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1.0 BACKGROUND

On 27th August 2015, the Minister of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education Hon Dr Michael Kaingu, MP., dissolved the Copperbelt University (CBU) Council following the impasse between the University Council and the Copperbelt University Academic Union (CBUAU) that led to the closure of the University in June 2015.

The Hon Minister appointed a ten member Caretaker Committee to preside over all affairs of the University. The Committee was given an immediate task to investigate the circumstances and concerns which culminated in the disruption of the academic life of the University and to recommend the necessary actions to avoid a similar situation in future. The Committee was given two weeks in which to submit its report to the Hon Minister on this matter.

The appointed Committee comprised the following Members:

i. Mr. Friday Ndhlovu - Chairperson;
ii. Dr. Patrick Nkanza - Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education (MESVTEE);
iii. Ambassador Lucy Mungoma - University of Lusaka;
iv. Prof Patrick Phiri - Copperbelt University;
v. Mr. Mwiya Songolo - CBUAU;
vii. Mr. Henry Tukombe - MESVTEE;
viii. Mr. Humphrey Lungu - Copperbelt University and Allied Workers Union (CBUAWU);
ix. Mr. Sylvester Chulabantu - Copperbelt University Senior Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff Union (COSATSU); and
x. Mr. Owen Mgemezulu - MESVTEE.

2.0 COMMITTEE’S WORK PROCEDURE

The Caretaker Committee held its first meeting on 1st September 2015. The meeting was attended by CBU Management and a representative of the CBUAU.

The Committee reviewed its specific Terms of Reference (Appendix 1) and adopted its work procedure. The Committee agreed that its point of departure would be to review the letter that the Copperbelt University Academics Union (CBUAU) wrote to the Honourable Minister of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education (dated 22nd June 2015 entitled Vote of No Confidence in Copperbelt University
The approach adopted for the remainder of the assignment was as follows:

- to meet the CBUAU (without CBU Management) to elicit evidence on all the allegations against CBU Management raised in the letter to the Honourable Minister of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education;

- to meet the CBU Management (without CBUAU) to seek substantiation of their response to the allegations contained in the CBUAU’s letter to the Honourable Minister of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education;

- to meet the CBUAWU (without CBU Management and CBUAU) to seek their views on the allegations against CBU Management raised in the CBUAU’s letter to the Honourable Minister of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education;

- to meet the COSATSU (without CBU Management, CBUAWU and CBUAU) to seek their views on the allegations against CBU Management raised in the CBUAU’s letter to the Honourable Minister of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education;

- to be open to all witnesses so that as much information as possible could be obtained and analysed;

- to review all relevant documents and analyse the information provided by CBUAU, CBUAWU, COSATSU and CBU Management and prepare a report on its findings; and

- to present its findings (with recommendations) to the Honourable Minister of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education.

3.0 REVIEW OF THE CBUAU’S LETTER TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF EDUCATION DATED 22ND JUNE 2015 AND ENTITLED VOTE OF NO CONFIDENCE IN COPPERBELT UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

The Caretaker Committee reviewed the letter that the Copperbelt University Academics Union (CBUAU) wrote to the Honourable Minister of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education. The letter contained nine (9) allegations against the Copperbelt University (CBU) Vice Chancellor and his Management and on whose basis, the CBUAU passed a Vote of No Confidence in the Copperbelt University (CBU) Management. The Vote of No Confidence was passed during the CBUAU meeting held on 16th June 2015. The specific allegations contained in the letter are outlined below:
i) Continued Misleading of the University Council on University Policies

The CBUAU alleged that Professor Naison Ngoma led by decree and misled the University Council by submitting policies and other documents to the Council without the approval of various University Committees. The specific issues cited were as follows:

- The passing of the ‘Lecturer Work Load Policy’;
- The ratification of the ‘Copperbelt University Statute’;
- The adoption of the ‘Alcohol and Drug Policy’ and Purchase of Breathalyzers;
- The decision to confer an Honorary Doctorate degree on Mr. Vernon J. Mwaanga;
- Appointment of Deans for various schools; and
- Worsening the already blotted CBU establishment by creating new positions in middle Management at the expense of academic staff.

