**Minutes**

**Student’ Representative Council Meeting**

4 October @19:00 (SRC Boardroom)

# Prologue

A regular Students’ Representative Council meeting of Stellenbosch University on (4 October), in terms of section 38 and section 39 of the Stellenbosch University Student Constitution which mandates the SRC to meet at least at least once every two weeks. The following are the minutes of the meeting thereof.

# Welcoming

C. van Wyk opens the meeting at 19:02

# Attendance

Present:

Carli van Wyk

Alex van Greuning

Leighton September

Lauren Stevenson

Lethiwe Mbatha

Melt Hugo

Mariné Bothma

Tariq Khan

Mthunzi Matshabane

Paulu Joubert

Eduard Beukman

Absent:

Alchadvon Fransman

John Kachoko

Thembeka Myeko

Jané Fourie

Proxies:

L.Stevenson: A. Fransman and J. Kachoko

L. Mbatha: T. Myeko

P. Joubert: J. Fourie

# Setting of the agenda

C. Van Wyk asks two SRC members to raise their hands to confirm the setting of the agenda. L.September and M.Botma raise their hands. C.Van Wyk proceeds to thank them.

# Voting

C.Van Wyk: Procedure for tonight’s voting will be as follows:

Voting will take place in terms of the student constitution section 102 according to section 102 1(d), we will have a positive closed vote and members will have to achieve a 50% plus one vote to be elected. Candidates will have the opportunity to address the house for two minutes where after we will have one round of two questions. After questions we will proceed to voting. In the spirit of transparency and accountably, one member of the house will be asked to help the chairperson of the session to ensure its all free and fair.

Due to the fact that I am also running for representative of council. , A.Van Greuning the Vice-chairperson will ensure that there is no conflict of interest by chairing the session.

C. Van Wyk denies point of order according to the constitution. Allows A. Andrews point of clarity.

A.Andrews: Clarity pertains to the attempt to raise a point of order. Which constitutional prescription allows you or distinguishes you to prefer point of clarity as opposed to point of order

C.Van Wyk: Thanks speaker, well according to the constitution, If a member that is not elected of the house would like an opportunity to speak. The chairperson ,which is I of the session can allow this person to speak or I cannot allow them to speak according to section 41 (c ) of the student constitution. A person who is not a member of the SRC is not allowed to speak unless they sent a written notice to the secretary to speak at least a day before the meeting. I will allow a point of clarification

M.Mlangeni: Constitution does not refer to a point of order, rather it refers to a point I would like to discuss, so it would become an agenda point.

C.Van Wyk I understand where you are coming from although I will not allow a point of order. I request that you will need to send in a notice to make one.

M.Mlangeni: While student parliament was taking place, they had to postpone because SRC members weren’t there. Information was sent a long time ago and as SRC members you would have been well aware. You have all read and understand the constitution. So I wouldn’t be wrong to say that the SRC sabotaged student parliament.

C. Van Wyk: Thank you, first of all we would never sabotage student parliament as we support it and we do stand for accountability. We were supposed to 5 members attending, in the future we would like to attend more meetings. What happened was that the SRC had already had two meetings this week, three of our members wrote tests at the time and another member was late due to unforeseen circumstances. The 5th member had an emergency so we had to find another 5th member, while this member was on his way , the meeting was adjourned. I would love to have a meeting with the current speaker to ensure that we do support student parliament. I will no longer take points regarding this matter because we need to vote according to the agenda.

M.Mlangeni: That is a wrong precedent for a meeting because you can’t say that you will no longer be taking points. You also can’t have private meetings with the speaker. That meeting was open to the public, the same way this meeting is more than just the SRC. You are represented students not SRC members. If we ask questions and for clarity you have to allow it.

C. Van Wyk: I do understand and I see where you are coming from so we will not proceed with the agenda.

A.Andrews: Point of clarity, student constitution section 41(1-3) .providing for discretion you would allow certain points. The constitution says you have to give one university day notice for point , the speaker should allow it. How are we suppose to bring a point in one university day that hinges on a meeting that happened an hour ago. The student parliament meeting had happened an hour ago and we are expected to give a university notice to something we could not have foreseen. Ultimately we rely on your discretion to entertain us however your discretion has hinged that you will not take a point of order but rather point of clarity. We believe that to underpin the rationale you present to the house otherwise it would be an arbitrary decision. In this sense you allow point of clarity but in another sense you refuse point of clarity or point of orders regarding the student parliament meeting.

C.Van Wyk: Speaker as I said , I do apologize given the importance of this matter, I do allow the speaker to continue.

A.Andrews: Clarity based, does this mean you will allow point of orders from this point on.

C. Van Wyk: I will not take point of orders, only point of clarity but regarding the importance of this matter, I will allow the student to raise their points.

A.Andrews: Point of clarity. Does this mean we are allowed to raise a point of order in respect of this matter.

