

### In this Newsletter

1. Summary of the talk by Sascha Auerbach at the April Branch Meeting
2. The Funding Crisis in HE
3. Report from Regional Committee
4. TUC Pensions Conference
5. Worker Led Just Transition
6. British DSocial Attitudes Survey
7. CINDERS TURNING TO ASHES
8. UCU Retired Members Branch



### More information and news

can be obtained from these websites.

UCU National Website:

<http://www.ucu.org.uk>

AgeUK: <http://www.ageuk.org.uk/>

68 is too late: [www.68istoolate.org.uk](http://www.68istoolate.org.uk)

National Pensioners Convention (NPC):

<http://npcuk.org>

### Follow your branch:

Website: <http://www.ucu-em-rmb.org.uk>

Twitter: @ucu-em-rmb

Please join the new Facebook Group at:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1077256209678817>

### Branch Meeting

Details of the next meeting are yet to be decided.



We hope that you will read and enjoy our newsletter. It would be even better if you wrote for it. Send in an article -it does not have to be long- to me. It can be on an issue of interest to you and other retired members. You might want to correct or challenge a previous article. The only limits are that you must provide your name and treat other members with respect. Get writing!

Julian Atkinson

---

## **1. Summary of Sascha Auerbach's talk on *Slavery and the Colonial Origins of Public Health*.**

In the late eighteenth century, the Caribbean was a very fragile system, owing to a collision of man-made and natural disasters. Planters were growing cash crops, which were not native to the islands and which changed the whole ecology. The work was done by imported, enslaved Africans (a quarter of whom did not survive the passage). As the whole economy was orientated towards cash crops, one of the issues arising was how to feed the local population. The answer was found in imports from other parts of the Empire as this was cheaper than producing food stuffs for local consumption on site. This ecological disruption contributed to the high mortality rate of slaves (and the lack of oversight as to how slaves were being treated). Competing empires were better at keeping their slaves healthy, but the British considered them private property outside the purview of the State.

The American War of Independence disrupted supply chains and hurricanes, which became more frequent, disrupted supply chains, trade routes, and production. It was this changing context that made slave owners concerned about the health of their slaves and the abolition movement contributed to these concerns. Slave owners were looking for ways to lower mortality rates and to increase fertility. Barbados was the only island where these aims were met, partly because land was devoted to local food production there. Slave owners on all islands were, however, concerned with improving the health provision.

Public health, however, required some involvement of, and regulation by, the State. James Grainger, an ex-army surgeon, married into a sugar plantation, and publishes in 1764 *An essay on the more common West-India diseases; and the remedies which that country itself produces*. He managed to create some public support for health professionals and research (but didn't acknowledge native contributions to his work). Whereas medical research could identify causes and problems, there were no means to make slave owners follow any guidelines, but eventually the idea emerged that health benefits might be used in defence of slavery.

Jamaica offered cash rewards for women who had healthy children surviving into adulthood. Methods were borrowed from the empires of other powers, and eventually officers returning from the Napoleonic Wars were recruited to oversee the treatment of slaves (merging in fact civilian and military government). The health "rights" for slaves conflicted with the rights of the owners to do with their property as they pleased, especially the notion that enslavement might create mental health issues.

Much of this early health provision was by trial and error and driven by instrumental rather than humanist concerns, but public health in the colonial periphery was an issue a long time before the lessons learnt were applied in the metropolitan centre.

Sascha Auerbach hosts *Where Did Everyone Go? Histories of the Abandoned*  
<https://podcasts.apple.com/fi/podcast/where-did-everyone-go-histories-of-the-abandoned/id1797327170>

Harry Ziegler

---

## **2. The Funding Crisis in HE**

What is happening currently in Higher Education is commonly referred to as a funding crisis. How we name things matters, because if it is a funding crisis, this implies that the solution to the problem is more funding. More money would be welcome, but it won't address what has actually created the current situation. The crisis as it is, has been caused by the market model of Higher Education.

