



**MINUTES OF STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY'S STUDENTS'  
 REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL MEETING  
 HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 29 APRIL 2015  
 IN THE SRC BOARDROOM AT 21:00**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Stefan Laing, Rhodé Brand, Wimpie Greyvenstein, JC Landman, Sasha-Leigh Williams, Dumisani Majombozi, Collen Mathieledzha, Tarina Nel, Albert Coetzee, Arnim Ritter, Tinotendaishe Muzofa, Rika Botes, Sixolile Pani, Caitlin Troup, Daniella Potgieter, Kayla Joubert

**ABSENT WITH REASON:** Jacobus de Wet, Angelique Fouché, Kyle Anderson

**ABSENT WITHOUT REASON:** Murray McDonald

**OTHER ATTENDANTS:** Thandiswa Kona, Siya Nama, Khanya Mda, Kamva Somdyaca, Chali Rasumba, Abigail Bogale, Quan Piers, Bradley Frolick, Lwazi Pakade, Dylan Swigelaar, Sikhulekile Duma, Thulani Hlatshwayo, Meloely Potgieter, Bandile Mndebele (Minute Taker)

|           | <b>DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION:</b>  | <b>MOTIONS/ACTIONS:</b>   |
|-----------|---|---|
| <b>1.</b> | <b>Opening</b><br>Mr Laing opens the meeting at 21:09.  | None  |
| <b>2.</b> | <b>Welcoming and Personalia.</b><br>Mr Laing congratulates Ms Potgieter for the success of MAD <sup>2</sup> and Mr Swigelaar on being Election Convenor.  | None  |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>Approval of previous meeting minutes.</b><br><br>Mr Muzofa nullifies the misrepresentation of task teams on page 5 and says that there is no need for a task team. Ms Troup alludes to the grammatical errors on page 11 as distorting the content and extent of her representation.   | Mr Muzofa and Ms Nel approve the meeting minutes of 16 April 2015.  |
| <b>4.</b> | <b>Item(s) from previous minutes.</b><br><b>4.1. Student Constitution.</b>  | Owing to Mr de Wet's absence, the agenda item is carried forward to the next meeting, 14 May 2015.        |
| <b>5.</b> | <b>Setting of Agenda.</b><br><b>6.12. Society Feedback.</b><br><b>7.4. Branding.</b><br><b>7.5. Open Stellenbosch.</b>  | None  |
| <b>6.</b> | <b>Discussion and Feedback:</b><br><b>6.1. SRC Elections 2015.</b><br><br>Mr Swigelaar (Election Convenor: SRC 2015) brings to attention the issues of transparency, mentions the arrangements made with <i>ex-officio</i> chairpersons regarding the upcoming SRC elections and processes, and communicates the provisional [tentative] dates surrounding the elections:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nominations: 11 May - 21 July 2015</li> <li>• Voting/Elections: 10 August - 14 August 2015</li> <li>• Election Reveal: 17 August 2015</li> <li>• SRC Chairperson Election: 23 August 2015.</li> </ul><br>Mr Swigelaar further requests and urges elected members to partake | Mr Swigelaar to judiciously confirm dates after consultation with the SRC, as per constitutional mandate. |

[creatively] in the electronic questionnaire in an effort of ameliorating and having an efficient electoral system [process], which ought not to receive interference from the SRC, and facetiously discourages members from submitting essay long responses.

**6.2. *Metanoia Catering Complaints.***

Mr Greyvenstein brings to attention the complaint regarding Metanoia residence's dissatisfaction of the catering service [Fedics], provides a background of the situation stating that only 98 residents have continued consuming the meals whilst an odd 100 have taken meals in other residences, *i.e.* Sonop, and the entitlement disputes between Fedics Management and residents, and stresses the safety ramifications and ineffective internal management the situation has underlined.

Ms Nel clarifies the entitlement enigma and verifies that Fedics has contractual ownership of the Metanoia dining hall. Mr Laing concurs with Mr Greyvenstein's concerns and suggests that the matter be referred to the PK.

