**SRC Meeting**

**Date: 11/02/2020**

**Time: 18:00- 20:00**

**Attendees:**

Lewis Mboko (SRC Chair Person)

Wama Ngoma

Nstako Mtileni

Fadeelah Williams

Sifiso Zungu

Ingrid Heydenrych

Yanga Keva

Xola Njengele

Brandon Murray

Chloe Krieger

Hlamulo “Jeff” Ngobeni

Lwazi Phakade

**Absent:**

Michael Burke

Tembakazi Swaartbooi

Tebogo Ndaba

1. **Welcoming**

By Lewis.

Purpose of the meeting- discussion of portfolios selection for the SRC

***Point of clarity*** Fadeelah asks if the managerial positions will also be a discussion point in this meeting. Chairperson says yes.

1. **Managerial Portfolios**
	1. **Special Needs Portfolio:**

Fadeelah notes that in 2019 Lizelle Ferus, a staff member at the disability unit reported some concerns with regard to the same students running both the dismaties structure and the SRC special needs portfolio as it lead to those people being spread very thinly. Furthermore, Lizelle noted that, not very many members of the disabled community tend to run for leadership positions and so the same people are often left to fulfil these roles through multiple years. On these grounds, Fadeelah thus noted the question of the necessity of both structures existing at the same time in the case that they have they have similar mandates.

 In response, Yanga notes that Dismaties is a society and thus the SRC has no ability to disband it and its mandate is completely up to its executive. In response Ingrid proposes we either:

1. not have a special needs portfolio or
2. During the election process for managerial positions, be conscious of the members currently running Dismaties and the strain that running both structures could potentially cause to those applicants.

After, Yanga notes that if the special needs portfolio were to fall under the SRC it would have access to more resources and thus potentially be more effective in achieving the mandate prescribed to it.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with a special needs managerial portfolio.**

* 1. **KUKO(compulsory portfolio)**

Yanga notes that through his discussions with the previous KUKO manager and the KUKO executive the SRC is currently in a spot wherein if they do not have an equipped manager and body before the end of February there is very little hope of SU Acapella being possible.

Yanga suggests the SRC Executive consider experience when electing the new KUKO.

* 1. **Women Empowerment**

Chloe notes that in light of the nationwide focus on Anti-GBV and violence against women among other factors such as the large load of work transformation efforts in the context of women’s’ issues specifically demand women empowerment should be a separate managerial portfolio from transformation. Fadeelah follows noting that owing to the fact that Jeff is the only SRC member running for transformation and he identifies as male women empowerment empowerment should be run separately and by a woman. Yanga calls for the SRC to provide a general vision or mandate for this portfolio as well as list some of the specific purposes of the portfolio in previous year. Ingrid notes that in previous years the Women Empowerment portfolio would provide support for the HK’s in residences as well as host a termly “event”. Yanga emphasizes

The necessity for the portfolio to have a mandate that relates to the SRC’s plan for a year if elected to be a managerial portfolio.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with a Woman Empowerment managerial portfolio.**

* 1. **Potential Commuters Portfolio**

Sifiso proposes the creation of a portfolio of which’s mandate would be to deal with issues specifically pertaining to commuters issues. Xola responds suggesting instead increasing Michaels’ responsibility with regard to commuting students’ issues. Ingrid expressed the hardships of Michaels’ responsibilities and workload and Yanga follows noting that commuters’ issues directly fall under Michaels’ constitutional duties and thus having a separate portfolio should not be necessary.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are not to move forward with a Commuters portfolio.**

* 1. **International Students Portfolio**

Lewis suggest that the International student managerial portfolio be implemented with new vigor as international students experience the same issues year in and year out, however previously, not much follow up had been done on these issues. He notes that if this portfolio is implemented the manager will be expected to follow up on these issues and additionally, vigorously fulfil the productive mandate they will be required to submit. Xola suggests keeping the applicants fresh in order to avoid the issue of the same people running an office in multiple years. Jeff suggest implementing a benchmark in the application stipulated that only international students can apply for the position.