A core belief of the Conservative party since Thatcher, and one never seriously challenged by Labour, is the notion that "the market", this figment of the neoliberal imagination rather than the markets as they actually exist and operate, drives innovation and improvements in quality through competition. Another core belief of the Conservatives, also not seriously challenged since Callaghan's Ruskin College speech, is that the main purpose of education is to train the labour force for employment. Education for citizenship and emancipation became, at best, a remnant to be tolerated. In the early days of neoliberalism, it was still accepted that the State would underwrite human capital formation, but, under the small state Tories Cameron and Osborne (and with the collaboration of the Liberal Democrats), this responsibility was shifted on individuals "investing" in their future and expecting a financial return on that investment. The role of the state was reduced further by limiting funding to STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) subjects, and then only a part of it, but the bulk of university funding was to come from paying customers (students and companies buying "services"). The market model was extended by lifting the cap on how many students a university could recruit per academic year, exposing the less prestigious (and less socially exclusive) institutions to increased financial risk. (The Conservatives were unlikely to have a problem with this. The post-1992 universities had been at the forefront of the widening participation agenda, for which the Tories (and many Labour politicians) had little time or respect as they sent their children to "good" universities.) The "good" universities would prosper, and the rest would perish. The crisis as it is now, is not an aberration, but was the aim of a market model in which the weakest are eliminated.

The increase in tuition fees and reduction of what little there remained of maintenance grants were not, however, popular. As a result, the Government did not increase the fees cap in line with inflation, except once in 2016, so that the income from fees shrank in real terms. According to a briefing paper published for the House of Lords on 23 August 2024 (<https://lordslibrary.parliament.uk/higher-education-funding/>), the average income from tuition fees and teaching contracts is 53%. This varies, of course, according to the type of

university as some are far more dependent on income from teaching. All universities responded to this challenge by recruiting students from overseas who, through their much higher tuition fees, in part subsidise British students' studies. Numbers from the same briefing paper suggest that a quarter of universities' income is derived from overseas students. The number of countries from which English universities recruit is, however, small; changes in these countries can affect recruitment. By the same token, British governments worried about pressure from the right to reduce immigration, can change visa rules which also have a negative effect on recruitment from abroad. Applications from international students dropped by 18% after rule changes introduced by the Sunak Government, but applications from home students are also going down, not least because potential students are questioning the value of taking on debt in an environment where employment is increasingly precarious.

In its general election manifesto, the Labour Party committed to creating a "secure future" for higher education and pledged to work with universities to "deliver for students and our economy". (<https://labour.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Labour-Party-manifesto-2024.pdf>) So far, however, there is little sign of this. Labour is tightening further the restrictions on international students and so far, has not made additional money available except for a slight rise in fees. In the meantime, staff and students are bearing the brunt of the cuts, students through loss of options and choice, and staff through increasing SSRs (staff-student ratios), unmanageable workloads, and insecure employment. Universities UK, the umbrella organisation of UK universities, published the results of a survey recently (<https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/what-we-do/creating-voice-our-members/media-releases/universities-grip-financial-crisis-what>) which suggests that 49% of universities have closed courses, and 18% whole departments. Nearly one university in five has reduced investment in research and four in five are considering cuts in this area. According to an article in *The Guardian*, 10,000 jobs have so far been lost in the sector. (<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2025/may/08/uk-universities-income-falls-for->

[third-consecutive-year](#)) Arts and Humanities are particularly affected as these are not seen as vocational degrees. (The report from Regional Committee gives some current numbers of planned cuts in the East Midlands.)

The market model of HE has arguably also contributed to the current situation in other ways. Universities are competing on the basis of new buildings, are trying to acquire real estate in London so as to attract international students who would rather be in the capital than in the provinces, and by opening campuses outside Britain so as to circumvent immigration rules. Competition may be driving innovation in the sense of making university management creative in seeking income streams but is highly debatable whether their actions improve the quality of students' education. It may not just be that universities do not receive enough money, but it is also time to ask how they are spending what money they have got.

In April, our General Secretary gave evidence to the Education Committee and in June, the Government will present its spending review. A White Paper on post-16 education is expected after that. Let's hope that a government, which constantly talks about growth, sees higher education as productive force, but also a means to enhance critical and emancipatory thinking. This would, however, require that the anarchy of the market which dominates the sector at present is replaced with a model which has its heart medium to long-term thinking and restoring a degree of stability in which teaching and research can prosper.