**6.3. *Terms of Reference Policy.***

Mr Muzofa introduces the Terms of Reference, drafted by Mr Mndebele (Secretary: Sub-committee Maties ID and Student Relations), as a policy specifying and enumerating the roles of all stakeholders that will lead representations on behalf of the SRC which includes a Code of Conduct for the members in the sub-committee and says the document shall be implemented after SRC approval. Mr Laing credits Mr Mndebele for the document and affirms that the document shall form part of the SRC restructuring.

**6.4. *Regalement for the Rector's Awards for Exceptional Achievement.***

Mr Landman enquires if members have received his document enumerating on the regalement and addresses the document translation issue by saying that it is expensive to have the official document fully translated in English.

Mr Muzofa brings to attention that Dr Botha's (SU Senior Director: Student Affairs) office budget makes provisions for all SRC official translation requirements, and suggests in postponing the vote to occur after the document has been translated. Ms Nel further conveys and raises her concerns regarding the lacked translation of the Residence Policy.

Mr Landman responds to Ms Joubert's inquiry on the alternative translation solution by saying it is difficult to have the accurate portrayal [meaning] of the original words as sometimes translation can distort the meaning and authenticity of words. Mr Laing affirms that the voting will occur after document translation.

**6.5. *Feedback on the Language Policy Forum.***

Ms Nel to raise matter to the PK.

Terms of Reference document to form part of the SRC restructuring framework after approval.

Voting on Regalement to occur officially after translation thereof.

Mr Laing says the forum was aimed at involving various leaders and having Prof Schoonwinkel (SU Vice-Rector: Learning and Teaching) expound, introduce, and explain adequately the Language Policy to all stakeholders and leaders, however, is displeased that Prof Schoonwinkel assumed a defensive stance on the Language Policy to the audience.

Ms Nel stresses that student leaders, including the PK, were not approached or consulted with to include their stance and opinions on the Language Policy and strongly advocates the suggestion of a database and platform wherein students can review, deliberate, and revise all the adopted and various SU policies. Mr Laing credits the suggestion, however warns about the existing bureaucratic 5-year lags of revising policies to and by SU Council.

Mr Muzofa stresses that the Language Policy needed not to be discussed but rather the language itself alongside students' experiences of the Language Policy, says albeit Prof Schoonwinkel was defensive in his dance, he was untruthful [inaccurate] in his allegations and expounds by using ensample of Goldfields and engineering students who have had module discrepancies and invariances, further adds that albeit English is an internationally recognised tuition language, SU faculty departments should address the current language disparities as some modules are in either English or Afrikaans, and suggests in uploading a video catalogue on SUNLearn to this effect.

#### **6.6. Feedback on the Freedom Day Discussions.**

Mr Greyvenstein summarizes the discussion that took place at the V&A Waterfront which included inspirational guest speakers, delegation teams, and professors on stop violence, and mentions that despite CPUT's absence to the event; he is not deterred to have all universities in the Western Cape region to engage deliberatively and constructively on the robust discussions thus far.

Ms Williams adds that the nature and monopoly of the conversation was highly distorted and required numerous opinions in addressing controversial issues, *i.e.* the colonial name of the country and suggests in bringing the discussions to campus.

Mr Pani refers to an SRC meeting regarding specific discussions and recommends in leading a necessary process for the discussions to occur. Mr Laing concurs and says this will be made a discussion point in the next meeting and thanks everyone who represented SU at the discussion.

#### **6.7. Feedback on Transformation Discussions with Management.**

Mr Laing says the discussions were pre-empted for a while and informs members of a discussion with management on 28 April 2015 which highlighted the lack of discrimination policy and a strategic reconciliation with SU Vision 2030 and transformation, informs members of SU Council's non-adaptation [disapproval] of transformation document in 2013, infers the onus of this duty to the SRC to champion and campaign in this regard, and says the meeting could not be finished however there will be a follow up meeting on 8 May 2015.