ii) Lack of Offices and Computers for Academic Staff

The allegation was that Professor Naison Ngoma made no attempt to plan for the construction of offices for academic staff since he assumed office in 2012 although half of academic staff had no offices.

iii) Lack of Lecture Rooms

The allegation was that Professor Naison Ngoma did not make an effort to provide additional lecture rooms although the University had only half of the required lecture rooms. Instead of providing additional lecture rooms, Management was worsening the situation by converting some classrooms into offices for the administrators that were being engaged.

iv) Misplaced Priorities

It was alleged that Management’s priorities were misplaced and was reflected in the following:

- That after spending K9 Billion (unrebased) on the purchase of a Graduate School Complex, meant to have classrooms and lodging for graduate students, Management was focused on building a Kitchenette instead of adding academic value to the Complex by building more classrooms;
• That Management convinced the University Council to purchase a Restaurant/Lodge called Africanza using a K4.3 Billion (unrebased) loan from Investrust without any economic analysis to establish the viability of the business. As a result of this purchase, academic work had greatly suffered as the restaurant was unable to service the loan. Instead of the restaurant servicing the loan, Government funds meant to go towards academic work was being used to service the loan;

• That more than K6 Billion (unrebased) had been spent on the Multi-purpose Facility Hall (MPFH) and more was being spent on the same. That this money was not budgeted for and neither did the University Council approve the MPFH project. That the funds used should have gone towards construction of permanent classrooms unlike the MPFH which was said to have a seven (7) year life span. That the University Council had failed to supervise Management.

v) Lack of Discipline in Contracting Debt/Loans

It was alleged that within a space of three years, the University Management had contracted a number of loans from Investrust Bank. These were tabulated as follows:

• K4 Bn (unrebased) out of the K9 Bn used for the purchase of the Graduate School Complex;

• Funds used to purchase personal to holder vehicles for Principal Officers; and

• K4.3 Bn (unrebased) used to purchase Africanza.

vi) Failure to Pay Retirees Benefits and Gratuities

It was alleged as follows:

• That the debt towards retirees and gratuities had been increasing since 2012 since Prof Ngoma became Vice Chancellor;

• That Management had not availed the University Council any plans on how to deal with the situation;

• That the Vice Chancellor and Management never appeared on the lists of those waiting to be paid gratuity as they were paid as soon as their
contracts expired; that money for payment of gratuity for Management was always found but not for the ordinary workers; and

- That the Vice Chancellor and Management did not inspire confidence as they failed to raise extra funds but instead preoccupied themselves with lamenting about poor funding from Government.

i) **Non Remittance of Contractual Obligations**

That Management was not making effort to remit contractual obligations to NAPSA, ZRA, ZNBS and ZSIC.

ii) **Increased Number of Contractors for Non Academic Works**

That Management was wasting resources by engaging a number of contractors for activities that were not core to improving the academic wellbeing of the University.

iii) **Increased Travelling by the Vice Chancellor**

That the Vice Chancellor was undertaking a lot of unnecessary trips abroad.

4.0 **MEETINGS HELD WITH VARIOUS PARTIES TO ESTABLISH THE VERACITY OF ALL ISSUES RAISED IN THE CBUAU LETTER TO THE HON MINISTER**

In line with the Committee’s adopted work procedure as outlined in section 2.0, the Committee was given time to study the CBUAU letter as well as the Management response. Thereafter, CBU Management was asked to excuse themselves to allow the CBUAU Executive Committee Members to freely elaborate and adduce evidence on the allegations raised in their letter. After discussing with the CBUAU Representatives, the Committee later engaged the CBU Management Representatives to discuss and obtain supporting evidence to the response to allegations made by the CBUAU. In order to have a complete picture of the matter, the Committee also engaged the Copperbelt University Allied Workers Union (CBUAWU) as well as the Copperbelt University Senior Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff Union (COSATSU).

4.1 **MEETING HELD WITH CBUAU REPRESENTATIVE**

The CBUAU Representative took the Caretaker Committee through all the nine (9) issues contained in their letter to the Hon Minister. The Committee sought more insight and clarification on each of the issues. The CBUAU Representative did not provide documents to support his submission but requested that more Members of CBUAU
Executive Committee be allowed to appear before the Committee on Wednesday, 2\textsuperscript{nd} September 2015 at 09.00hrs to reinforce the submission made by way of furnishing concrete evidence on all the issues. The Committee had no objection to the request.