Yanga notes that the SRC should be careful about how the SRC discusses portfolios as proper, purposeful mandates need to be drawn up for these portfolios. He also encourages the SRC to reimagine the system of mandates for the sake of accountability i.e. link managerial portfolio’s to SRC portfolios

Lewis notes that the SU Student Constitution says, “Each SRC Manager must be accountable to a specific SRC member and to the SRC as a whole”

***Point of Clarity*** Ntsako asks if the purpose of managerial portfolios is to relieve the workload of the SRC by outsourcing some of the work. Multiple SRC members respond yes.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with an International Students managerial portfolio.**

* 1. **Internal Brand/Media and Marketing Manager for the SRC**

Ingrid suggests the appointment of a manager to assist with the internal branding of the SRC among other marketing related responsibilities. Xola comments describing his experience running marketing as an SRC member as draining. Fadeelah stresses the importance of the mandate of such a portfolio specifically clarifying outlines when it comes to potential overlap with the mandate of the communication portfolio as this may result in issues about accountability. Ingrid notes that in the interest of maintaining accountability the manager of this portfolio should not have direct access to any official platforms of the SRC i.e. Website, emails, social media etc. but rather create the content for these platforms of which will be posted at the discretion of the communications officer.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with an Brand Manager/Media and Marketing managerial portfolio.**

* 1. **Student Care**

Brandon suggests a managerial portfolio dealing with student care that should focus on informational posters, motivational quotes and organizing talks on campus for students. Chloe clarifies that student wellness covers similar topics within its mandate. Brandon highlights that this managerial portfolio would specifically deal with on the ground organization and assistance especially in times of concentrated need such as exams etc. Xola notes his admiration for the idea however he recognizes that the student wellness portfolio should cover most of the mandates Brandon envisions for this portfolio. He continues noting that the AAC is having a similar portfolio and suggests the SRC utilize the brand manager for advertising of information packets or assistance services as well as exploit the student wellness portfolio.

Brandon reiterates that student care would in comparison to student wellness be properly visible to students and hands on in its’ approach to student care.

***Point of Clarity*** Chloe requires clarification on whether Brandon is suggesting Student Care as an SRC portfolio or managerial position. Brandon responding confirming it as managerial.

Ntsako raises the question of whether this portfolio would be recognizable through its effect in relation to its mandate if it were not named? Brandon responds listing the benefits of having a person available to specifically assist with organization on the groundwork. Ingrid notes the option of task teams under SRC portfolios as an alternative.

**Wama moves to a vote of which the results are not to move forward with a Student Care managerial portfolio**

* 1. Fundraising as Managerial Portfolio.

Fadeelah suggest in light of the various RegisterAll fund fundraising events already planned for our term among any other fundraising events still to be decided on we appoint a manager capable of handling large sums of money and organizing such events at an administrative standpoint. Xola notes that any fundraising endeavors the SRC decides to take on is the responsibility of the treasurer and with regard to organizational responsibilities that would fall under various portfolios and/or task teams or if not to the larger SRC and thus there is no real need for such a portfolio.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are not to move forward with a Fundraising managerial portfolio**

* 1. **Critical engagement**

Xola notes that as an attender of critical engagement in 2019 he has experience of critical engagement being ineffective however he suggests that if the SRC does choose to do critical engagement as a managerial portfolio the SRC does it right through a clear mandate. Ntsako refers to residence education as critical engagement. Ingrid notes that if the src moves forward with a critical engagement portfolio it should have a different mandate than those residence portfolios to avoid redundancy however she doubts that the SRC’s managerial portfolio would have such a mandate. Xola notes that he sees the SRC 2019/2020 as a body currently moving away from event led portfolios. Sifiso thinks it is important for the SRC to have critical engagement and that it is definitely link to transformation. He suggests that if we do not have a managerial position for critical engagement we assign critical engagement related responsibilities to transformation. Ntsako notes that the SRC does have sub committees and too much work should not be a reason not to have any portfolio

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are not to move forward with a Critical Engagement Portfolio**

* 1. Wama proposes opening to students the option of suggesting managerial positions.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with the suggestion**

 h. Social Welfare

Jeff presents this portfolio as one focusing on student needs dealing with the issues of food access during exams etc. Xola suggestion to pause this portfolio discussion in consideration of redundancy in portfolios of the SRC that may mandate similar responsibilities.

