**Minutes**

**Students’ Representative Council Meeting**

13 March 2019, 19:37 @ Huis Marias

# Prologue

A regular Students’ Representative Council meeting of Stellenbosch University was held on 13 March 2019, in terms of section 38 and section 39 of the Stellenbosch University Student Constitution which mandates the SRC to meet at least once every two weeks. The following are the minutes thereof.

# Welcoming

C. van Wyk welcomes everyone to the SRC meeting of 13 March 2019 and states that the meeting will take place from 19:37-21:37.

# Attendance

**Members present**

Carli van Wyk

Mthunzi Matshabane (leaves early due to academic reasons)

Melt Hugo

Mariné Hugo

Leighton September

Paulu Joubert

John Kachoko

Lauren Stevenson

Eduard Beukman

Alex van Greuning

Jané Fourie

**Managers present**

Anna Durheim

Bongani Mapumulo

Takudzwa Masunda

Maxolile Ndamandama

**Apologies**

Thembeka Myeko (proxy went to Leighton September)

Inés Mars

# Approval of previous minutes

A. van Greuning and E. Beukman approve the minutes of previous meetings

# Setting of the agenda

There have been changes to the agenda and the minutes will be a reflection thereof.

# Feedback

## Prim committee

P. Joubert states that Prim development took place on 12 March 2019 with Prof Stan du Plessis. PK is currently undergoing internal re-structuring to ensure that representation flows through the system to increase participation and prevent top-down communication. The committee would like more voices to be heard and create comfortable spaces for dialogue.

## Academic affairs council

E. Beukman states that the council is currently waiting on re-admission statistics from the registrar. AAC also hosted a successful open day, with the involvement of all the faculties to cultivate a welcoming environment for prospective students. The structural system of various faculties have also been finalized fostering engagement between faculties. The ACC is also revising faculty constitutions to ensure the inclusion and alignment of both undergraduate and postgraduate students. Furthermore the AAC also went on a development camp to plan out the year.

## Societies council

There is no feedback as elections for a new chairperson and vice chairperson have been postponed. The SRC is also waiting on student court’s response for the appeal case.

## TSR

J. Kachoko explains that the TSR has been working on two issues, the transport fund and library hours. There has been a lot of uncertainty between the TSR and clusters as to who is liable for the transport fund. Previously money would be injected into this fund and the TSR would then be responsible for paying the buses, the newcomers used during welcoming along with general transport expenses. A policy is currently being drafted to provide more clarity with regards to the fund. The library has also received R24 000 which makes provision for extended library hours to accommodate students different examination and test schedules.

## Military academy

No feedback

## Election conveners

A. van Greuning explains that the executive of the SRC is responsible for electing the election conveners according to the student constitution. Applications have been sent out, received and interviews have been conducted. The elections are currently in its final phase and candidates will be elected by the end of March.

# Voting

# Communications

C. van Wyk explains that section 22(6) of the student constitution states that the communication officer is a compulsory position within the SRC. She further states that in the case of a bi-election this position will be made open for broader campus, if not a SRC member will fill this role.

Election of the communication officer will take place according to the student constitution section 6(102). A 50% plus one vote is required, the candidate will also have to give a motivation and one round of questions will be allowed before the vote.

**Only one candidate: Leighton September.**

P. Joubert hands out the voting ballots and an active citizen from the floor helps C. van Wyk count the votes. *L. September is elected as Communications Officer.*

# Discussion

C. van Wyk requests members of the house to recognize the rules of engagement. According to section 4 (44)(1c) in the student constitution, a student that is not a member of the SRC is only allowed to speak if they submit a written notice 24 hours in advance to the SG and it is approved. C. van Wyk states that no notice was received however the SRC will allow points from the house to ensure constructive engagement.

