is briefly described in 1.4 (“Methodology”, p.2), following the Introduction on pages 1 and 2.

Specific instructions by the DVC of Humanities (listed verbatim in Appendix D, page 27, under “Terms of Reference”) are paraphrased as headlines for Section 2, paragraphs 2.1 (p. 2) – 2.4 (p. 19), which represent the bulk of this report.

Guided by previous reports by Harper (2004) and Sogge (2006) we formulate some conclusions at the end of each paragraph. A final conclusion, together with some options, is introduced in Section 2.4 (p. 19), followed by our recommendation on page 21.

Appendix A (p.23) details a further request by the DVC, with a response given by the CCS in form of an ‘Institutional Review Mandate’ (pp 23 –26). Appendix B (p. 26) is a list of all interviewees. Finally, a list of references and some abbreviations terminate our report on page 28.

Compiled (with the assistance of the Review Panel)
by:

Peter Krumm
UKZN DURBAN
29 February 2008

1. INTRODUCTION: The Centre for Civil Society (CCS) in Context

1.1 History, Composition and Commitment

The CCS was established in 2001 by Professor Adam Habib. After a brief sojourn in the School for Community Development and Adult Education, and after some negotiations with the Head of the School of Development Studies (SDS), Professor Mike Morris, it found a home in the SDS at the beginning of 2002, by which time Professor Vishnu Padayachee had become the new Head of School. After Habib's departure to a senior post at the Human Sciences Research Council in early 2004, Professor Vishnu Padayachee took over as Acting Centre Director for nine months. Professor Patrick Bond began his tenure as director (originally set for three years but since extended) on 1 October 2004.

The Constitution [CNS] for the new Centre, dated February 2002, lists as composition of the Centre a director, a management committee, a 'nationally based advisory board', a research board and Centre staff including research associates and fellows [CNS, 5.1 – 5.5]. The introduction to the Constitution sets its mandate into the following context:

The achievement of democracy in South Africa marks a decisive break with the authoritarian past. However it is important to be mindful of the evidence that unconsolidated democracies remain fragile. A consolidated democracy is defined as a democracy in which citizens have the entrenched right and capacity to engage the government around policy development and implementation in both partnership and opposition. A vibrant, informed, confident, well resourced and effective civil society is therefore crucial to the consolidation of democracy. The Centre for Civil Society will be committed to academic and research excellence and to a scholarship of engagement. [CNS, Introduction]

1.2 Previous Reviews

There have been two previous Reviews of the CCS: the first a mid-term review on behalf of the Atlantic Philanthropies' Gerald Kraak (by Ann Harper) in late 2004 [Harper, 2004] and the second, a five-year 'end-of-grant', external evaluation done by David Sogge in September 2006 – 'to assess activities and outcomes, to reflect on the Centre's positioning and its prospects for future funding'. Sogge was also, subsequently, 'encouraged' to look at internal management [Sogge, 2006]. Patrick Bond had arrived just before the mid-term review, which concluded that the CCS had 'given shape and form to the vision of a national centre dedicated to scholarly reflection upon and engagement with civil society' [Harper, p15]. The 'national' was given content by Habib as reflected in the kind of research that was supported, in the members of the Advisory Board, in the services provided (such as training) and in partnerships with a range of institutions [TS, pp 315-16]. Morris, however, argued that it was an impossibility to have a 'national centre' located within a specific institution [TS, p 359].

1.3 This Review

According to a letter to the Chair from Prof. F.N.M. Mazibuko, DVC & Head of College: Humanities (28 August 2007), "it is the job of the review panel to collect information and to hear the views of members of the Faculty and other key stakeholders" (for a list of

interviewees see Appendix B). Above all, the review is to “provide an opportunity for reflection, for airing views, for posing suggestions and for developing constructive ways forward.”

The review panel (see Appendix C) was asked to do, inter alia, the following:

- “To assess the performance of the Centre” - this is dealt with in 2.1 (a) below
- “To assess the profile and image of the Centre within, and its impact on relevant external constituencies and stakeholders in civil society” - dealt with in 2.1 (b)
- “To re-assess the rationale for having it based at a University and within a School such as the School of Development Studies” - dealt with in 2.2
- “To provide a firmer and clearer basis to position, staff and resource the Centre in any possible future phase” – as dealt with in 2.3

1.4 Methodology

The review extended over several months, due to some administrative-technical glitches. For starters, in conjunction with the research office, clarification about procedure was sought from, and given by, QPA (Leanne Browning). Preliminary information about CCS and SDS was obtained in private conversations of the chair and one panel member with the director of CCS (Patrick Bond) and SDS (Julian May). Submissions were invited with some positive responses. The panel met for introductory deliberation and then conducted face to face and telephonic interviews with the participants (Appendix B) for three days (17 – 19 Sept 2007). Transcripts of the interviews were prepared in questionable quality by a commercial enterprise and eventually distributed to panel members for reading. Preliminary drafts, compiled by the chair with input from panel members, were circulated for comments to all committee members and to stakeholders in the SDS, CCS, and faculty. There were subsequent meetings of panel members with stakeholders to collect further information. One panel member withdrew towards the end for reasons of time constraints. The full panel met for a final session on 21 Feb 2008.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

More specifically, the terms of reference for this review (*as accepted by the Board of Studies, SDS, 2 Apr. 07, amended on 2 July 2007, see Appendix D for exact wording*) are: to reflect upon, analyse, and assess,

2.1. (a) Strengths and weaknesses of the Centre over the last five years in relation to its original mandate

Questions that arise in response to this task are, inter alia: what was the original mandate (according to the Tender Document [TD] and Constitution)? What do Sogge and Harper have to say about the strengths and weaknesses of the Centre? What is the view of the review panel?

(i) A closer look at history. The CCS was founded as the *Centre for the Study of the Non-Profit Sector*, through a successful tender by the office of the V-C of the then University of Natal in 2001, in response to a request by funding organisation Atlantic Philanthropies. Reference to the broad generic term “non-profit sector” in usage at the time was intended to comprise the space outside of the state, private capital and family, and include NGOs, CBOs, organised labour, churches and other organisations. The establishment of the Centre for Civil Society was subsequently approved by Senate and Council (February 2002) [Harper, 4].

The decision to submit a tender for the establishment of the Centre was driven by the then Vice Chancellor, Prof Brenda Gourley, and drew strongly upon the university's purported commitment, capacity and track record in "engagement *with* the community in conjunction with scholarly reflection *on* the community". A synergistic range of Schools, Centres and programmes, many based in the Faculty of Community and Development Disciplines, were cited in support of this contention. [Harper, 6]

Having set the terms of its call for tenders, and having selected a proposal from the University of Natal, Atlantic Philanthropies made its grant on the understanding that the Centre would become a scholarly think-tank whose work would influence public policy in South Africa. By 2006 it was to have contributed to the following outcomes:

- an enhanced public profile for the non-profit sector;
- the emergence of "non-profit studies" as a legitimate, acknowledged field of theoretical and empirical study, characterised by a multi-disciplinary approach and intellectual rigour;
- the publication of a body of new theoretically sound and intellectually rigorous research on the sector;
- improved policy formulation and an improved legislative and fiscal environment for the sector, as a consequence of better- targeted and better-quality policy research. [Sogge, 8; see also Harper, 15]

According to Harper, the Centre was envisaged as "a *lean* structure that will map existing research, provide a focus for new research, link research needs to research providers, host a research fund to sponsor innovative research on the non-profit sector...."

She concludes that "the centre has the potential to foster the new and growing tradition of non-profit sector studies and act as a catalyst for other research initiatives" [Harper, 5]

Later she insists that although "the tender has been endorsed by the Executive of the University of Natal, it is critical that the Director and Advisory Board have the latitude to develop, refine and re-direct the project on the basis of consultation with one another and with relevant stake-holders and role-players... it (the University) certainly can and does commit to putting its full weight behind the Centre and to ensuring adherence to the spirit of the tender" [Harper, 13]

Harper further notes, that "the Centre is the first of its kind on the continent and from an international perspective is one of the few locations outside of developed countries dedicated to this area of scholarship. CCS has been through a high energy, large scale expansionist phase in the number of staff employed, the scope and spread of the projects undertaken, the range of high profile national and international researchers commissioned, and its capacity to attract significant funding. During this time the director had to straddle and negotiate the potentially competing imperatives of academic credibility and the world of social activism." [ibid p. 13]

This *straddling* between academic credibility and social activism, succinctly expressed in David Sogge's "Inquiring Activism"- title for his 'end-of-grant' External Evaluation [Sogge, Sept. 2006], is reflected in the CCS Constitution (listed as '3. core purpose')

“The mission of the Centre will have two central thrusts. The first is to promote the study of civil society as a legitimate and flourishing area of scholarly activity in South Africa. The second is to develop and promote partnerships aimed at knowledge sharing and capacity-building in civil society. Civil society is defined as that element of society that is independent of the state and the for-profit sector.” [CNS, p. 1]

Subsequently, under its first Director (in Phase I), the Centre’s mandate widened. In addition to research, it aimed to engage actively with civil society and to strengthen training for it at several levels. The Constitution further committed the Centre to educational roles in two different realms:

- a) post-graduate training of students pursuing masters and PhD degrees offered by the university, in collaboration with the School of Development Studies; and
- b) in-service training of ‘people working in, with and on civil society’ [Sogge, 9].