Harry Ziegler

---

### 3. Report from Regional Committee

HE Sector Committee no longer meets on the same day as Regional Committee. Members voted to have the meeting on a Wednesday afternoon before Regional Committee. The meeting on 16 April 2025 was cancelled by the Chair in solidarity with the UNITE strikers in the Union.

The Chair of Regional Committee reported that the FE Sector had not been quorate, and neither was the Regional Committee, which had both been scheduled to meet on 26 April

2025. There was therefore no AGM, and the current officers will continue in post until elections can be held. No business could be transacted.

The RO reported, however, that a number of institutions in the Region are planning redundancies. The University of Derby, which had already the lowest number of PLs and professors, has declared 35 people from that group at risk. The Branch seems unwilling to fight these redundancies, but more are expected next year. Nottingham University has declared 446 posts at risk and will proceed in two phases; support staff will be targeted first. Support functions will be centralised and some outsourced. Lincoln University wants 285 staff to leave, 150 through Mutually Agreed Redundancies. This is part of a major reorganisation. The immediate impact, however, will be an increase in SSRs. The Branch is planning on taking industrial action. Nottingham College intends to lay off 20 support staff, mainly SEN support, which raises issues as to whether the College is still compliant with the law. A Section 188 notice was expected from DMU the day after the meeting. The universities of Leicester and Loughborough are expected to make redundancies next year. Across the Region it is noticeable that employers are resorting to capability procedures as a cheaper route to redundancies.

Harry Ziegler

---

### 4. TUC Pensions Conference – 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2025

Your correspondent was intending to write a general article on the work of the national Retired Members Committee, of which he is Vice-Chair, but time has proven limited. However, something which may be of much greater interest, is the April TUC Pensions Conference, which several members of our committee attended, including our Chair, Liz Lawrence. The article below is adapted from Liz's report.

This conference is an annual event organised by the TUC for trade unionists which brings together pension experts and trade union



pension trustees, pensions officers and other union representatives.

The meeting started with an address from Torsten Bell, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Pensions. Some of the themes in his address were also presented by other speakers. The government's is that auto-enrolment in pensions has been a success in substantially increasing the number of pensioners with occupational pensions. The Government plans continued support for auto-enrolment. The focus is on economic growth to increase wages and hence the size of occupational pensions. The Labour Government clearly sees itself as managing capitalism more efficiently.

There was recognition of the problems for workers who have pension savings in many small pension pots. Consideration is being given both to help with tracking and tracing pensions, through the creation of a pensions dashboard and the provision of consolidation of pension pots. The Government plans to create a National Wealth Fund and is looking to pension funds as a source of investment to finance economic growth. It also wants to encourage mergers of pension funds to have fewer, larger funds, which are likely to be more robust.

How much will this actually help pensioners and reduce poverty among the elderly? Plans to improve traceability of pension pots and consolidate them could be helpful to workers who are in precarious employment and work for many employers over a working lifetime, if there is enough in the pension pots to make the occupational pension worth having. A workshop on poverty among pensioners identified certain groups as most vulnerable to poverty in old age, including workers in precarious employment, women, some minority ethnic groups, and people renting in the private sector.

There was little discussion of the level of the state pension and the focus seemed to be mainly on occupational pensions. These can work reasonably well for groups of workers with stable employment, high earnings and a decent defined benefit pension scheme. The danger for some other groups, however,

particularly those who are low paid and in casualised employment, is that if they accrue a small occupational pension it may raise them just above the level for means-tested benefits, but not provide an adequate income in retirement. The means-testing of the winter fuel allowance highlighted the difficult situation of people just above the qualification level for this benefit. Pensioners with very small occupational pensions would be better served by raising the level of the state pension. No explicit discussion was observed of the situation for migrant workers or UK pensioners who have pension savings in more than one country, but this is also an issue which needs addressing, since some workers have working lives in more than one country and this can be expected to continue to be the case in future.