C. Van Wyk: Would you want to raise a point of order before we proceed.

M. Mlangeni: You said there was a family crisis but there are 15 members. What made students angry, was that the SRC members were moving around and just drinking coffee. Student parliament has been postponed for a long time and finally had a meeting , only for it to be postponed again. I conclude that you please communicate to the speaker to ensure that your house is in order. Please make sure in future we have SRC members attending student parliament meetings to avoid it being postponed. Thank you

A. Van Greuning: I apologize in this meeting as well. Once we arrived at the student parliament meeting , I did apologize for there not being quorum at the start which is unacceptable . The only explanation I can give for that is that we were trying to marshal the energy of our SRC. This is our first meeting, with tomorrow morning being our second. We were postponed by a week due to our chairperson and vice chairperson elections which means we have lost a lot of time. We do need to make the portfolio appointments tonight. To make provision for the student parliament meeting at six tonight, we consulted with the student parliament speaker earlier this week, who was kind enough to come to our office where we agreed that this meeting would be moved an hour later so that student parliament could have their speaker elections. I would like to clarify that the SRC does support student parliament and wants it to succeed. The only reason that there was not quorum was due to the emergency raised, the member had to replace himself. I understand in the heat of the moment he may not have thought of it, we should have thought of it and made sure there were 5 members. At the end of the day there were 8 people there, however the ruling was already made which s constitutionally understandable. Going forward we will ensure there is quorum at these meetings and once again I would like to apologize for there not being quorum tonight.

C. Van Wyk: Once again we apologize that our fifth member was not present. The reason for two meetings is because we want to serve campus. Our meeting was moved in provision of your meeting. We can carry on with the discussion regarding whether SRC supports student parliament. We do apologize that our fifth member was not present and we will be more visible at the next meeting.

**C. Van Wyk allows L. September to speak before moving on**

Leighton: I would like to shed light on the student constitution amendments. Section 104, subsection 6 , chapter 4 comes into effect on the 1st day of the fourth term 2019.

A.Andrews: Point of order. When will the final document be made available to students in order to gain clarity regarding the different bodies and power.

C. Van Wyk: We working on the student constitution

A.Andrews: Asks that the previous member withdraw his statement.

L. September: Refuses to withdraw his statement. Once again reads the student constitution. The section I am speaking about came into effect on the 17 September 2018 hence I will not withdraw my statement.

C. Van Wyk: We moved our meeting to prevent clash as we recognized their meeting might taking longer. We will prevent future clashes and we do support student parliament. With that saying I conclude this point.

A.Andrews: If the SRC meeting does not make quorum at the time the meeting was to open. Do you wait for SRC members to arrive and how long do you wait. Will the meeting continue.

C. Van Wyk: Thank you speaker, we are allowed to have a SRC meeting without quorum , we cannot vote without quorum. I now conclude that point.

**Voting commences in accordance with the agenda**

Once again due to me standing for representative as council , A. Van Greuning who is vice chair will now act as chair to ensure there is no conflict of interest. I will just repeat the procedure from earlier.

Voting will take place in terms of the student constitution section 102 ,according to section 102 1(d), we will have a positive closed vote and members will have to achieve a 50% plus one vote to be elected. Candidates will have the opportunity to address the house for two minutes where after we will have one round of two questions. After questions we will proceed to voting. In the spirit of transparency and accountably, one member of the house will be asked to help the chairperson of the session to ensure its all free and fair.

## SRC Representative on council

1. Van Greuning: Just to confirm the members standing for council are E. Beukman,P.Joubert, C. Van Wyk,M.Matshabane, L. September. Could those five candidates please present starting with E. Beukman who has two minutes. (26;00-1:02:54).

**Each candidate gives their speech.**

**Questions are then asked to each candidate after everyone has given their speech.**

A. Van Greuning states that questions will be asked in accordance with the candidates. First question is then directed towards E. Beukman and so forth. One question will come from the SRC and the other from the house. Time limit of a minute for each question to be answered.

S.Speaker: Suggests that the members stand outside as questions are asked as they can be influenced by other members.

A.Van Greuning: Denys the suggestion that candidates need to stand outside.

S.Speaker: Point of clarity is the meeting being minuted or recorded

A.Andrews: Point of order should we not have been informed that we were being recorded. Stating from point of clarity what will happen to the recording

A. Van Greuning: The recording will not be used beyond the SG and is being used for minute purposes.

L. September: I am only recording because I’d like to engage more as opposed to typing throughout the meeting. It will be destroyed once its been minuted.

**After each candidate answers their questions, Alex announces that we will now proceed to voting**. According to the student constitution section 102(d), a positive closed vote will take place. I ask that the candidates leave the room as we had out the ballots. You will not receive two ballots but one in which you write two names if you have are a proxy. Please can someone from the house assists with the voting to ensure transparency and fairness.