The Caretaker Committee also proposed to undertake a tour of the Graduate School Complex and the Multi-purpose Facility Hall to appreciate the concerns of the CBUAU as contained in the letter to the Honourable Minister.

4.2 MEETING HELD WITH THE ENTIRE CBUAU EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Committee met the CBUAU Executive Committee Members on Wednesday, 2\textsuperscript{nd} September 2015. Details of what the CBUAU submitted is attached as Appendix 2.

4.3 MEETING HELD WITH CBU MANAGEMENT REPRESENTATIVES

The response by Management to the issues raised in the CBUAU letter to the Hon Minister is attached as Appendix 3.

4.4 MEETING HELD WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CBUAUW

The Submission made by CBUAUW is attached as Appendix 4.

4.5 MEETING HELD WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF COSATSU

The Submission made by COSATSU is attached as Appendix 5.

4.6 MEETING HELD WITH THE STATUTE COMMITTEE

The Submission made by the Statute Committee is attached as Appendix 6.

4.7 MEETING HELD WITH DEANS OF VARIOUS SCHOOLS

The Submission made by the Deans is attached as Appendix 7.

5.0 ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS ON SPECIFIC ISSUES RAISED IN THE CBUAU LETTER TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER

5.1 Continued Misleading of the University Council on University Policies

Specific Allegations:

a) Professor Naison Ngoma and his Management sneaked the “Lecturer Work Load Policy” for approval by Council without passing through the respective Committees of the University.
The Caretaker Committee’s analysis of this matter revealed that there was no evidence provided by the Management to confirm their position that adequate consultations with Stakeholders were undertaken. A further investigation by the Caretaker Committee through the Deans and Directors of Schools on the varying positions presented by the Management and the CBUAUU, established that there was generally insufficient consultations held with the Stakeholders on this matter including the Schools, before the Policy was presented to Council for approval. The only notable consultation was said to have been done by the Deputy Vice Chancellor with some Schools and, only after the Policy had already been approved by Council. Written record of this consultation is not available either.

As a way forward, the Caretaker Committee resolved with both sides that if any revisions may be necessary, Management Committees of Schools could submit their inputs through Deans, Directors and Coordinators for consideration by Council.

b) The recently ratified Copperbelt University Statute which was thoroughly consulted and agreed upon by all Stakeholders was doctored and passed to Council for approval. That submissions of Stakeholders in a Consultative meeting were discarded and that among other issues, a good example was the appointment of Dean. The allegation further states that instead of presenting to Council as per the resolution by the University Stakeholders, Professor Ngoma and his Management changed the Stakeholders’ resolutions and presented to Council that “at least two and no more than three of the top elected candidates be nominated and subjected for interviews”. More disturbing it states, is the office of the Legal Counsel which has failed to serve the best interest of the University Council but individual Principal Officers. The CBUAU demanded the original Statute document as agreed in the Stakeholders Consultative meetings.

The Management had totally denied this allegation and provided evidence to show that the document presented to and, approved by Council was exactly what was adopted by the Statutes Committee which comprised among others eminent external Legal Counsels and was Chaired by the Honourable Mr. Justice Lloyd V. Siame.

After examination of evidence provided by Management in the form of the approved Text of the University Statute; two sets of minutes of meetings held by the Statute Committee with Stakeholders, and; a summary of submissions made by Stakeholders to the Statutes Committee, the
Caretaker Committee called for a meeting with members of the Statutes Committee with the view to seeking verification of the allegations by the CBUAU. After an examination of the information provided by the Statute Committee, the Caretaker Committee concluded as follows:

- The Text of the University Statute presented to and approved by Council was the text that was agreed upon with the Stakeholders during the Consultative process;
- That Professor Ngoma did not change what the Statutes Committee agreed upon and presented to Council, the original of which was circulated electronically to the whole University community after it passed Council;
- The alleged good example cited by the CBUAU, on the appointment of Deans was not reflected in the approved Statute as alleged; and
- That the University Legal Counsel was not guilty of any wrongdoing as accused.