Implicit in the Centre’s vision statement is the ultimate goal of the Centre “to strengthen the non-profit and voluntary sector”. Harper argued that it is important that the Centre be afforded the intellectual space to interpret this mandate and bring its considerable creative energy to bear on this task while consolidating the niche which it is developing within the community of civil society scholars and researchers [Harper, 15].

(ii) Organisational Structure. The tender document [TD, 2001] noted that the Centre should be staffed by a Director, a webmaster, and an administrator; that it should be national in its operations, in order to facilitate research (including hosting a research fund) and build and disseminate knowledge [TD, appendix summary]. In terms of focus the TD raised questions about the decline of the NGO and growth of the CBO sector, a correct evaluation of the terrain, and one into which the CCS has increasingly moved. In addition, the tender document placed the suggested CCS within the University of Natal (UN) mission statement, including that:

“The University of Natal dedicates its excellence in teaching, research and development to progress through reconstruction. It undertakes quality research to national and international standards and provides development services which meet community needs ... It aims to be a socially responsive institution, reacting ethically and intellectually to the many problems of South Africa and the rest of the world. It directs its considerable resources ... to redressing the growing divide between rich and poor, thus filling a role that universities are uniquely qualified to perform.” (Vision Statement, UN)

Indicative of this vision, the TD listed 16 units (departments, etc) within the University which could relate to the CCS, once established. The TD also recommends that the CCS should be located in the then existing School of Community Studies (SCS) in the then Faculty of CADD in the University of Natal, and be administratively served by the SCS. Here, again, changes need to be noted, as the CCS immediately took over its own administrative self-management, including activities related to its involvement in and with the CBO sector.

This is an area of intense disagreement, and even bitter conflict between the CCS and its host body, the School of Development Studies (SDS) and is at the core of the outcome sought by the CCS from this review process, namely a number of extra (non-research project) posts.

The panel understands that the TD was drafted and submitted in relation to the initial period of funding (five years) where a set of responsibilities to the donors was set out. The general thrust of the CCS, however, should rather be measured in this review against its Constitution (which would certainly have been shaped by the original agreement to Atlantic Philanthropies – it was, after all, giving effect to the terms of the needs expressed by the donor – but also reflects its location within a university) and the measures of evaluation provided for the structures related to the CCS (the Board, management committee, and location within a specific sector in the University). The constitution (to our knowledge) was never changed, and serves on the CCS website as a statement of intent and reflection of mode of operation.

The Constitution calls for a management committee, ‘nationally based advisory board’ (to meet twice a year), an advisory research board (to meet at least annually), a Director (a University-created post, specifically for this position as noted in the TD), and ‘research associates and fellows’. The intricacies of the director’s post are discussed in 2.3 (pp. 15/16).

Conclusion

- *An initial mandate was fulfilled, in terms of establishing the CCS as a functioning research unit on aspects of civil society; of drafting a Constitution that would indicate a longer-term mandate (than the initial five years); of raising money for (research) projects beyond the establishment fund provided by Atlantic Philanthropies and Mott; of operating within and with the SDS, and creating an effective profile for the CCS;*
- *The mandate appears to be failing in terms of establishing the CCS as an on-going ‘national’ research unit – with a research fund, with an effective on-going national research presence, and of forming the ‘association’ that was part of the initial brief. Although the CCS had a huge research fund operating from 2001-06 that supported work all over South Africa and allowed sponsoring CCS presentation at all national social science associations, the grant permitting this has now dried up. Instead of forming ‘the association’ the CCS promoted the international society for third sector research;*
- *The mandate was interpreted in a different way by the next Director (Bond) (although elements may have been there through the contract staff employed under Habib), and this set new criteria for evaluation. Here the success was in much closer ties to CBOs in its contract activity (the Wolpe lectures and the ‘extended’ purpose these have served, local level activism and ‘advocacy’, micro-research, resource functions and associated posts), and a very high profile engagement with ‘social justice’ and international civil society concerns through the presence of the new Director, Patrick Bond;*
- *This new direction created its own set of problems: a disjuncture between the activities of the Director (international, individualised, and high profile), and that at the local level (undertaken by junior staff and/or contract staff); the increasing failure to engage in long-term collaborative research projects, specifically bounded in terms of personnel and time, a direction which appears to have had serious implications for funding; the engagement of contract staff on activities that serviced CBOs without financial return through their activities or effective fund-raising (and yet with the expectation that they would be long-term or permanent because there is no clear date of conclusion for these activities); increasing tension between staff (other than the Director) in the CCS, and those in the SDS, because of the very different direction from the one that characterised ‘phase one’ (a breakdown that cannot be allowed to continue).*

- *The structures that were planned and set (the nationally based advisory board and the advisory research board) did not effectively function to give direction to the center. As a result the direction that the centre took revolved largely around the person of the director. Also, the effectiveness of the management Committee was not established by the panel. There would be no concerns about administration staff employed by CCS if the management Committee was effective enough to have input in how CCS is run.*

2.1 (b) Profile and image of the Centre and its impact on relevant constituencies in civil society.

So, what is the image of the CCS? Colourful, partisan, provocative, controversial? What are the relevant constituencies? What do some of them have to say, themselves in their interviews, and according to Sogge and Harper, as reflected in their reports?

As Sogge noted, “Most informants perceive the Centre’s output as coloured by its prevailing political persuasions. No one argues that critical, activist scholarship is a bad thing; on the contrary several hold that it is vital, and in the best traditions of the University.” [Sogge, 21]

Indeed, there is an implicit opinion amongst stake holders in Civil Society, that just as Universities are considered to be the conscience of society (a role German Universities, after WW2, found themselves accused of having failed during the Nazi era), the CCS is seen, by some, as being the conscience of UKZN (cf. Vision Statement cited on page 4).

The positive aspect of this “critical, activist scholarship” is reflected in the submission of a researcher based at the School of Development Studies.

I think CCS has an important role to play in the life of the faculty. There are few such institutes in the country. They introduce a range of both South African and international people and ideas. They facilitate access to the campus for many people who otherwise would not dream of coming here, most notably community activists. This is good for them but also for keeping research grounded in the realities of what is happening in the world. Their website is a very useful resource and they generate dynamism in the faculty – even if sometimes around controversy.

However, this “dynamism around controversy” may have its downside, as argued in the remainder of the submission:

An area to be strengthened is their research programme. I would like to see a coherent research programme. As it stands their research seems a bit bitty. The other concern is their need to manage their internal struggles better. There seems to be extremely petty politics that consumes .. a lot of space on their list serve. I for one have unsubscribed from the list serve as there were too many bitter personality battles. It seems as if they are making progress with this. [8 Aug. 2007].

These sentiments are in sharp contrast to a submission by Prof. Bond, who feels that: “the CCS Research Programme is coherent insofar as it addresses – at a world-class level – the problem known as 'primitive accumulation', namely the relationship between markets and non-market phenomena, in the spirit of Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Polanyi, Frantz Fanon, Guy Mhone, David Harvey and Michael Burawoy, all leading social theorists of their generation, concerned with resistance to excessive power by corporations and states. The coherence of the programme is reflected in the application of these ideas in more than a dozen book-length publications (and many dozen refereed articles and chapters and the division of CCS work into six interrelated

research areas, which take forward the problem of social resistance to exploitation in race, gender, class and environmental terms.” [cf. 1, Appendix A]

His rebuttal is supported by Professor Habib, who at the same time comments on the perceived partisanship of the CCS. “I think at the moment CCS is seen as more ideologically orientated than the centre was under my leadership, and maybe that’s the choice that has been made, and that is the choice that is required, because maybe Patrick felt it is appropriate to have a much more focused research agenda and be much more ideologically focused...and we have research centres around the country that do that. The Sociology of Work Programme – SWOP – at Wits for instance, is very much located in the trade union movement and very much aligned to COSATU.” [TS, 310]

Asked about the impact of the CCS on relevant constituencies in civil society, Professor Fatima Meer [TS, 346 – 348], had the following to say:

“My experience with it (the CCS) is largely the involvement in the community with civil society, and I think it is playing a very significant role. The University can become a place on the hill and it looks down on the city...the CCS, which understand(s) what is going on in the community... plays a good role there. It is also a teacher to the people who are far removed from academia. So, I think it is a very commendable department of good will.”