Mr Landman adds and commends the Rector's Management Team (RMT) meeting for being highly effective and productive and acknowledges the received meeting requests to discuss and address

Mr Greyvenstein to get back to members on future dates, times, and information on discussions.

Discussion item to be in the Agenda for next meeting on 14 May 2015.

Mr Laing to inform members on the outcomes of follow up meeting with management.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>constructive issues.</p> <p>Mr Greyvenstein brings to attention the accusations that the SRC is perceived as a ‘Manager’s Representative Council (MRC)’ regarding the endeavours to release SU Council meeting minutes and records, briefly provides the background of management’s stance on the sensitivity and confidentiality of the minutes, and stresses the proactive efforts of the SRC in this regard.</p> <p>Mr Laing says in light of various discrepancies in the Language Policy and other transformative issues, numerous loose ends are being resolved by making reference to the student draft memorandum to management and inclines members to be decided on the approach and sharp stance the SRC should take to have critical discussions through various avenues where problems will be adequately addressed.</p> <p>Mr Pani states his concerns on the lacked implementation [disparity] of university policy at various academic departmental levels and suggests that by term end or June, all departments and faculties should disclose how they will actively implement [feasibility analysis] the Language Policy.</p> <p>Mr Laing attributes one of the contributing factors of the disparity to being on the lecturer’s improper execution [application] of the Language Policy and suggests in individually assessing each module and the language application thereof. Mr Pani advocates using the existing university structures to facilitate the process efficiently and adequately to address these issues.</p> <p>Mr Muzofa says many of the misunderstandings result from SRC’s communication manner and transparency mandate and alludes that misunderstandings impale the integrity of the SRC and, in response to Mr Greyvenstein’s summary on the sensitivity and confidentiality issue of the minutes, advocates the support of the SRC Executive to receive and address SU Council minutes and a concise summary page as the current delay raises impatience among students and leaders as they are anxious to hear how discussions pan out in SU Council.</p> <p>Mr Greyvenstein further informs members on a lecturer’s misuse of the T-language specific option and exclusion of students by divided half of the module learning outcomes in Afrikaans and the remainder in English, says there are numerous problems resulting from structures not being implemented or utilised, and suggests that the approach and resolve of this issue should be referred to the ABR.</p> <p>Mr Laing refers to and fully concurs with Mr Muzofa’s point and assumes full responsibility thereon and mentions that he has SU Council minutes.</p> <p><b>6.8. Feedback from the PK.</b></p> <p>Ms Nel commends the minute taking and thoroughness of her secretary and says the PK has considered the SRC restructuring and will discuss the HK [PK] restructuring at the next PK meeting and carried through at HK meetings, <i>inter alia</i>, stresses that certain issues, <i>i.e.</i> finances and safety or correlating [coinciding] portfolios with the SRC, do not need to be discussed by the PK, and suggests that 2 or 3 HK members should be</p> | <p>Mr Laing and Ms Williams to provide feedback on the student draft memorandum to members.</p> <p>Mr Greyvenstein to ensure the lecturer’s misuse of the Language Policy is referred to the ABR.</p> <p>Mr Laing to get back to members on SU Council minutes release.</p> <p>PK to further discuss on the HK [PK] restructuring.</p> |
|--|--|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>at residences whenever something in residence or campus occurs.</p> <p>Ms Nel further mentions the visiting hours consideration in residences by the PK, the outline of the alcohol limit and sexual harassment policy by revealing the intentions of the policy not to police or unduly restrain students but minimise [monitor] risks prior and after an alcohol limit has subsided, and an enacted communications [welcoming] task team to focus on how the HK can collaborate and work efficiently with Management.</p> <p>Ms Nel states the PK voting on mixed residences as being still undecided and will be put forth to the next PK meeting and that a majority of PK members voted for the Halaal kitchen being at dining halls and further mentions that there will be a ‘Celebration of Student Leadership’ Ball on 23 September 2015 and cordially invites members.</p> <p>Ms Williams expresses concerns on implementing an alcohol limit [percentage] and validity of claims and says such do not feature in a sexual harassment policy, expounds on the practicality of the Halaal kitchen requiring non-alcoholic consumption, <i>inter alia</i>, and the sanctity of the dining hall, and says the HK cannot unanimously implement this as it is unfair and inconvenient to a majority of residence students. Ms Nel clarifies by saying the sexual harassment policy caters for the vulnerability of females when intoxicated and verifies the methodology whereby residences serve Halaal food prepared at Halaal kitchens and the dining halls are not necessarily Halaal compliant.</p> <p>Mr Pani says the PK complained about the uncertainty regarding the role of SRC guardians in residences and informs members about a HK’s [Prim’s] defensive and dismissive attitude on a resident’s complaint after the resident lodged the complaint with Open Stellenbosch and subsequently such raised issues have a bad portrayal on him as a black student by virtue of being black.</p> <p>Ms Nel concurs with Mr Pani’s point and refers that the PK should draw more emphasis on such matters and encourages the residences to adequately address such matters and situations among themselves in a non-derogatory way.</p> <p>Mr Coetzee adds that the PK is sending out SRC Guardian evaluations to evaluate the functional criteria of guardians in order to install an efficient structure in the future <i>viz-à-viz</i> the PK restructuring and says the PK will discuss the HK attitudes at great length through various structures <i>i.e.</i> the financial forum. Mr Muzofa commends the PK evaluation and motivates the need to evaluate the Prim’s and HK’s.</p> <p>Mr Landman responds to Ms Troup’s inquiry on SRC Managers and says the SRC Managers are not elected members as their role is strictly limited to managing specific SRC portfolios, adds that it is unfair to attribute the purpose of SRC Managers to alleviate the work of the elected SRC official, and recommends that the SRC restructuring should explicitly visit this.</p> <p>Mr Ritter stresses and refers that the role, nature, and criteria of the SRC Guardians should be expounded on to include explicitly the relational context with residences and emphasises that the process thereof cannot be delegated with.</p> | <p>Ms Nel to provide feedback on the task team and follow up meeting.</p> <p>PK to assume decisive stance on mixed residences.</p> <p>PK to send out evaluations of Prim’s and HK’s.</p> <p>SRC restructuring to look into the roles and nature of SRC Managers and Guardians.</p> |
|---|--|