**Voting results are announced:**

C.Van Wyk first member on council , with 50 plus one votes

We will then proceed with a second round of voting with E.Beukman,M. Matshabane,L. September, P. Joubert as they have the same amount of votes, to choose our last member on council.

P. Joubert is then voted as the second representative on council.

## SRC Representatives on senate

C.Van Wyk thanks the vice chair and Lonwabo for assisting with the votes

The following members running for senate: M. Hugo, L.September, E. Beukman and M.Matshaban. Asks M. Hugo to give his two minute address to the house, the rest of the candidates will be required to do the same. Thereafter each candidate is subject to two questions from the house; one from the house and one from the SRC members. Then voting will commence, 50% plus one majority must be achieved to be elected. 3 candidates will be chosen as representatives on senate.

M. Hugo states he has served on various structures in a non-positional leadership. He is well-prepared and always willing to discuss with

L. September speaks he is more well-prepared to serve on senate given his experience. He is fortunate enough to be in senate two years and to be able to serve on senate for two years will ensure good leadership.

E. Beukman states he was also able to serve on senate last year and it is a very important role. I want to start new conversations with senate, promote new avenues for postgrad scholarship. Aside from working with senate, I want to bring new dimension to it.

M. Matshabane, senate pertains to student success so it’s vital for me to be a representative on this board , to ensure I remain in the loop and I will be able to bring my dynamic in terms of experience. I bring love and ingenuity I will incorporate these elements if I am elected as representative on senate.

C.Van Wyk then asks for candidates to step forward for the round of questions. Reminds that each candidate will get two questions, one from the SRC and one from the house. All four candidates then answer the questions presented, once questions are completed , C. Van Wyk announces that voting will commence.

**Voting results are announced(each have a 50% plus one majority):**

M.Hugo,L. September and E.Beukman

## SRC Representatives for Institutional Forum

Two candidates will be elected to serve as representative on this body. M. Botma,L. Mbatha,L. Stevenson,A. Van Greuning are the members standing. M.Bothma is requested to start.

M.Botma states she will be beneficial to serve.

L.Mbatha states you vote or you don’t and she is very capable of serving

L. Stevenson greets everyone and states she stands on external committees hence she brings new perspective. Forum is highly represented by students. Financial representation to the forum will ensure there is representative.

A. Van Greuning states he is a law student so he has the knowledge that will be beneficial to serve as representative.

Questions then commence and once completed voting then starts. Karli reminds that we will need a 50% plus one majority, if this is not achieved a second round of voting will occur.

**Voting results are announced:**

A.Van Greuning and M. Botma

# Portfolio allocations

C.Van Wyk reads out the portfolios for 2018:

Strategic initiative and leadership

Leadership development

Transformation

Student Success

Sustainability and Innovation

Postgraduates

Safety

Members will be allowed for 4 minutes to motivate why they should receive the portfolio. The executive will then decide and the results will only be announced at the next meeting. This is allowed in terms of the student constitution section 35. No specific list for members to motivate the portfolios so any order is welcomed, once this Is completed the meeting will be adjourned.

S.Speaker: Clarity regarding voting

Carli: States this is not compulsory portfolios, voting will not to take place. Executive will then meet and brainstorm which portfolio is best suited.

L. September: Point of clarity for the house, student success will be two people

A.Andrews: Could you tell us what exactly point of clarity entails

C. Van Wyk: Point of clarity is allowed to change or improve what is discussed. Says thank you and concludes the point.

Each member then proceeds the portfolios they would like.

M.Hugo starts and says he will like to have student success in terms of mental health as his campaign was centered on it. Another portfolio I am interested is postgraduates. I am really interested in and have plans in the pipeline. I don’t think I would be too competent in other portfolios.

T.Khan: In addition to communication, I would also like student success portfolios. Since first year I was part of two societies. I really want to guide students and I was also the leader of a society. I understand the importance of assisting. I will also build on the foundation of previous work done. Services also need to be improved. A student success was also organized and I really liked it. Wellbeing is dimensional, it’s not just about your academic wellbeing. I am hands on and I take initiative. I do not disappoint because I take my leadership responsibilities seriously.

L.Mbatha: Strategic initiative and development. This is second year it is running and last year it was run by a black women. What it does is to redevelop leadership on campus. It will help fulfill my mandate.

M.Matshabane: Student success, I can give you the logistics behind it but what I want to do with it is develop continuity and give it more purpose.

M.Botma:Transformation and policy officer. Won’t bombard you with my opinions because you all know how I think. There are two types of people in the world , those who overcome their challenges and those who use it as their excuse. I want to help and empower students in order for them to realize they have the power to do whatever they want. I won’t force my opinions onto the transformation portfolio.

Students are then allowed to ask questions to members standing for specific portfolios. All questions are raised before members are allowed to answer.

# Next Meeting

Proposed 17th October 2018

# Closing

Meeting adjourns at 22:10