A workshop was held on 'Integrating climate risk into scheme investment'. This indicated that some people working in the financial services industry are very aware of the climate issue and are factoring it into economic planning. Risk was explored from various aspects. These included loss of assets from climate events, such as fires and flooding, and loss to profits depending on how just transitions are managed. It was recognised that this is a politically contested area and that the Trump administration might oppose such integration of climate considerations in investment planning, just as it has opposed Diversity, Equity and Inclusion policies in organisations.

At times, comments from the conference floor indicated a view of the world in which poverty in old age was seen as a real and pressing problem, rather different from the government view that an increase in the number of occupational pension holders and better occupational pensions would provide an answer. For those workers in precarious employment and on low earnings, who do not earn enough to save for a good occupational pension, improvements in management of occupational pensions are unlikely to be the answer. What the Labour Government is contemplating in terms of pension reform may help some of the relatively better paid workers, but will leave poorer workers still at risk of poverty in old age, and hence give

Reform UK and other far-right groups an issue for mobilisation and recruitment.

The UK Government is planning a pensions review and legislation on pensions, so trade unions need to watch developments in this field.

With many thanks and full credit to Liz Lawrence, Chair of the National UCU Retired Members Committee.

Rob Kirkwood

---

## 5. Worker Led Just Transition

I was elected the first Climate Officer for Notts Trades Council in April 2024 having made the case for the post at earlier trades council meetings through my involvement with the Climate Justice Coalition and New Lucas Plan.

It has proved to be rather challenging trying to establish the Climate Officer role on the Notts TC during a period of constant industrial unrest, attacks by Government and uncertainty around public services in Nottingham where I live. Gary Young recently attended a 'resistance' workshop in Hyson Green – a deprived area of Nottingham City – he described the situation of the City as that of a 'failed state' – local authority 'bankruptcy' operating under commissioners, the principal NHS Trust in special measures and the local Police authority in a similar position. In such circumstances it is easy to see that climate change matters are seen to be second order.

At the time of becoming Climate Officer the Trades Council agreed to work in conjunction with the Carbon Neutral 2028 – a partnership project led by the City Council and championed by the former deputy leader of the Council in the Nottingham Green Partnership. I was sceptical about this decision having been a member of the Green Partnership at its inception as an academic and community activist – my experience was that it had little interest in the trade union position. I was happy to go along with the decision but made my concerns known to the Trades Council. In the event the funding crisis at the Council and the failure to attract corporate sponsorship meant that the flagship 'Citizens Assembly' was scaled back significantly.

The Nottingham Save Our Service Campaign (Notts SOS) which was established with a strong involvement by the Trades Council in response to swingeing cuts to budgets and resulting cuts to services provided by the City Council as a result of the actions of the commissioners. Again the immediate threats to jobs and services precluded space for consideration of climate breakdown concerns. I made the point that public services would need to be greatly expanded if climate breakdown impacts were to be mitigated – but this could not be developed in the atmosphere of cuts and threatened cuts.

I attended a public consultation for the new East Midlands Combined Authority for the Adult Skills Fund which would come under the control of the new mayoralty and set the agenda for adult skills – including Further Education and Adult Education. My fellow campaigner from Derbyshire and myself were askance that the consultants leading the event had no time to consider skills needed to address climate impacts.

Positively there was to be a series of meetings to be hosted by the Worker-Climate Project which would invite Trades Councils from around the country to present their experience of developing approaches to a worker led Just Transition. It turns out that the Worker-Climate Project is an outcrop of the former 'Labour for a Green New Deal' – that had been very active under the Corbyn leadership of Labour but had found itself marginalised by the new party leadership under Starmer. They came to the view that it was better and more effective to build a campaign outside the Labour Party. The meetings for Trades Councils on worker led Just Transition were to be the one of the first under their new non-aligned campaign. This approach accorded with the routes I had suggested to Notts TUC.

So far there have been three meetings convened. All have been on Zoom and open to Trades Councils across the country. Each has taken short presentations from Trades Council officers and then opened up a forum for debate from Trades Council delegates elsewhere. It was agreed at the end of the third session that the meetings were of great value – enabling

Trades Councils to better understand their work on worker led Just Transition and of the challenges that each face. The dialogues were honest and objective.