c) Alcohol and Drug Policy

On the basis of the submissions by the two sides, the analysis of this matter by the Caretaker Committee was that Management moved hastily in purchasing breathalyzers in response to the Disciplinary Code that had been adopted at the time of the purchase and while consultations on the Alcohol and Drug Policy which was supposed to inform the type of intervention by the University were still ongoing. Although Management did not put the breathalyzers to use and planned to sell them off, the CBUAU was justified in considering the action by the Management as one of the instances of misplaced priorities and decisions taken before broad consultations were made.

d) The Vice Chancellor bulldozed the conferring of the Honorary Degree on Dr. Vernon Johnston Mwaanga

An investigation of the minutes of the Senate availed to the Caretaker Committee showed that the Senate had approved the awarding of Honorary Doctorates to former Namibian President, Dr. Sam Nujoma, Zambian Politician Mr. Vernon Johnson Mwaanga and the Zambeef Managing Director, Mr. Carl Richard Irwin without any problems, before they submitted the recommendations for approval by Council.
However, the Deans and Directors who sit on the Senate orally submitted that the awarding of Honorary Doctorates was still new to the Copperbelt University and that the process needed to be improved in future. In particular, they pointed out that more time was required in studying the nominated candidates and to allow the Honorary Awards Committee do a thorough examination on them after receiving recommendations from the respective Schools. This procedure was necessary prior to submitting the same to the Senate for agreement, before Council approval. The Caretaker Committee established that there was more information that had been expected to be availed with respect to two Zambian candidates. Dr. Mwaanga had been recommended by the Dag Hammarskjold Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, in relation to Honorary Doctorate that he was being recommended for.

e) No Substantive Deans for a long time and appointments are done by decrees others, continue in office by word of mouth

The submission from Management was that appointments were pending the adoption of the University Statute. With its recent ratification by Senate, and approval by Council, appointments of Deans would commence.

However, as established earlier, the Caretaker Committee learnt that there were still some misunderstandings arising from Management’s inclusion of interviews after election of candidates.

On the other hand, an inquiry from the Acting Deans established that contrary to allegations by the CBUAU, there were no appointments made by decree; that their continued stay as Deans was communicated in all cases in writing and, that the acting period for three Deans recently expired and are awaiting written communication from the Management on their positions.

f) Worsening the already bloated Establishment by creating new positions in middle management at the expense of an academic staff

Management availed the Caretaker Committee with a chart and statistics indicating that the recruitment of staff was in line with the 2014 to 2018 Strategic Plan which indicates that out of all staff recruited between January and May, 2015 sixty seven per cent (67%) were academic staff. A copy of the Strategic Plan was availed in support of this point.
There was no counter evidence from the CBUAU on the statistics provided by Management. The Caretaker Committee, therefore, considers this allegation as lacking substance.

5.2 Lack of Offices and Computers for Academic Staff

Specific Allegation: That more than half of the academic staff have no offices and they stand by the lawns every day as they wait to enter the classrooms to lecture. There has been no attempt by Prof Ngoma’s Management to construct offices for academic staff since he assumed office in 2012.

The CBUAU provided evidence showing the total number of staff and available office space. They argued that the computers required would equal the same number as the deficit in office space. The Caretaker Committee could not accurately determine from the information presented, the number of offices that had been provided each year since Professor Ngoma assumed office as Vice Chancellor in 2012. The CBUAU contended that his Management lacked academic focus because they had instead, prioritized construction of an administrative block, a car park and a day care centre under the 2015 University budget and pushed construction of offices for academic affairs to 2017.

In their mitigation, Management explained that construction of offices for staff was in the Strategic Plan for the University. They stated that plans had been made since 2013 to find office space and gave an example of the efforts to partition the Kitchen of the former University Dining hall and the conversion of seven staff houses into office space. However, these had to date not been converted allegedly, because lack of funds constrained implementation of this project. On computers Management said they had bought 606 computers had been bought in the last two years at a cost K13billion (unrebased)

The Caretaker Committee observed that there was merit in the CBUAU raising the issue of lack of offices. However, the issue of computers still has to be verified in terms of the type of computers and the targeted recipients. It is quite obvious that the lecturers without offices could not have received Desktop computers. Notwithstanding financial resource constraints, this matter remained a serious problem that required Management prioritization.
5.3 Lack of Lecture Rooms

Specific Allegation: That Professor Ngoma and his Management did not make an effort to provide additional lecture rooms although the University had only half of the required lecture rooms. Instead of providing additional lecture rooms, Management was worsening the situation by converting some classrooms into offices for Administrative staff.