Desmond D’Sa [TS, 179], Chairperson of the SDCEA, (South Durban Community Environmental Alliance), a representative of one of the relevant constituencies in Civil Society, confirmed this assessment: *“The CCS has opened its doors to the poor, vulnerable and marginalized who would otherwise not be able to access education so desperately needed in our communities. The CCS over the years has been able to host several workshops on housing, basic services such as water, electricity, climate change, globalization etc. We, as the South Durban communities, have been very fortunate to work with the CCS and are able to bring our people on a regular basis to these workshops.*

The CCS provides a platform where real struggles of ordinary people are spoken. The Director Patrick Bond and his staff have all worked hard to ensure that the CCS embodies the spirit of the Centre’s founders (and) that it be people centred and a place for all.

We hope that this practice continues.” [letter of 21 Sept. 2007]

Fatima Meer’s remark about the “the place on the hill” is reflected in Sogge’s contention that “the University’s Vice Chancellor at the time wanted no ivory tower, but a centre consistent with ‘the university’s purposed commitment, capacity and track record in ‘engagement with the community in conjunction with scholarly reflection on the community’” [Sogge, 14]

The dean of humanities, Prof. McCracken remarked that “community outreach is wobbly as a concept. The university has...actually not come to terms with community outreach yet, and what community outreach means and how you measure it”. *It is the devil’s own job, judging it when people put it down for promotion...one tries to err on the side of the academics, but it is very difficult to get a handle on what is counted and what is not counted...Maybe I will say it is the poor cousin of all the various categories...Maybe an awful lot of it is perception, but I get the impression that they (the CCS) are playing their own tunes. They are singularly absent on service within*

the faculty. ...it is just this feeling of being disconnected with the rest of the show...
[TS, 426]

Conclusion

If profile is provided through and measured against 'public intellectual' involvements, then it has undoubtedly been successful: in its Wolpe Lecture series, in the frenetic activity and activism of its Director and staff, through its academic and popular publication reach. How this profile, through its specific focus, has affected perceptions within the University where it is located, and shaped access to funds, is another matter, and difficult to measure. There seems, however, to be a perception that the CCS, despite its communications via the University notice system and its popular website, has failed to communicate effectively its outreach activities to the wider University community and of actively participating in the running of the faculty.

2.2. (a) The location of the Centre within a University environment, given its national' mandate

What was the national mandate? How appropriate/important is the University environment for this? Why is the CCS at UKZN in the first place? And what about the cost to the University?

The main reason for the CCS being housed at UKZN is due to the successful tender by the office of the V-C of the then University of Natal, Professor Brenda Gourley, in 2001, in response to a request by funding organization Atlantic Philanthropies (see 2.1). There appears to be no other binding reason to locate the CCS, planned as a national facility, at a University, although some valid reasons are given in the Tender Document.

Professor Habib described the emergence of the national mandate:

First, what we had imagined was a research centre that focused on the study of civil society, not of the state and not of the market. Second, it can be pioneered to courses and the study and the teaching of civil society in the university curriculum. And third, it was meant to engage at the national level with civil society organisations. That is really like a mandate from a much more significant community engagement...The idea was that the centre was not supposed to be only a centre of the University of KwaZulu Natal, but it was the only centre of its kind in the country, so it was meant to have a national appeal. [TS, 303/4]

When judged by its lists of events and publications it is obvious that the CCS has a considerable national role. There is hardly another critical mass of progressive academics committed to social change in South Africa, or another institution devoting as much time and effort to rebuilding analysis, particularly in civil society, political economy and environment, at the national level, and seen through the eyes of the CCS, their website is already the premier South African site for this work.

Concerning the role of critical mass, Professor Habib concurs, "There is of course individual research being done in various departments, sociology, psychology, political science on civic life, but because they are individually directed, you could not create the kind of critical mass of researchers around a particular research and this is where the centre can play a very, very crucial role. It brings together researchers from a diversity of areas and departments to go after a big gap in its market around civil society". [TS, 311]

However, concerning the national mandate, Professor Padayachee suggests “that one stops thinking of the Centre as a ‘national’ centre, physically based at UKZN, and intellectually located within the SDS”, as “this creates vagueness about purpose and accountability”. He “would like to see it as a programme/project within the School, much like...Population Studies (with its own MA degree, research, etc) though the latter is being integrated into broader Development Studies/Economics/ Social policy debates.” [7 Aug. 2007]

Asked about the cost to the University in establishing the CCS, Prof. Ronnie Miller (TS, 368 – 377), Dean of the faculty of CADD (Community & Development Disciplines) at the time, had quite a good recollection of that. “I’m afraid there was some wheeling and dealing that went on. We need to go back and remember a time not that long ago when space was at absolute premium. If you can remember, in the MTB building, there wasn’t a spare cupboard. Now, the then director, Adam Habib, had a vision for the centre and it wasn’t a modest vision. He wanted a lot of space and he wanted high quality space. The funders paid the money which enabled us to build”.

Asked for how long this space had been allocated, he thought that nobody “got too technical about that”. “You see, a whole lot of moves then took place. It was like those little checkers that people start moving around, but it enabled them to have the space that they wanted, but we didn’t commit anything in writing – you won’t find any formal papers, I don’t think”. [TS 373/374]

When asked about the allocation of space by the University, a member of the CCS felt that the space had to be bought from the university and that some documentation should exist. “Well, we bought it by law from Ronnie Miller. I’m sure there are documents (dating back to 2001), where it says we physically paid R300 000, plus every year CCS pays overheads. So, last year I think it was close to R250 000. So, we still pay our separate overheads. You know, every department has an overhead that the university pays. We pay our own.” [TS 299 – 300; for financial and organisational details see the Minutes of the first Meeting of the CCS Advisory Board, 27 May 2002, available from the Research Office].]

Concerning what those in charge of the university get out of a centre the dean of humanities, Donal McCracken, had the following to say: “They get out of it prestige, they get out publicity, they get out intellectual endeavour. Very often they don’t get out any subsidy in the form of FTEs. ...It is something that we have to pay for if we want it, and we have wanted it in the past, therefore we paid for it. But if the general faculty budget is shrinking and we have lots of other commitments to meet, then it is very difficult to take on another financial commitment.” [TS423].

Conclusion:

The CCS is at UKZN because it was formed at the UN as a result of a successful tender submitted to Atlantic Philanthropies, who were convinced that the core activities could most successfully be carried out within this institution. The Centre is appropriately placed at the university given its mandate, which is in line with the description by the University of its community. The location of the centre within the university is actually giving substance to the claim by the university that it engages with its community, which is broader than at a local or national level. As expressed by some interviewees, the nature of the work done by the centre is not the kind of work many centres do.

The CCS has shape-shifted though, but not that a national role is ruled out. If it is defined in terms of the original brief, then it does realise a national role through collaborative research, through wide and inclusive dissemination of research results and analysis of civil society, and through a coordinating role.

2.2 (b) The Centre's location in and its relationship to the School of Development Studies, in respect of its research and teaching mandate

Why is the CCS located in the SDS? How close is the fit with the SDS?

The CCS eventually found a home in the SDS, “because it had to be housed somewhere”, and the SDS offered itself as “an ideal place”. Prof. Ronnie Miller [TS, 368 – 377] explains, “Obviously this institute (the CCS) had to be housed somewhere. They looked around the university. At the time we were the faculty of CADD, Community & Development Disciplines....The School of Development Studies would be an ideal place. The initiative came very much from the school of development studies and that school was within the faculty I was dean of.”