One of the central points that emerged for me was of the advanced positions developed in Scotland by their Trades Council often in response to the huge threats to the future of vital fossil fuel extraction/distribution and refining industries which face uncertain futures if we are to address climate breakdown effectively. There is clearly a pressing need to develop strategies for a Just Transition for workers in these industries – the corporate class have shown little appetite to address this need, showing a similar disdain to that shown to the coal miners by the Thatcher Government. The Trades Councils in Scotland, unlike those in England/Wales are closely integrated with the Scottish TUC which is entirely separate to the TUC. In England/Wales Trades Councils operate very much outside of the formal TUC structures in comparison with what appears to happen in Scotland. Consequently there appears to be a much more concerted and coherent approach in Scotland. There has been some good work at the regional level by Yorkshire and Humberside TUC which appears to be supported by Trades Councils in the region but less integrated than what is seen in Scotland.

UCU has adopted a strategic approach to responding effectively to the challenges of climate breakdown with excellent programmes of continuing professional development for members and an active policy development process unafraid to tackle the thorny issues. Certainly, the incompatibility of militarism and re-armament to effective action to address climate breakdown is fully recognised.

The recent Summit of Resistance attracted over 2000 people and set out a set of seven demands including

***'No more austerity: welfare not warfare - Invest in housing, public services and the welfare state, not in militarism, the drive to war or increased defence spending. Stop the attacks on disabled people - end cuts to services and benefits, scrap the two-child cap and reinstate the Winter Fuel Allowance.'***  
and

***'Action on the climate emergency - No more investment in fossil fuels - invest instead in a million green jobs to deliver the sustainable economy we need'***

There remains a huge task to integrate these demands into Trades Councils and Trades Unions but it is one that we must not shy away from. A worker led Just Transition lies at the heart and is a good focus for much needed debate, discussion and development by Trades Councils across the country.

Ian Hewitt – Notts Trades Council Climate Officer

---

## 6. British Social Attitudes Survey

The exploration of satisfaction with the NHS and Social Care produced by the King's Fund and the Nuffield Trust makes interesting and thought provoking reading. It is a consideration of the latest British Social Attitudes Survey. There has been a significant collapse in satisfaction with both Social Care and the NHS. In 2024, only 13% of respondents said they were 'very' or 'quite' satisfied with social care (the same figure as 2023). 53% of respondents were 'very' or 'quite' dissatisfied. Satisfaction with GP services continued to fall, mirroring the trend over the last few years. 31% of respondents said they were satisfied with GP services, compared with 34% in 2023. 51% said they were satisfied with the quality of NHS care. People aged 65 and over were more likely to be satisfied (68%) with the quality of NHS care than those under 65 (47%). Dissatisfaction with waiting times and the ability to get an appointment is widespread and is consistent across respondents from all ages and UK countries: 62% of all respondents were dissatisfied with the time it takes to get a GP appointment. 23% were satisfied. 65% of respondents said they were dissatisfied with the length of time it takes to get hospital care. 14% said they were dissatisfied.

Dissatisfaction levels are highest regarding the length of time it takes to be seen in A&E. 69% of respondents said they were dissatisfied, while just 12% said they were satisfied. This loss of satisfaction with the services is both reflected in and promoted by media such as The Mail, Sun, Times and the other usual suspects. Of course, they have an agenda that is

fundamentally opposed to the NHS and its free provision of care. The Private Health providers are hovering and have infested our political elites with “helpful” grants of money. Wes Streeting has been particularly blessed with this beneficence.

This year’s results show that the startling collapse in public satisfaction with both the NHS and social care has continued. This indicates the degree of danger for the NHS. Satisfaction with the health service is now 39 percentage points lower than it was before the Covid-19 pandemic in 2019. Dissatisfaction with the NHS has climbed further to 59%, a record level never seen before in this survey’s 41-year history. Meanwhile, satisfaction with social care appears to have plateaued at a low of 13%. This collapse in confidence could have bad consequences for the future of the NHS. In the USA, Republican politicians have expressed a strategy for diminishing state services, “starving the beast”. Such services are underfunded and dissatisfaction with their deterioration makes it easier to replace them with private profit orientated enterprises.