## By-election

C. van Wyk explains that in the previous SRC meeting, the SRC voted on the possibility of a by-election due to Lethiwe’s resignation. In the space of time following the meeting another resignation was received from Tariq Khan. The SRC is waiting on student court to submit the declaratory order regarding the process of by-elections. The SRC’s current understanding of a by-election entails applications being open for two weeks, caucuses will occur on both central campus and satellite campuses prior to elections.

L. September disagrees with the possibility of a by-election due to the lack of time as the new SRC member will be elected at the end of the SRC term, resulting in thus member being unable to contribute to the team and fulfill the responsibilities of the role. He also states that a declaratory order has been requested seeking clarification as to whether Skype counts as quorum but no feedback has been received yet. A. van Greuning, J. Kachoko and E. Beukman all agree with L. September point as it would disrupt the planning on the SRC elections, it would be a strenuous process for the current SRC and should not occur for the mere sake of reaching quorum. The suggestion from members within the SRC is to distribute portfolios internally and possibly appoint more managers to share the workload equally.

## Portfolio re-allocation

### Strategic initiatives and leadership development

L. September states that this has not been an active portfolio based on reports and that the previous portfolio holder focused on accommodation. The SRC has also managed to operate in absence of the portfolio hence the suggestion that the portfolio be defined and strategic initiatives can be divided amongst the executive of the SRC. E. Beukman cautions that if this suggestion is implemented there is a need for one person to spearhead this portfolio to ensure accountability and responsibility.

M. Matshabane cautions that if the executive take on this additional portfolio it would increase pressure leading to P. Joubert to elaborate on the idea as he states that each executive member will take on one strategic initiative and will be responsibility for that specific initiative. M. Hugo states that this portfolio can also be reshaped despite its prior existence and that it should be taken on full on. He further states that if all SRC members are thinking strategically with their portfolios and the budget has not been approved then there is no need for this portfolio.

L. Stevenson agrees with P. Joubert and L. September points as it will ensure the continuity of the SRC and it will broaden the role of the SRC. Some members within the SRC feel that the executive spearheading this portfolio would be ideal due to their level of commitment.

Two suggestions reached is that the executive take on this portfolio bearing in mind the additional workload and pressure or a SRC member avail themselves to delegate this portfolio

C. van Wyk concludes that a decision will not take place regarding these two portfolios as this is merely a meeting and a decision will be made at a think tank.

### Transformation

C. van Wyk informs the house that she had a meeting with KristhoffKridge and Mini regarding the possibility of the two mangers managing the transformation portfolio as critical engagement and women empowerment stems from transformation. Both mangers will still be responsibility for their respective managerial positions but will also serve as umbrella transformation officers.

M. Matshabane is in favor of this suggestion and suggest that an additional manager to assist with the workload and bring in new innovative and creative ideas, as both appointed mangers will still be responsible for their respective managerial positions. L. Stevenson also suggests that the 4 mangers can work as a team for transformation but still work on their own individual project.

M. Ndamandama states that it is important to speak to everyone involved with the portfolio as he cautions to not make the team to big as there would be need for a leader of the team. A big team will result in the vision and structure being lost. The SRC need to consult who is really interested in driving the process as opposed to people who desire the position to pursue personal interests. L. September states that by adding another manger it will serve as an operational hindrance and the appointment of a new manger will be time consuming due to the SRC term coming to an end.

C. van Wyk agrees with the points raised and reitatres that this is merely a suggestion and an opportunity to discuss it. Further stating that both managers were unable to attend tonight meeting and C. van Wyk does not want to make decisions on their behalf. Voting regarding the future of this portfolio will not take place and will be discussed at a think tank.

## Financial guideline

L. Stevenson states that the challenge to the financial guideline is that it is a structured budget which does not allow for increases/adjustments for the SRC members respective budgets. The executive solution is that if a SRC member desires an increase in their respective budget it will need to go through the strategic fund. Adjustments to an SRC member budget will need to be aligned with the financial guideline as a new preliminary budget will need to be provided and the questions in the guideline will need to be answered. The financial guideline is currently being updated. C. van Wyk expresses that this adjustment will give the SRC more lee-way regarding adjustments with budgets, ensure accountability, transparency and sustainability.