Prof. Adam Habib agrees, “I thought very early on, it should be linked to the School of Development Studies, it seemed to me that it should have a linkage, if you are going to impact on teaching, then the teaching would happen firstly through the graduate programme and the SDS was a very appropriate for it to be located here. Secondly, the fact that a significant component of the developmental studies research agenda involved civic life and we thought that interfacing between the two was of great importance. Thirdly, I thought the centre of its own would be swallowed or become a victim of university procedures and I thought looping it within a centre like the SDS would give it a shelter at least for the first few years”...

According to a submission to the panel “the CCS has benefited from Prof Bond’s incredible global academic and activist network, which has seen the Centre at the very front of some of the most significant debates in civil society and political economy; increasing the latter, which begs the question as to whether the narrower ‘civil society’ tag/label is appropriate. It may be a great complement to what the School of Development Studies does, if the CCS can be re-fashioned as a ‘Centre for Social Justice and Human Rights’, as one idea”. This will ease fund raising, as civil society might not be “as sexy among the Foundations, as it was 10 years ago.” [7 Aug. 2007]

Julian May sees his role towards the CCS mainly in grievance control, no mean task considering the extent of conflict within the CCS until September 2006. A certain tension between SDS and CCS concerning research priorities and output is, in his opinion, nevertheless appropriate and beneficial for the academic and intellectual climate within the school. He sees no need for the duplication of administrative staff, and in contrast to Patrick Bonds expressed view, no urgency for the director being a black person.

He admits that sustainability of the centre and the raising of sufficient funds as a problem and detects a certain confusion in the status of hired or invited visitors, which are counted and treated as academic staff. [PK, own notes, 10 September 2007]

The future sustainability of the CCS and the rationale for its current organisational location are reflected in the Institutional Review mandate of the CCS (see Appendix A). For ease of reference some excerpts are cited here:

"The future sustainability of the Centre from 2007-11 will require two substantial shifts: *making permanent several of the research and administrative staff who are on contract*, and bringing to CCS a larger network of up to two dozen honorary researchers who will work closely – albeit at a distance - with our staff and pay for their transport/accommodation needs in annual Durban visits, via research grants earned through scholarly publications.

Concerning the rationale for current organizational location and accountability system: The primary rationale for continuing with CCS's location within the School of Development Studies (SDS) is the close fit between the daily activities of CCS staff, their research interests, and the parallel (sometimes overlapping) policy/development roles of SDS staff. In addition, there are two courses – 'Civil Society' and 'The Political Economy of the Welfare State' – taught to SDS masters students by CCS staff. And CCS post-graduate research students are able to take advantage of common interests and projects with SDS staff/students.

Conclusion:

- *As is the case with every unit at the University, research and teaching remain the primary roles of Centres as well. In the case of Centres the weight is on research, while in departments obviously it is teaching. Given its unique way of doing research the CCS can and should be free from interference by the SDS, notwithstanding collaboration with SDS researchers and teachers. While the specifics of the teaching function are not spelt out, it is still expected, and serves to strengthen other arguments for its contribution to the institution that may be made.*
- *'Teaching' could be under- or post-graduate; it could be through courses for which the Centre is responsible through appropriately qualified staff; it could be through contributions to existing courses; it could be through supervision of graduate students, mentoring as part of research projects or through combinations of any of these.*
- *What the CCS seems to have lacked is a distinguishable approach to its teaching responsibilities, and an item in its reporting that covered this aspect in a coherent way. While staff members have participated in several of these aspects, it seems to have been fairly ad hoc, and seen as a possible add-on to resolve funding crises.*
- *Suggestions, some emanating from staff in the Centre, that it would strengthen their case for additional University support by either locating in a teaching Department – such as Sociology or Politics – and participating in under-graduate teaching, seem not to have been thought out properly. It would, for example, require that existing qualifications are such that staff could teach in the disciplines mentioned, that such additional demands could be catered for in what is already argued are full-time jobs, and that the reliability and responsibilities demanded of teaching staff with large numbers of students (meetings, tutoring, marking, etc) can be met by those currently employed in the CCS.*

Professor McCracken added that FTEs have not featured in the financial allocations to faculties for several years now. Teaching will not, in any direct way, be an open sesame to money for salaries.

- *The teaching direction is not a solution for the funding crisis for the Centre at this moment. It should, however, be taken much more seriously, even as a subsidiary activity, in future, with a coherent and consistent approach followed and reported on.*

2.2 (c) The current degree of autonomy in matters of administration, management and finances

What is the significance of CCS autonomy re administration, management and finances? What are the advantages/disadvantages? In what way could the autonomy be extended, reduced or modified? For instance, why is the CCS not just a programme within the SDS, maybe with another label than CCS?

Professor Ronnie Miller explained the present degree of autonomy in his interview: “When we set it (the CCS) up, there was some nervousness on all sides. The foundation [Atlantic Philanthropies] was nervous that the centre had some degree of autonomy. Development (the SDS) was nervous that they didn’t get swallowed up by this thing. So, we had to structure it so that there was a partnership, but that each side maintained some degree of independence. The way we did this was that the director of the centre would become a fully fledged member of the school of development studies, at a professorial level, but no other members of the centre would automatically. They may become associates, but they would not be members of staff. The director then was on the university staff, but nobody else was.

That seemed to satisfy all parties; it seemed to be a good kind of structural arrangement. It was a mechanism to provide a link between the two, but also to allow the two to be separate from each other.”

However, how to reconcile these two concepts, on the one hand a national facility, and on the other hand to be housed in a school of a university? Professor Miller explained, that “the centre as such is not part of Development Studies. Development Studies doesn’t control what goes on in the centre. The director of the centre has a post in Development Studies, but in fact is seconded to run the centre. The Development Studies doesn’t run the centre and so it was for that reason that it had to be independent.

The funders were insisting that the centre must have an independent identity because it was a national centre. It used to give out money. It served as a funding agency. So, it had to be seen to be independent, not only of the school, but also of the university.” However, as was pointed out by Professor May, “since the CCS has to follow University’s procedures, so it is not independent of the University, that much is certain. All it can be is somehow independent of the school and that link has always been an uneasy one with the management and the administrative side of the relationship.” [TS, 467 – 482].

Professor Miller conceded that “These centres and institutes, they get a life of their own. The funding agency comes along, sets up something, provide some seed money for a few years, then that dries up, then there’s a problem....Then the only recourse really is to go the route of income generation through teaching if you can’t raise it any other way. I don’t see why that should be a problem if they can contribute to a sustainable teaching programme.

History is replaying itself. Development Studies started off having no teaching at all. It landed up with having difficulties; (it) had to start teaching. It seems to me like the centre has got exactly the same kind of problem.” [TS, 368 – 377]

A drastic solution could be advanced. In Julian May’s words, “A third option and the final option is that we regard the CCS as a project that has come to its natural end. It has existed for a number of years. It has generated a lot of information. It has generated a lot of research interest. It has created, I think someone used the word a ‘buzz’ an excitement about civil society and maybe it is time to recognise that it need not continue any longer. I think that would be a shame”. When asked why he thought so he explained.

I think given the mission and vision of this university and its emphasis of promoting scholarship in Africa, its emphasis on engagement, I think the centre is one of a very limited number of places in the university which still does that. There used to be many more NGOs housed in this university. It is one of the last remnants and I think it would be a pity to lose that and particularly given the emphasis on the university right now. I think its engagement with other parts of Africa is a very positive thing and they are linking up with networks again which is not that common in the university to have those kinds of networks that people are able to make use of.

He added that, “if the funding problem is resolved, potentially the centre does have a future at the University and we can talk about where in the University later. ...If it becomes project based, I think it may be most practical if the centre either becomes some virtual entity or becomes simply a project in the SDS, and that would mean that you could pool resources for administration.” [TS, 467 – 482]

Nobody will doubt that having two independent administrations, one for the SDS and one for the CCS, is more costly than one combined administration for both. A CCS member frankly admitted that “money would be saved if the admin section of CCS would be subsumed within the school’s administration, if their resources were pooled”, but was adamant that this would impact negatively on CCS work. It appears that this is attributed, by CCS staff, to a remaining old day mentality and lack of progressive attitudes within the SDS administration and the incompatibility in character of the CCS and SDS administrative work (see also 2.3).