There are also some positives in the Survey. When the funding of the NHS was considered, only 8% of respondents said that the government spent too much or far too much money on the NHS; 21% said that it spent about the right amount, and 69% said that it spent too little or far too little. Only 11% agreed that ‘there are enough staff in the NHS these days’. 72% disagreed. This shows that the public is well aware that the source of the NHS problems is a lack of money.

When asked about government choices on tax and spending on the NHS, the public would narrowly choose increasing taxes and raising NHS spend (46%) over keeping them the same (41%). Only 8% would prefer tax reductions and lower NHS spending. The analysis reveals divergence in many areas: along party political lines, with Reform supporters least satisfied overall with the NHS. Even on the question of NHS spending, where real political distinctions exist, a majority of supporters of every political party share the view that too little money is spent on the health service. The public agrees that the NHS is broken, but in particular ways – above all because of waiting times, staffing and

money. This points in a different direction to the arguments of Nigel Farage for an insurance based scheme. Needless to say, he has said nothing about the transition from a tax based financial provision to an insurance model that starts from scratch with no financial resources.

The government faces the prospect of addressing these concerns if it is to reverse a tectonic shift towards disillusionment with Britain's national health services. And that means more money and less artificial fiscal rules.

[Julian Atkinson](#)

---

## 7. CINDERS TURNING TO ASHES

UCU’s march and rally in London on May 10 highlighting the plight of post-16 education was undoubtedly necessary and useful. But with little or no media coverage, and given what we know about the government’s economic agenda, it feels implausible that our members will not be forced into a more strenuous national response in both HE and FE sectors. The parlous state of post-16 funding is leading to genuine crisis levels in HE, with mass redundancies being announced in many universities with brutal cost-cutting measures and course closures becoming nigh-on daily announcements. The FE sector, which I focus on here, has, as we know, been in Cinderella’s shoes for decades, largely ignored by the media and rarely at the top of the in-tray of one education minister after another. In recent editions we have highlighted the parlous state of FE funding and its corresponding staffing and morale crisis. Weasel words about the importance of the sector to the economy have been left to hang on the petard of one cut after another whilst more progressive notions of lifelong learning have been largely jettisoned.

A recent (Jan 25) comprehensive review by the Institute of Fiscal Studies (IFS) of post-16 funding lays bare the scale of this crisis. Spending across the whole education sector fell remarkably by 11% in real terms between 2010/11 and 2023/4 or, as a proportion of national income, from 5.6% to a mere 4.1% despite large increases in student participation. Recent increases in school funding, though stemming the tide, are merely



restoring spending per pupil back to 2010 levels, though the tiny increase in capital spending could put further pressure on these budgets as schools battle against the blight of decaying and RAAC infested buildings.

In FE, spending fell in real terms by 14% in colleges and a staggering 28% in school sixth forms between 2010/11 and 19/20. Labour's autumn budget has done nothing to repair this damage and indeed inflicts more. The IFS points out that once inflation and rising student numbers are taken into account last autumn's £300 increase (ring-fenced for 16-19 provision) will actually deliver a real terms freeze in funding per student leaving this measure 11% below 2010 levels in colleges and 23% lower in sixth forms. This will be compounded by a projected 5% increase in student numbers between 2024-8.

Meanwhile average FE teachers' pay remains around 18% below that of schoolteachers, resulting in a now permanent recruitment and retention issue in the sector. That the IFS can recognise this problem while a Labour government chooses to ignore it is particularly galling and suggests a collision course ahead if the unions decide to take industrial action. Furthermore, the report notes that 37% of colleges reported operating deficits in 2022/3 and that at least £200m of additional funding would be needed simply to maintain spending per student up to 2028 - again without factoring in teachers' pay. Conversely therefore, with a predicted rise of 5% in 16-18 year olds up to 2028 funding per student will actually fall by a further 4%.