In providing the 2014 to 2018 Strategic Plan and an Activity Work Plan and Budget which provided for the construction of the following Schools: Medicine, Natural Resources, Mathematics and Natural Sciences as well as the construction of the Directorate for Distance Education and Open Learning, the Caretaker Committee established that Management had endeavoured to provide lecture rooms but had been constrained by lack of financial resources.

5.4 Misplaced Priorities

Specific Allegations: That Management’s Priorities were misplaced and was reflected in the following:

5.4.1 Failure to add academic value to the Graduate School Complex

After studying the submissions of the CBUAU and the response by Management on this matter, the Caretaker Committee undertook an inspection of the Graduate School. The Committee had already established the Cafeteria was added to the Contract because it was needed given the location of the Complex. Contrary to the allegations, it was established that the Complex was a good investment of great academic value to the University and was in fact, value for money spent to purchase it. The Caretaker Committee also observed that ample lecture rooms, staff offices, library, computer room, student hostels and a cafeteria to cater for staff and graduate students at the premises had been completed in some cases and, constructed works were moving tandem on the other unfinished works. However, Management lamented the slow pace at which the Construction Company was taking to complete the remaining buildings. The Dean also expressed concern at the lack of resources to equip the Library and the Computer rooms which still only remained with only furniture items. Following the tour, the CBUAU representative on the Caretaker Committee explained that the allegations made in June reflected the positions as at that time.
However, the overall assessment by the Committee still maintained that this clarification changed little in terms of the weight of the allegation.

5.4.2 Purchase of Africanza

In examining this matter, the Chairperson of the Caretaker Committee declared interest and recused himself from discussion on this matter. A study of the allegations and response by Management with supporting documents indicated that Africanza was purchased from CBU own resources following the conducting of a due diligence study and that the investment was viable. Additional evidence provided in the form of Minutes of Council meetings, Business Plan, Due Diligence report proved that the project was approved by Council and that the necessary economic analysis was undertaken. The 2014 audited Statement availed by Management also showed that the investment was viable and not at all dependent on the CBU support as alleged. The allegation is, therefore, null and void.

5.4.3 Construction of the Multipurpose Facility Hall (MPFH)

The Caretaker Committee analysed this matter only on the basis of submissions from the CBUAU and Management’s response. Records provided by the CBUAU and Management put together, did not give the Caretaker Committee a full picture of the total expenditure on the MPFH to confirm either the allegations that K6 Billion Kwacha (unrebased) or Management’s position. However, the Development Committee Minutes of the meeting held on 4th September, 2012 showed that the Committee approved the proposal to construct the MPFH and that contrary to the allegations, the decision was endorsed by the Council meeting held on 7th November, 2012 on which the CBUAU is also represented. Management also explained that the books for the Multipurpose Facility were audited in 2014 and that no anomalies were found with regard to the method of procurement of related items.

The Caretaker Committee learnt from Management that the decision to construct the facility arose from pressure on the University to provide space for holding Graduation ceremonies and utilize as an examination hall among other activities. The MPFH has also been utilized as a lecture hall for big classes which could not be accommodated in existing University lecture halls. The call by the
CBUAU that the University Council must be answerable to Government for failure to supervise Management may, therefore, also need to be weighed against the need that arose for having such a facility and that correct procedures were followed for approval of the project albeit not having been budgeted for.

The Committee also established that the allegation by the CBUAU that the Vice Chancellor decided to purchase the Multipurpose Marquee during one of the errands to China was false. A detailed list of the travels made by the Vice Chancellor indicated that he had never been to China.

5.5 Lack of Discipline in Contracting Debt/Loans

Specific Allegations: That within a space of three years, the University Management had contracted a number of loans from Investrust Bank for the purchase of the Graduate Complex; Africanza Lodge and Restaurant and; personal to holder motor vehicles, as outlined earlier in the Report under the CBUAU submission.