Fatima Meer, when told that it has been suggested that there could be a change in label from the CCS to that of a human rights group or something like this she disagrees:

I think that would be a mistake because civil society again is an extremely strong element and it’s drawing together sectors in our society. So, it would be unfortunate if we lost ...a growing and vigorous Civil Society Centre by renaming it. I think I would want us to go into what the development studies group is doing and how do they differ in their orientation. [TS, 346 – 48]

Conclusion:

The strong views by some SDS staff that administration support available to CCS is unnecessary and that the Centre can survive as a project of SDS might reveal a certain lack of understanding (on the part of SDS) of the nature of the work done by CCS and the kinds of administrators suitable for the work. From all the evidence available from the interviewees, it was very clear that there is an underlying deep disagreement between

CCS and SDS about how the CCS operates/should operate. Mainly participants from SDS were in favour of CCS remaining within SDS. It is thus difficult to recommend that CCS remains with SDS. The tensions will not suddenly move away. Patrick Bond's suggestion of a new and specifically Black director being appointed should seriously be considered in the light of the kind of work that CCS does and the nature of the wider community that CCS engages with. It is not part of our mandate to look at where the university will find the money to appoint a new director. Based on the importance of the CCS for the university, the university should provide resources for a director of the CCS with transfer of one administrator/ information management and a research (assistant) post. Patrick Bond should remain as director until the issues of appointing a replacement have been resolved, such that the position may be advertised speedily. The nature of the work of CCS does warrant the centre to have a high degree of autonomy, which would not be effective if the CCS becomes a project within any school.

2.3. (a) Staff composition, tenure and structure of the Centre, to carry out its mandate

What are the present mandate, programmes and activities of the CCS? What is the present staff composition and structure of the Centre? What is the position of the director's post? Are these conditions appropriate?

It seems that, in line with the TD, the CCS was not to have 'permanent' research staff, but to facilitate research, its central activity, through associates and fellows. The TD spoke, for example, of a 'lean team', also referred to by Harper's mid-term Review (see page 3 of this report). The Review committee contrasted this with the situation at the time (2006) of a Director and at least 14 other staff [Harper, 14]. It must be said that it has not been clear who are perceived to be 'staff' at any moment – some people have been 'collaborators', while employed in SDS (such as Valodia and Skinner), some have been visiting associates, others have been employed on contract from core funding (such as Helen Poonen), other again have been employed from project funding with an understanding that such contract ends on conclusion of the project and/or when funding is depleted.

According to CCS information, there has been no remuneration for nearly all visiting Associates; for a few in 2006, resources were located to provide small stipends, and for a few ongoing community scholars there are small stipends.

It appears that there has been a change in staffing policy, related to the changes in mandate and functions associated with those changes. First, the Director remains, funded through a UKZN post (as discussed above). That post was created specifically for the Directorship, and did not exist before 2001. But was it, or did it become, a post in SDS, from which the incumbent was 'seconded' to the Directorship of the CCS – as seems to be the argument now, but not for the first Director? In other words, is Patrick Bond contracted to CCS and after three years at CCS, does he then reapply or can he step down at that moment and if he steps down into the post what happens to the director ship of CCS?

The HOSDS, Julian May, is adamant that "His post is at the SDS. His post is guaranteed. He does not have to do CCS. He is a very good academic. When he

teaches he gets very high ratings from the students. The students like what he teaches.”

But Julian May concedes that there is a problem.

In the advert and his letter of appointment his appointment is for three years. So legally his directorship comes to an end and legally we cannot insist that he stays on. When I first spoke to Mike Morris about this, Mike’s reaction was (there were various other words involved here), he is the director of civil society and if he steps down the CCS goes. So there is not a permanent position. So I do not know the answer to your question. He does not want to continue the CCS without money. I do not think a contract person could be a director of a university institution. So I do not have an answer to that question. [TS, 467 – 482]

But this is a crucial question to be answered, as it directly and immediately affects recommendations from the Review Committee, and the future of the CCS. For example, if it is a seconded post, with professor Bond no longer (as per advertisement) the Director, then another, vacant, post has to be found and activated (funds released for advertising) immediately. How the various Boards and HR have not acted on this obvious crisis (if our interpretation is correct), is a mystery and a grave oversight. When approached for comment the present incumbent explained his position as Director: “We have assumed that the director position is a University professorship attached to whatever departments hosts CCS. Initially that was community development, then it moved to development studies. That is the explanation I had when I moved to UKZN in 2004. Well before the three-year appointment as director ran out in 2007, I made requests to the SDS Board of Studies to clarify who would take over, which are on record. The response – dating to March 2007 – was to conduct the review. Hence it is not a ‘grave oversight’, merely a long time-lag in University review processes.”

Thus there now appears to be a request, *through this Review Committee*, that the post moves with the present incumbent but without the Directorship of the CCS, hence the request for an additional University funded post, preferably at the level of full Professor, for a replacement for Professor Bond (see SE p1: ‘to pass on the directorship but awaits confirmation that there will be resources to hire a director’!).

In addition, it appears that the approach to additional staffing has changed with the change in mandate. It seems that with the initial core funding it allowed the core administrative position, occupied by Helen Poonen, to be a longer-term appointment (five years); and with research-related contract staff to be employed to work alongside permanent employees from the SDS (Caroline Skinner and Imraan Valodia to be two examples).

However, in phase two, with fewer funds-attracting projects being undertaken, the research (or at least research-writing) has overwhelmingly become the preserve of Professor Bond. (*see also 2.3 (b) below*). At the same time, the need for on-going management staff has increased (the Outreach person, Finance officer, and the Resource Centre manager, etc) as has the need for administrative staff (largely because of greater separation from the SDS in day-to-day functioning and by handling more events and centre relationships than the SDS could manage). Mike Morris referred to this aspect, an alleged top-heavy administrative staffing, the drain that that has meant on funds for core activities, and the reason for such a staffing policy –

namely that the Centre operates largely autonomously from the SDS, of which it is meant to be part [TS 352-353]

Other than the request for the post, against which the CCS director can be appointed, there is also a request that these seven posts, all (except for one) outside of the direct research function, be made permanent through UKZN funding [see SE p6]: Senior Administrator, Administrative Assistant, Financial Manager, Research Fellow, Outreach Officer, Website Manager, Resource Centre Librarian. In addition, three honorary professors and an honorary researcher are mentioned. This request is to expand the honorary membership, to support a much larger supervision load for Masters/PhD students and to contribute to CCS research.

The request for additional University-funded permanent posts is, therefore, to be evaluated against both the mission and functions that underlie the existence of the posts, and the reason for the lack of external funding and also against the track record of CCS. This track record is much shaped by Patrick Bond. As Julian May pointed out, “potentially Patrick could use his money to keep some of the CCS people employed. So that money...is with Patrick....This year it was about R230 000, it is substantial. It is very substantial and I think the university’s share of that is much larger. ...So it is a huge benefit to the university to have a Patrick, to have people like Patrick at the university.” [TS, 467-482]

In this context it may be appropriate, to present programmes, activities and prospects of the CCS in the words of their own staff, as reported, in greater detail, in their Self Evaluation [SE, 2007] and in the Annual Reports.

“The CCS presently has a small staff complement and is hence run by a collective monthly staff meeting. However, with an ambitious research/advocacy programme in six issue areas, we seek an institutional position amongst the world’s cutting-edge researchers and practitioners. These are (with their lead champions):

- economic justice (Patrick Bond);
- environmental justice (Bond);
- global and African integration (Sufian Bukurura and Baruti Amisi);
- social movements (Ntokozo Mthembu and Molefi Ndlovu);
- social giving (Annsilla Nyar); and
- culture (Dennis Brutus).

There are six vehicles for getting our work out to scholars and the general public:

- public events including the monthly Harold Wolpe lecture (organised by Helen Poonen), seminar series (run by Bukurura), and conferences and workshops;
- the website (run by John Devenish);
- outreach activities in eThekweni and nationally (Mthembu and Ndlovu);
- the Resource Centre (run by Amisi);
- the *CCS Wired* double-DVD set (edited by Bond); and
- publications, including the ‘Eye on Civil Society’ *Mercury* column (coordinated by Nyar).

In addition our staff and associates regularly comment on television, radio and the press. A long list of events in 2007 also suggest CCS’s ability to spread our messages both at home and abroad. CCS’s growing cadre of research masters and doctoral students add enormously, particularly during weeks in June and December when they are in residence. We have a brilliant administrative team with Poonen running the

centre on a day-to-day basis, Amy Ramsamy as finance manager and Lungi Keswa doing superb administrative work. Another crucial element of our capacity is the superb group of community scholars (usually two at a time) and visiting scholars (as many as five). However, the present staffing situation is untenable insofar as a new director is required to replace Bond; four staff positions whose funding expires at the end of 2007 and three others in 2008 need to be made permanent; and new researchers are required – including a host of honorary researchers (unpaid by the university but whose work/visits are funded by research accounts gained through publications). *While the present structure is functional, we are in urgent need of a new director (while Bond remains a CCS researcher), permanent jobs for staff and new honorary researchers to add muscle to the six projects.*” [SE of the CCS, 14 Sept 2007, points 1.1 and 1.2]

Section 2.3 (a) is dealt with in great detail in the CCS Self Evaluation (APPENDIX A).