Being the lowest hanging fruit in the sector adult education fares even worse. The most eye-catching figure, perhaps, is the two-thirds collapse in spending on adult classroom-based learning - the kinds of activity that used to keep colleges open until 9.30 every night and had second-chance learners and pensioners coming through the doors. This is a classic case of robbing Peter as successive governments have become increasingly myopic in their view of what adult education should be for and reflects the shift towards vocational spending, for example on apprenticeships and work-based learning, both questionable in their effectiveness. The peak years for adult funding

were the early 2000's. By 2023 it had fallen by a third. When considering the whole round the IFS calculates a 23% decline since 2010//11.

The spring spending review had yet another sting in the tail with an announcement that the adult social fund to devolved budgets, ie those going to mayoral authorities and the like, of a further 2-3%, much to the chagrin of those bodies, who had expected more especially given the so-called growth agenda. With adult learner numbers, especially via 'traditional' routes halving in a decade, none of this adds up to a well thought-out strategy. Non-devolved providers, such as the WEA and those in the private sector get a kick in the teeth with a sudden additional cut of 6% and a removal of 'uplift' funding, which supported providers who had been so successful they had over-provided.

The coming years will undoubtedly be a mighty challenge for the whole sector, and consequently for our union.

**Meanwhile UCU is running a consultative e-ballot in all branches to ascertain the appetite for a national strike ballot in autumn.**

[Paul Wilkinson](#)

---

## **8. UCU Retired Members Branch**

See how to join our Branch Facebook group, as detailed in the information section on Page 1.

Our branch has been meeting since 2008 and now has well over 300 members. Our aims are listed below. We meet three times a year, often in places of interest to make part of a day out. Meetings focus on important issues for UCU pensioners and provide a chance to talk with other retired members.

A termly newsletter with articles of interest to retired UCU members is e-mailed to all branch members for whom we have addresses and to UCU branch secretaries in the East Midlands and to other RMBs.

Please let us have your personal e-mail address and let us know if it changes.

## RMB Roles and Functions

- To represent the interests of retired members within the union.
- To represent the interests of retired union members within the wider union and pensioner movements.
- To provide a forum within the union for retired members to come together to consider and debate matters of mutual interest.
- To provide a resource of collective memory, advice and expertise in support of the union, in particular to those still in active employment.
- To provide active support, where appropriate, by involving the broadest section of the branch in support of the wider interests of the union and its members, including support for those still in active employment.

**For more information  
please contact** Harry Ziegler  
e-mail: [em-rmb-sec@outlook.com](mailto:em-rmb-sec@outlook.com)

website: [www.ucu-em-rmb.org.uk](http://www.ucu-em-rmb.org.uk)  
twitter: @ucu-em-rmb

facebook:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1077256209678817>

### East Midlands Branch officers and committee

Chair: Rob Kirkwood: [rsmkirkwood@gmail.com](mailto:rsmkirkwood@gmail.com)

Vice-Chair: Angus McLardy:

[apmclardy@btinternet.com](mailto:apmclardy@btinternet.com)

Secretary: Harry Ziegler: [em-rmb-sec@outlook.com](mailto:em-rmb-sec@outlook.com)

Assistant Secretary: Crystal Walker:

[crystalwalker@btinternet.com](mailto:crystalwalker@btinternet.com)

Assistant Secretary: Paul Wilkinson:

[paul.wilko@ntlworld.com](mailto:paul.wilko@ntlworld.com)

Treasurer: Brian Hambidge:

[brianhambidge44@gmail.com](mailto:brianhambidge44@gmail.com)

Equalities officer: Vacant

Membership: Bob Haskins:

[bobh@piperdrive.org.uk](mailto:bobh@piperdrive.org.uk)

Newsletter Editor: Julian Atkinson:

[jdatkinson34@btinternet.com](mailto:jdatkinson34@btinternet.com)

Committee Members:

Margaret Davies: [mhdavies8@aol.com](mailto:mhdavies8@aol.com)

Alan Tuckman: [alantuckman@gmail.com](mailto:alantuckman@gmail.com)

Rachel Grant: [rachelhgrant@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:rachelhgrant@hotmail.co.uk)

Godfrey Jennings:

[godfreyjennings0507@gmail.com](mailto:godfreyjennings0507@gmail.com)

East Midlands regional UCU committee.

HE representatives: Harry Ziegler, Rob Kirkwood

FE representatives: Margaret Davies