## Shuttle Task team

Following the SRC’s last think tank, a decision was made to create a task team according to the section 31 in the student constitution. The task team will focus on finances and social justice. Members of this task team will be responsible for organizing consultation with the necessary stakeholders and research. The team will be led by C. van Wyk and all students may apply. The only criteria is that students need to be committed and passionate about the cause. The task team will be a continuous initiative and applications will be sent out before the end of the term.

# 8) General points

## Manger contracts

M. Bothma states that contracts were sent out once again as concerns were raised and a vote needs to take place on it. According to the constitution there is no specific way to vote this in. It will be a majority vote and those with voting rights may vote. Contracts were voted in and will be available in Sharine’s office tomorrow by 12:00 for mangers to sign and two witnesses will be required.

## Evaluation panel

E. Beukman explains that the SRC need to select and appoint who will serve on the evaluation panel as the panel meets in September. The initial criteria for this panel was either two students or two staff members. A vote was taken where SRC members decided that there should be a combination of staff and student. Nominations have to be sent to A. Greuning and are due by the end of the term.

## Institutional forum

M. Bothma and A. van Greuning are the two SRC members who serve on the institutional forum and request that a vote be taken on who will serve as a member on this forum from the student union. Criteria for this member is that the student had to serve on the SRC as the institutional forum wants to ensure continuity. This procedure was voted in on the 3rd May 2018 as part of the institutional forum vision. The two nominations are Wiann Bester and Denisha Padachey.

L. Stevenson disagrees with the criteria as she finds it unfair that this position has not been made available to all students. C. van Wyk states that she is aware the SRC may receive backlash for this, the nominations were due last year hence she proceeds with the voting process. Denisha is elected as the member from the SRC.

## Food security

P. Joubert provides feedback on the meeting he attended alongside M. Matshabane and K. Krige with Alumni, SSVO, student communities and person of student supports. The meeting had a large turnout due to it being a collective problem that needs to be resolved. P. Joubert states he will remain updated with the situation and look into various ways in which the SRC can address this problem.

C. van Wyk states that the people’s movement is organizing a drive and would like the SRC office to serve as a pickup point. A. van Greuning discloses that he is contact with an individual that tackles issues like food security. Once feedback is received, tomorrow, the SRC can relay the information to the right people.

M. Ndamandama explains that some students may have money available for food but are unable to access their food allowance because these students do not have proof of accommodation. He proposes that the SRC need to look into the rooms available on campus and states that to his knowledge there are rooms available in Metanoia and Aurora PSO house. P. Joubert states that J. Fourie and he has a meeting scheduled with student housing to discuss the matter of accommodation as it is a serious issue on campus. He also states that he is aware of the rooms available in Aurora, the rooms open in Metanoia are reserved for international students and that they will be looking into room availability at LLL, and names of students will also be collected for SRC assistance.

## Impartiality of budgets

TK seeks clarity regarding the impartiality of budgets as he asks the SRC if certain budgets are favored over others. L. Stevenson explains that the budget process entails a preliminary budget from the respective SRC member which is then adjusted and discussed amongst the executive. If the executive disapprove the specific budget will have to be adjusted further until it is approved. If a budget is approved, it is made available to the respective SRC member.

L. Stevenson states that academic pressures just like all students are subject too, have a role in the release of the budget but that budgets are always completed. TK states that he would prefer to have an internal discussion as he is waiting on information and it is a constitutional matter. C. van Wyk personally invites TK to attend an executive meeting to discuss the issue further and requests that L. Stevenson make the required documents available to TK, if he does not have access to the documents.

# 9) Next meeting

Next term

# 10) Closing

Meeting adjourned at 21:58