The Chairperson of the Caretaker Committee Mr. Friday Ndlovu, declared interest in this matter. The allegations by the CBUAU insinuated that his having been Chairperson of the recently dissolved University Council and until recently also at the helm of Investrust Bank, may have played an alleged influential role in the favours for loans being obtained the University from that Bank.

After a careful scrutiny of the evidence provided by Management the Caretaker Committee was satisfied with the correctness of the position on the matter. The evidence availed was in the form of accounting documents that showed that the Graduate School Complex and Africanza were both purchased using CBU own funds. The CBUAU did not dispute this evidence and, therefore, the allegation is null and void.

The Procurement on the motor vehicles was done through asset financing by Investrust Bank. Furthermore, Minutes of the Management Executive Committee held on 9th December, 2013 showed that three Banks namely, Investrust, Eco and Baclays submitted their proposals for asset financing in respect of the purchase of the vehicles. Investrust had the cheapest offer.
An investigation on the presence of Banks operating ATMs having full banking facilities revealed that ZANACO, Barclays, Finance, ECO and Investrust Banks started their operations at the University in the order listed, and that ECO and Investrust have full banking facilities. The Caretaker Committee learnt that the presence of the Banks on campus was initiated in 2005, long before the current Management Team led by Professor Naison Ngoma. The Banks responded to the invitation by the University in the wake of Government’s decision to pay student allowances in cash and the security concerns presented for them moving around with huge sums of money to be deposited in Banks in the City.

5.6 Failure to pay Retirees Benefits and Gratuities

Specific Allegations: The debt towards retirees and gratuities had been increasing since 2012 when Professor Ngoma became Vice Chancellor and that there were no plans availed to deal with the situation. Moreover, that the Vice Chancellor and Management never appear on the List. Management contended that this problem had been with University for a long time due to insufficient funding and is, therefore, not unique to the current Management Team. However, they did not submit the list of retirees as at 2012 and the names of the 93 members of staff that they submitted had been paid between January 2014 and May, 2015.

After its interaction with various University Stakeholders, the Caretaker Committee learnt that although they appreciated the challenge that Management faces in addressing this long standing problem, in comparative terms to previous Managements there appears to be little effort dispensed in reducing the numbers of those on the list.

5.7 Non remittances of Contractual Obligations

Specific Allegation: That Management had failed to pay various institutions such as NAPSA, ZRA, ZSIC and ZNBS. Furthermore, that the University Management had even gone to the extent of deducing VAT from consultancies undertaken by the Academic members of staff but failed to remit the same to ZRA.

The Caretaker Committee’s conclusion on this matter is similar to the case on gratuities. Management is pleading financial constraints but provides no payment plans made. Management disputed the deduction of VAT for consultancies by Academic staff.
5.8 Increased Number of Contractors for Non Academic Staff

Specific Allegation: That there was a large number of Contractors on site contracted by the CBU Management to undertake non-academic projects

Evidence given by the Management was that its initiative to outsource services were meant as a cost cutting measure, for instance for cleaning and security services. The oral submission made by the CBUAU countered the by Management. However, with regard to their example on security services the CBUAU could not supported the allegation documented evidence. The CBUAU had alleged that between 2014 and 2015 security services went up from K900, 000 to k2.4million rebased.

The analysis of presentations given by the two sides still leaves this matter hanging in determining the corrective measures to be taken for the long term financial health of the Institution. There is need for the CBU Council to review this matter.

5.9 Increased Travelling by the Vice Chancellor

Specific Allegation: That the Vice Chancellor undertook frequent trips abroad with big entourages., that these trips did not yield any profit to the University and that this happened at the cost of educational field trips by students with their lecturers which had been halted. That a single trip by the Vice Chancellor and his team was capable of offsetting 2 educational trips of 30 students per trip.

On examination of both CBUAU and Management’s response submissions, the Caretaker Committee observed that trips by the Vice Chancellor must be undertaken on the basis of a cost benefit approach. Investigations also confirmed that permission for the Vice Chancellor to travel is granted by the Secretary to the Cabinet after assessing the trip’s value to the University. Management submitted a list of all the travel that Professor Ngoma had undertaken between November 2013 and June, 2015, stating the purpose for the travel. There was no single instance that he traveled to China.