Conclusion:

Unless a miracle happens, and South Africa has its full share in the ‘miracle of transition’, such a request for a full professorship plus seven other posts (of which only two out of eight are research-related) might appear to reflect some naivety. However, given the labour relations act, and its insistence upon formalising informal employee relations, the request for making more permanent posts available, contingent upon performance, may be good H.R. practice. In addition, the panel cannot answer, with confidence, the question whether the number of CCS staff is appropriate or bloated, because it did not look at what actual jobs each staff members do. But, if the university appoints a director, surely s/he must have some administrative assistance. The number of people to assist the director depend on the nature of the director's work. The kind of the people employed in CCS were appointed on the basis of the nature of the work that CCS does and the community that interacts with CCS. The argument that came from some of the interviewees that the work done in the CCS by admin staff can easily be done by admin staff in SDS, is simplistic as the two entities operate differently.

What has to be resolved, otherwise even the existence of the contract posts are in question, is the position of a new Director. The simplest solution would be to go back to the initial appointment which seems to have been based on an argument that the Directorship is a University-funded post (as per the TD), where the post is subsequently located within the SDS, but for the CCS directorship. In that case, Patrick Bond applies for a further period of appointment as Director, or applies for another post in SDS, which ‘frees’ the existing post for immediate advertising for a new Director.

2.3 (b) The prospects for future funding (internal core and research-related) in this area of academic/outreach activity

What are the academic vs. outreach activities and how are they (to be) funded?

History and development of the CCS may be divided into two phases. Phase I: from its inception unto Sogge’s end-of-grant review, 2002 – 2006; Phase II: from then to this review. These phases may be characterised by labels and quotes:

Phase I: From the Time of Plenty to Austerity

“The Centre’s early life was built around ¾ major externally-funded projects...This drove the research agenda. Now it seems that few projects on that scale exist, though this may not be for want of trying, just the difficulty of securing funding. If it’s about funding the question is why?”

Nevertheless the publication output has been phenomenal (though increasingly centred around the Director’s own amazing publications output). In order to secure broader participation within and outside the Centre and School, attention needs to be given to raising the funds in the amounts that would be appropriate.” [SDS submission, 7 Aug. 2007]

Phase II: Changing Donor Interest

In his review Sogge writes, “Today, tides of donor interest in NGOs and civil society have receded somewhat from high-water marks reached in the 1990s.

Some donors don’t like those parts of civil society not under their control. Some show animosity toward the ‘World Social Forum/Other World is Possible’ camp, due in part to that camp’s having shown real muscle. As ex-World Bank economist Joseph Stiglitz put it:

Until the protesters came along there was little hope for change and no outlets for complaint.... it is the trade unionists, students, environmentalists, ordinary citizens, marching in the streets in Prague, Seattle, Washington and Genoa who have put the need for reform on the agenda of the developed world. (Globalisation and its Discontents 2002)

In South Africa, donor bets placed in the 1980s on civil society -- the ANC, business-linked and activist groups -- paid off handsomely in a relatively easy transition to a new constitutional order in the 1990s. Since then, however, most of the aid/ philanthropy mainstream has followed paths of stabilisation, not transformation. Some donors even express annoyance with activists stepping on the toes of government authorities, who they feel should be given a chance to deliver – a sentiment roundly endorsed by many in government.” [Sogge, 4]

So, CCS, Quo Vadis? The situation is reflected in the following quote, “I believe that the CCS has on balance been a positive development and good for the School / University (publications, global image, buzz); however, it cannot continue as is with little new funds; it needs a few more senior and in-house-staff to give it more ‘body’; some serious restructuring and alignment is needed in order to capitalise on its advantages and history, and to take it forward.” [SDS submission,7 Aug. 2007]

Conclusion:

A new Director, working with the advisory board, will have, as a priority, to work out the long-term (and viable) research direction for the CCS. As indicated by several interviewees the CCS will have to find a balance between research that is recognised as worthy of funding (including local, provincial, and national government tenders, and not only large donors), and research that is driven by a specific political commitment. Or else, that world of global civil society will have to fund longer-term projects that are executed through the CCS – and here Professor Bond would have to say why that has not been possible to date, and what needs to be done to receive such money.

2.3 (c) Extending the Centre's mandate in a way allowing it to work elsewhere in Africa in line with the University's vision

What is the University's vision vis-à-vis Africa? It aims "to be the premier university of African scholarship" (see Vision document). What is the Centre doing already in this respect – should/could this be extended?

According to Sogge, "Centre staff have, sometimes in tandem with academic pursuits, sought to engage with African and global processes in certain networks or 'camps' in civil society through: Linking with activist intellectuals and their organisations,

particularly those associated with the World Social Forum (Alternative Globalisation) circuits, chiefly through CCS participation in meetings – often offering a key speech; Presenting commentaries in print and electronic media, particularly internet sites (Z Net, Pambazuka News) with large progressive audiences [Sogge, 12], and by responding to concerns that the academy in South Africa is mute or passive on contemporary issues of social justice. [Sogge, 13]

Adam Habib has the following to say: "A joint project between the CCS and the school of development studies was to develop a plan for an Africa-wide PhD programme". That plan was put together for the Ford Foundation, and Professor Bukurura worked closely with Ford during 2006. However, unfortunately Ford then made a decision not to pursue the project any further. "Now it would seem to me that you need to implement the plan, and I suspect you'd find money for that {e.g. from the Ford Foundation}. I suspect you'd find money for research on civic life on the African continent. You'd find money for stuff on religion. There are pools of money that are emerging around religion and identity and how that impacts on stability, political stability etc, because the Americans want to know what are Muslims doing in the middle of Africa. There are niches that the CCS could be involved in." [TS, 317]

Conclusion:

Judged by events and activities it appears that the CCS has already extended its mandate and has made contact to researchers elsewhere in Africa. In light of the perception that the Ford Foundation (or others) might provide the necessary funding it might be advisable for the CCS to resurrect the plan of an Africa-wide PhD programme, and to explore collaborative research, with prior funding on such topics as those mentioned by Habib. [TS, 317]

2.4. Recommendations to improve the capability and capacity of the Centre to carry out any future mandate.

What future mandate, if any? The University's implicit wish to improve the capability and capacity of the Centre is noted. How can this improvement be achieved and in what direction? How can the strengths of the Centre be improved? What have the Harper and Sogge reports recommended? What do panel members recommend? How can the location of the Centre within a University environment or within the School of Development Studies be improved? Should the CCS autonomy re administration, management and finances be extended, reduced or modified? How could the Centre extend its mandate in a way that would allow it to work elsewhere in Africa, over and above what it is already doing?

Conclusions and Recommendations in previous reports

At the end of her Mid -Term Report (2004) Ann Harper draws a short positive conclusion, but does not make any recommendations, while David Sogge (Sept. 2006) does both. The relevant reports are available from the Research Office.

Our Report: Conclusions

Some of the questions formulated above have already been dealt with in the conclusions at the end of each section. Before formulating a proposal we sketch some possible scenarios and briefly discuss merits and problems of each.

Possible Options

(1) Closing down or removing CCS from UKZN does not appear to be an option as it was rejected by all interviewees and panel members. Through its international recognition and standing, CCS has put UKZN on a world map in social science, a position the University dare not risk to lose.

(2) Continue as is:

CCS attached to SDS, the director holding a professorship in SDS but seconded to CCS. Teaching, Research, and Activism, predominantly with specific localised research projects.

Problems:

Ambiguity in administrative responsibility: who resolves strife and squabbles within CCS and between CCS and SDS staff? Also, CCS director intends stepping down, in his own words ‘to make way for another director to better represent the race /continental constituency’, but still occupying his professorial post in the SDS, although staying actively within the CCS.

Therefore, need for a new Director, which demands an additional University post. Staff are on contract, and are not all engaged in the activities that will generate long-term finances.

(3) Incorporation as a programme into SDS:

This would remove some of the present administrative ambiguities, but would severely curtail autonomy and (international) status of the CCS.