**Lewis pauses the topic and continues.**

* 1. Student leadership development

Yanga presents the concept as a portfolio that will focus on the leadership crisis on Stellenbosch University and have the responsibility of developing the leaders on campus. Fadeelah suggests the addition of responsibilities to include student governances’ leadership training organization as the system is currently disjointed and messy. Yanga specifically notes that the financial development of residence leadership and society’s council leadership should not be as disjointed as it is now however, other central aspects of different bodies should be separate but still more coherently organized.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with Student Leadership and Development as a managerial Portfolio**

* 1. Sustainability

Discussion.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with Student Sustainability as a managerial Portfolio**

* 1. Safety and Security :

If approved the manager should be conscious of the fact that the SRC is half way through it’s’ term and should focus on solving and addressing burning issues

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with Student Safety and Security as a managerial Portfolio**

1. **SRC Portfolios**

***Point of Clarity*** Ingrid asks for the mandated SRC portfolios to be read aloud.

* CHAIR
* Vice Chair
* Secretary General
* Treasurer
* Communications Officer
* Policy Officer
	1. Transformation

Yanga notes that transformation should not be given all the responsibility of “transformation” in the SRC and other structures and that the responsibility should be on each leader to be transformative in their work. Yanga asks the SRC to present practical purpose of this portfolio in the SRC’s term. Jeff presents noting the importance of the transformation portfolio played in the past in assisting marginalized groups on campus. Fadeelah presents, noting the role the transformation portfolio is planned to play in assisting in the shaping the Institutional Transformation Committee (ITC) and its’ mandates. Further as per the first meeting of the ITC, the SRC committed to assisting in fighting for the ITC to gain more power over faculties as currently the powers of the body is limited to be advisory in nature. Because of this, while the ITC can investigate study and advise on issues of large scale/institutional discrimination, transformation plans etc. the ITC does not have the power to enforce change onto faculties and thus faculty deans often ignore the advice and warnings of the ITC e.g. the engineering faculty. The transformation Officer would also be the Chairperson of the Student Institutional Transformation Committee (SITC) a body built with the aim of student engagement and organized through the transformation Office. Fadeelah continues noting the importance of a transformation officer in issues of discrimination not under any specific university recognized structures. Students should feel comfortable in coming to the SRC in these cases and the SRC should have a designated person dealing with such issues as management structures are specific in which cases they are able to investigate/assist with i.e. the issue of spar presenting as halaal in the Neelsie whilst not having a halaal certificate. This case does not fall under the jurisdiction of any university body as it involves the Universities business INNOVUS and their assets and partners but not the University itself yet the case still affects the student population

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with Transformation as an SRC portfolio**

* 1. Student Wellness

Wama notes the importance of student wellness and mentor health as well as finishing the plans of working bodies of the previous year. Xola follows noting that we have proof of how fast the University is able to implement policy through their implementation of the alcohol ban and thus the SRC should push for the mental health policy to be implemented effectively and as soon as possible as well.

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with Student Wellness as an SRC portfolio**

* 1. Student Access

Sifiso notes the importance of closing the gap between the five Su campuses. He continues noting his vision for the portfolio as focusing on student relations in relation to students. Xola does not want to undermine the mandate of MILAC and the TSR and thus notes that while student relations is a lovely idea theoretically, then asks realistically would there be a passion within the SRC to run such a portfolio? He continues stressing that if the portfolio is named student relations the SRC should be conscious of the implications of such a name and the intentions behind the mandate.

Wama stresses the consideration of transportation in student unification of the SU campuses. Chloe focus on the promises of student governance to assist in leadership transportation and collaboration. Ntsako notes that she is always happy to assist in organization of visits so long as you send her a meeting request. Ntsako also notes that management excused the lack of intercampus shuttles by “apparent student disinterest.”

Lewis closes the point

**Lewis moves to a vote of which the results are to move forward with Student Access as an SRC portfolio**

1. **General points**

Sifiso suggest an engagement on the Alcohol Ban in some way owing to Dr Makheta’s lack of clarity on ban in general. Ingrid notes that in the last PK meeting, the PK agreed to stand by the SRCs’ stance on rejecting the alcohol ban. However, the PK does ask for freedom for those communities to come to their own respective policies and positions on the ban. Yanga asks if Ingrid is aware of Tebogos’, (Absent; Senior Prim Committee Chairperson) position in this regard, she is not. He further asks how the SRC will ensure that in those autonomous decisions no contradictory points are met. Ntsako notes that the Tygerberg prims are doing the same thing as SU primarias as they are autonomously (environment wise) finding their own policies and plans.

Closing