As some of the one discussed in the report, the Caretaker Committee observed that this allegation was mired in conjecture and lack of researched information on the activities of the Principal Officers and moreover poor communication between Management and other Stakeholders in the Governance structure of the University.
6.0 OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Caretaker Committee appreciated the cordial and candid manner in which discussions were conducted with all the stakeholders in this matter. Notwithstanding the difficulties that the Academic Union had in obtaining some of the documented evidence to support the allegations contained in their letter to the Minister, their openness and willingness to explain issues during their oral presentations demonstrated their readiness to work towards a lasting solution to the governance of the Copperbelt University.

Generally, the Caretaker Committee observed from the documented evidence and, from the discussions in audience held with parties beyond the Management and the Unions, revealed that Management had not failed in its responsibility for the governance, control and administration of the University.

Furthermore, the Caretaker Committee observed that the dissolved Council was not negligent in its supervision of the Management on the matters contained in the Academic Union’s letter to the Minister.

Contrary to the assertion by the Academic Union that poor funding of the Institution is not the bigger problem but that of the misdirection of resources by the Management away from academic work, upon examination of the record of the oral presentations, documented evidence and the interactive discussions held with others mentioned above, the Caretaker Committee observed that limited resources coupled with poor flow of information and lack of well defined internal communication structures were at the centre problems at hand.

A review of Council documents has revealed that most of the issues raised by the CBUAU in their letter to the Honourable Minister were discussed in the Council meetings. This raises the question of whether CBUAU was effectively represented in the CBU Council. Cases in point are the allegations that Management contracted three loans from Investrust Bank for purchase of Africana, Graduate Complex and Motor vehicles. These matters were discussed in Council but the allegations made by CBUAU show that the Union did not have this information. It was also established that the construction of the Multipurpose Facility was not a popular policy among the University Stakeholders. This was the more reason why the Representatives of the Unions on the Council should have taken the responsibility to share information with larger membership on the matters related to the financing of this and other Projects stated above.

The Caretaker Committee generally observed that the CBUAU representative on the Council was not sharing Council documents such as agendas, budgets, resolutions, etc
with the CBUAU Executive Committee members. This meant that the CBUAU membership were not effectively represented in the decisions made by the Council.

The Caretaker Committee’s examination of the issues and allegations raised by the CBUAU in the letter to the Hon Minister dated 22nd June 2015 with regard to the Principal Officers and the evidence gathered after investigations revealed that there are no sufficient grounds to warrant the call for Council to terminate their services; and

Finally, although the Committee’s findings have established that the CBUAU allegations as contained in the letter to the Hon Minister have largely been without merit, evidence elicited from Deans and Directors point to shortcomings in management style of the current Vice Chancellor. These witnesses informed the Caretaker Committee that the management style was characterized by dictatorial tendencies eg shouting at Lecturers; centralization of authority where Deans were not considered part of Management as they were not involved in decision making, etc.
7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE MINISTER

1. In order to restore trust and harmony, the lacunae in the internal communication structures of the University which hinders effective flow of information among all stakeholders, must be addressed as a matter of priority;

2. The University must put in place well defined mechanisms and systems for regular dissemination and sharing of information between Management and all Unions;

3. That as a matter of priority, Management explores ways of meeting contractual obligations for its employees to ZRA, NAPSA AND ZSIC;

4. In order to arrest the problem of acute limited resources which have given rise to discontent among academia and students in the delivery of quality education, there is need for a detailed short to long term Plan that would ensure that funding gaps are closed from the year 2016 onwards;

5. There is need to orient Constituent Members of the CBU Council on their role on the Council.

6. The CBUAU Executive Committee should ensure that they are effectively represented on the Council.

7. The CBUAU Executive Committee should ensure that their representative on the Council adequately engages them on both the Agenda and Resolutions of the Council meetings.

8. The Honourable Minister should prevail on the Council to ensure that certain concerns such as those relating to management style of the Vice Chancellor are addressed timely.

9. On the basis of the evidence analysed, the Caretaker Committee was unable to validate the Vote of no Confidence passed by the CBUAU.