Problem:

Although favoured by some SDS staff this option was resoundingly rejected by other interviewees and the panel.

(4) Loose (mainly academic) attachment to the SDS, maintaining its independence status; CCS director responsible of the administrative running of the CCS, being answerable to the Dean or to the faculty through some management and/or faculty board:

This appears to be the option favoured by CCS personnel, with the hope of perceivable support by the University in form of additional academic and administrative posts, as enjoyed for instance by the Centre for Creative Arts, which apparently has four University posts: for a director, a manager, a senior administrator and an administrator.

The panel agreed that there is no precedent for the incumbent's resignation while retaining the post created for the director. Thus, a post would have to be found for the current director if his prolific publication record is to continue to be of benefit to the University. The CCS would then retain one permanent post at professorship level for the director

Problems:

As in (2) – where is the money/funding coming from for support staff?

(5) Attachment to another school, where more posts might be or may become available and which shares teaching and research interests with CCS:

This appears to be an option considered by Patrick Bond and would solve the problem of University positions, but such school (Sociology, Politics??) has to be found, which is prepared to host CCS, a problem that was not investigated by the Committee.

Recommendations:


- CCS should be made a more independent entity within its host School (e.g. the SDS). Thus, the Head of this school should not be charged with the administrative running and problems of the CCS, but this should be the responsibility of the CCS Director. A possible model of the CCS structure is sketched below.
- The status and location of the CCS Directorship must be clearly defined. Currently, the position of CCS director is unclear (since it was a three-year contract position - within a permanent tenured professorship - which technically ended in October 2007, but which Patrick Bond has continued in lieu of a replacement). This professorship has always been connected to the School wherever it was located (originally Development Studies and then SDS), which should be continued. However, the normal procedure in the case of an incumbent resigning from a post specifically founded as a directorship should leave the post available to the incoming director. Not to do so would leave the future of the Centre in limbo.
- There is merit in Patrick Bond stepping down as Director (but retaining his CCS connection as a professor in the SDS), with the desire for a black African and woman director, with a permanent position attached to the directorship. It would be foolish of the University (here, the Faculty) to lose the contributions made by Professor Bond to its research profile. On the other hand, it may be naïve to expect the CCS incumbent vacating his post as director *and* losing his position as tenured professor in the SDS.
- The School of Sociology and Social Studies appears to be another potential suitor as host, particularly in view of potential Social Policy and governance linkage, once personnel issues have been clarified.
- Support should be provided for the expansion of the Research Associateship, so that the well-developed international networking linkages of CCS can be maintained, as well as for administrative posts. As these are closely related to the organisation and presentation of the Wolpe lectures, it would seem possible that some of the

administrative support could be funded through that award. However, although a new application for funding has apparently gone to the Wolpe Foundation and Rowntree Trust, it appears that there are no sufficient funds to support one or more entire University posts.

In this context it should be noted that even if the CCS were to be closed down immediately, it would be unlikely that all contractual obligations could be discharged by making the SDS appointments only.

A possible model for the location of CCS within UKZN

We finally present the sketch of a possible model that offers a solution to the present problems, maintaining the (international) standing of CCS, and which is therefore favoured by the panel of this revision: an autonomous CCS with the director being responsible for the administrative running of the centre and being answerable (through an advisory/management/research board) to some higher authority representing university or faculty, while keeping channels open to the SDS allowing for mutual teaching and research programmes. As far as university support and institutional autonomy are concerned, the CCA model would be ideal,



Model of the proposed structure for CCS as autonomous entity within the Faculty of Humanities.

Solid double arrow indicates the line of responsibility, the broken lines indicate channels of communication for common teaching and research programmes

APPENDIX A: FURTHER DETAIL

The instructions, dealt with in section 2, were further detailed in a letter from Prof. F.N.M. Mazibuko, DVC & Head of College: Humanities (28 August 2007) to the Research Office as an **Additional Request**:

“Can the Review address in detail the Centre’s Performance

1. Establish focus areas in the period 2005-2007 and the period 2007-2011 and future sustainability plan.
2. Rationale of being based within the School of Development Studies and accountability arrangements to School of Development Studies.
3. Staffing arrangements in line with University/Faculty/School Equity Plans.
4. Indicate clearly the internal and external benefactors of the programme/s. State any benefits to students and community, engagement levels and nature of benefits.
5. research and teaching profiles of staff.”

A **Response** comes from the CCS in its Institutional Review Mandate [Self Evaluation, SE, Sept 07, 5-8]:

“Of greatest importance to the Institutional Review, perhaps, is the set of five issue areas raised by Deputy Vice-Chancellor Fikile Mazibuko in her mandate to the Committee, which can be addressed in a concise way below but deserve much more discussion:

1 Focus areas: Review 2005-07 and look forward for 2007-11

- The recent period, since Bond took over as director, is notable for a shift in CCS’s functions from large-scale research and donor roles (made possible by a generous start-up grant from Atlantic Philanthropies), to more surgical self-sustaining work in six key areas where civil society research/advocacy can be synthesised: economic justice, environmental justice, global and African integration, social movements, social giving and culture. (That process is explained in the 2005 and 2006 Annual Reports.) There are opportunities for self-sustaining projects in all these areas from 2007-11, but not without substantial University support.
- The future sustainability of the Centre from 2007-11 will require two substantial shifts: making permanent several of the research and administrative staff who are on contract, and bringing to CCS a larger network of up to two dozen honorary researchers who will work closely – albeit at a distance - with our staff and pay for their transport/accommodation needs in annual Durban visits, via research grants earned through scholarly publications.

2 Rationale for current organizational location, and accountability system

- The primary rationale for continuing with CCS’s location within the School of Development Studies (SDS) is the close fit between the daily activities of CCS staff, their research interests, and the parallel (sometimes overlapping) policy/development roles of SDS staff. In addition, there are two courses – ‘Civil Society’ and ‘The Political Economy of the Welfare State’ – taught to SDS masters students by CCS staff. And CCS post-graduate research students are able to take advantage of common interests and projects with SDS staff/students.

- Accountability arrangements with SDS currently include daily written briefings ('CCS Update') to the SDS Director, Professor May; full financial signing power in the office of Professor May; monthly CCS activity report-backs; an annual CCS Management Committee meeting which includes Professor May; and the annual CCS Advisory Committee meeting, also with Professor May.

3 Staffing arrangements

- Patrick Bond (tenured Research Professor, paid for from UKZN lines)
- Sufian Bukurura (Associate Professor and Research Director, on contract with funding through 2008)
- Helen Poonen (Senior Administrator, on contract with funding through 2008)
- Amy Ramsamy (Financial Manager, on contract with funding through 2008)
- Annsilla Nyar (Research Fellow, on contract with funding through 2007)
- Ntokozo Mthembu (Outreach Officer, on contract with funding through 2007)
- John Devenish (Website Manager, on contract with funding through 2007)
- Baruti Amisi (Resource Centre librarian, on contract with funding through 2007)
- Lungile Keswa (Administrative Assistant, on contract with funding through 2007)
- In addition, CCS has three honorary professors, one of whom – Dennis Brutus – is in residence and shares an office. (The other two – Adam Habib and Alan Fowler – are involved in various CCS projects and promote the institution in their networks.) An additional honorary researcher, Ashwin Desai, has not yet completed the legal process of regaining access to a formal university appointment.

CCS staff requests that the Institutional Review make recommendations on three requests:

- Confirm existing staff in their respective jobs as permanent not contractual positions;
- Open up a new professorship and recruit for the Centre's directorship;
- Provide support for self-sustaining Honorary Researcher positions to be attached to CCS, to be filled especially with African researchers of the highest caliber.

4 Internal and external beneficiaries

- Hundreds of researchers use the website each day (typically 800 page impressions are registered)
- Thousands who may not necessarily have fast internet connections have had access to *CCS Wired*, where two dozen films and thousands of research files are maintained
- Roughly 300 members of the UKZN and Durban communities come, on average, to each monthly Wolpe lecture
- Between 15 and 50 UKZN colleagues come to our weekly seminars
- Periodic workshops and colloquia attract hundreds more each year
- The academic audience which cites CCS work in scholarly publications numbers over 1000 (according to google scholar search engine)

5 Provide research and teaching profiles of staff

A package of c.v.s has been compiled and was given to the committee by hand on Monday, 17 September. Aside from teaching the School for International Training, in which all researchers participate, the three main lecturers for UKZN courses are professors Brutus and Bukurura ('Civil society and Development') and Bond ('Political Economy of the Welfare State'). The staff and our broader community of honorary professors and students have a variety of research interests, as expressed in an Appendix. Their names are as follows:

- Baruti Amisi / Patrick Bond (Director / Dennis Brutus (Honorary Professor / Sufian Bukurura (Research Director / Horman Chitonge (Doctoral Degree Student) / Rehana Dada (Research Masters Degree Student / Ashwin Desai (Honorary Research Scholar awaiting confirmation / John Devenish (Webmaster / Alan Fowler (Honorary Research Professor / Adam Habib (Honorary Research Professor / Lungile Keswa (Administrative Clerk) / Ntokozo Mthembu (Outreach officer / Prishani Naidoo (Research Masters Degree Student / Molefi Ndlovu (Researcher / Trevor Ngwane (Research Masters Degree Student / Annsilla Nyar (Manager of the Social Giving Project / Olusanya Osha (Post-Doctoral Scholar) Helen Poonen (Senior Administrator / Amy Ramsamy (Finance Administrator) / Virginia Setshedi (Research Masters Degree Student / Ahmed Veriava (Research Masters Degree Student

Although one staff person (Bond) has done the bulk of publishing, others have specialized in not just academic but also creative production (e.g. Brutus, the world-renowned poet of social justice, as well as several filmmakers associated with CCS).

Centre accomplishments. CCS has become known as the leading academic-based centre in Africa devoted to citizens' initiatives for social/environmental justice. CCS's objectives fit closely to those stated as the university's own mission and vision, particularly in relation to African scholarship. In support of the university's broadest mandates, the frequency and depth of CCS-sponsored public events – mostly of an intellectual or policy/developmental orientation - exceed those of any academic centre of its type. The role CCS plays in KZN Province includes facilitation of civil society institutional growth and networking, in part through a well-attended lecture series plus many other events and services. The CCS research profile is higher than any comparable institution, and on an academic per capita basis leads UKZN. All of this has been accomplished, however, without recourse to UKZN's financial resources, aside from one tenured research professorship. All other activities have, from 2002-present, come from own resources. CCS provides the university with substantial overhead and research funds; has purchased its own office space in the Memorial Tower Building; and raises the public image and research profile of the university hence providing name recognition and financial benefits. *The argument we will make is that this record should be rewarded with substantial university support, including a professorship for the next CCS director, permanent positions for existing staff, facilitation of an honorary researcher network and other opportunities for growth.*

Peer-reviewed publications by CCS staff, 2004-07

Year	Books/journals	Accredited articles	Book chapters	Total
2004	2	13	13	39
2005	8	21	21	55
2006	10	16	16	42
2007 (est.)	8	18	30	56

2007 work. In 2007, in spite of having lost six very active staff in the prior year, our existing contingent was extremely active not only in Durban but across the continent and the world. The list of events for 2007 exceeds 100, a record for CCS. Likewise publishing reached heights of eight major book-length contributions, 18 accredited journal articles and 30 book chapters, not to mention many dozen more shorter articles (e.g. the biweekly ‘Eye on Civil Society’ in *The Mercury*). CCS staff have also been deployed to make major academic inputs this year at the African Literary Association conference (Univ. of W. Virginia), the Centro Internacional Miranda (Caracas), Cornell, Dartmouth, Gyeongsang University, Harvard, Korea University, London School of Oriental and African Studies, Monthly Review (New York), Nairobi, Stanford, Stellenbosch, SungKongHoe University, Sydney University of Technology, United Nations University (Tokyo), the University of Alberta, the University of Botswana, and the University of California/Berkeley, as well as inputs to conferences and seminars for the Burmese liberation movement in Chiang Mai, the World Social Forum in Nairobi, the US Social Forum in Atlanta, the Ghana conference on the First Governmental Efforts to Abolish the Atlantic Slave Trade, the New Zimbabwe Lecture and Zimbabwe Coalition on Debt and Development about that country’s economic crisis, the Debt Audit Training workshop held by the Kenyan Debt Relief Network in Nairobi, the Brecht Forum and Left Forum (both in New York), Action Aid International in Washington, and in South Africa on numerous issues including climate change, energy, land, housing and water.

APPENDIX B: Interviewees

First Name, Surname (Position) [Interview TranScripts TS page numbers]

Baruti Amisi (research manager - CCS) [108 –119]

Richard Ballard [235 – 250]

Patrick Bond [456 – 466, 514-544]

Sufian Bukurura [484 – 500]

Catherine Burns [383 – 408]

Raphael de Kadt [320 – 331]

Desmond D’Sa (SDCEA) [162 – 180]

Adam Habib [303 – 319]

Johan Jacobs [410 – 420]

Abdool Karim [83 –94]

Vanja Karth (Wolpe Trust) [94 – 105]

Francie Lund (Board member) [441-452]

Lungile Keswa (Admin Assistant)[204 – 214]

Julian May [467 – 482]

Donal McCracken [420 – 432]

Fatima Meer [344 – 348]
 Ronnie Miller [368 – 377]
 Mike Morris [332 – 343, 352 - 365]
 Ntokozo Mthembu (Outreach staff) 258 – 278]
 Princess Nhlangulela (ex-Admin, now Med School)[251 – 257]
 Ansilla Nyar [120 – 141]
 Vishnu Padayachee [500 – 509]
 Helen Poonen [287 – 301]
 Douglas Ramphosa (formerly Advisory Board) [279 – 282]
 Amy Ramsamy (CCS finances) [108 -119]
 Ari Sitas [182 – 196]
 Caroline Skinner [549 – 562]
 Imraan Valodia (SDS)[432 – 440]
 Everjoice Win (Advisory Board) [224 – 231]

APPENDIX C: Composition of Review Panel

Dr. Thabisile Buthelezi (Education)
 Dr. Peter Krumm (Physics), Chair
 Prof. Gerhard Maré (Sociology, CCRRI)
 Prof. Relebohile Moletsane (Education)
 Karen Read (Diakonia)
 Prof. Derek Wang (Architecture)

Research Office Representatives

Nelson Moodley
 Premlall Mohun

APPENDIX D: Terms of Reference

More specifically, the terms of reference for this review are as follows:

1. Building on the earlier reviews,
 - To assess and analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the Centre over the last five years in relation to each of the key components of its original mandate.
 - To assess the profile and image of the Centre within and its impact on relevant external constituencies and stakeholders in civil society.
2. In relation to its institutional location,
 - To assess the appropriateness of the location of the Centre within a University environment, such as UKZN, given the Centre's 'national' mandate, and the scope and breadth of its objectives.
 - To reflect upon the appropriateness of the Centre's location and positioning within, and relationship to, the School of Development Studies, especially in respect

of its research and teaching mandate. More specifically to assess the extent to which there exists synergy and/or complementarity in the academic endeavours of the School and Centre.

- To reflect upon the appropriateness of the delegation of management and financial functions that structure the administrative relations between the Centre and the School of Development Studies. More specifically to assess whether the current degree of autonomy in matters of administration, management and finances should be extended, reduced or modified in some way.
3. In relation to its funding needs and staffing capacity
- To reflect upon the appropriateness of the staff composition, tenure and structure of the Centre, in relation to its capacity to carry out its mandate.
 - To assess, under current external and internal conditions, the prospects for future funding (internal core and research-related) in this area of academic/outreach activity.
 - To reflect upon whether the Centre should extend its mandate in a way that would allow it to work elsewhere in Africa in line with the University's vision, and the implication thereof for its capacity requirements.
4. Finally,
- In relation to each of the above, to make recommendations that would improve the capability and capacity of the Centre to carry out any future mandate.

APPENDIX E:

References (available from Research Office, UKZN, Durban):

- [Harper] = Harper Report, Durban, November 2004
 [Sogge] = Sogge Report, Amsterdam, September 2006
 [SE] = Self Evaluation of CCS, Sept. 2007
 [TD] = Tender Document: Tender and Preliminary Plan to Establish a Centre for the Study of the Non-Profit Sector at the UND, 2001
 [TS, no] = Transcripts of interviews, page number(s)
 [CNS] = CCS constitution

Abbreviations:

- CADD = Community and Development Disciplines
 CASS = Centre for Applied Social Studies
 CBO = Community Based Organisation
 CCA = Centre for Creative Arts
 CCS = Centre for Civil Society
 NGO = Non-Governmental Organisation
 SCS = School of Community Studies
 SDS = School of Development Studies
 UN = University of Natal