**6.9. Shaken Silence Feedback.**

Ms Brand is grateful for member's support of the 'Shaken Silence' campaign launch on Thursday, 21 May 2015, says the campaign requires more depth, and expounds on the futuristic prospects of the campaign to be a healing instrument, infiltrate residences and PSO's, equip students with guidelines, and bring awareness to people and in line with respect and human dignity, and enthusiastically advocates the forthcoming events and a guest talk that will find place on Friday, 8 May 2015, and affirms that the lifespan of the campaign will be tentative upon its desired effectiveness.

**6.10. Feedback on students' discussion after the march.**

Mr Laing informs members about a meeting that was set up after a memorandum was drafted and says a timeline was constructed to allow the student draft to be handed to SU Management and elaborates on having an official anti-discrimination policy in place by year end and implemented and existing in 2016.

Ms Williams elaborates by outlining the anti-discrimination policy draft to have a cohesive integration and coinciding of harassment points from both staff and students, emphasizes the need of an extensive stakeholders consultation throughout the process as it is a student driven initiative welcomed by management, mentions the intentions of having the policy voted in by SU Council on Friday, 15 May 2015, and suggests using a direct link on my.SUN and SRC websites to allow a possible interactive medium in this regard.

**6.11. Feedback on Shuttle Services.**

Mr Greyvenstein brings to attention the uncertainty regarding the Shuttle Service ownership and says there will be a regular check-up and reporting on the logistics and management of the Shuttle Service, apologises for the gross error in his draft, and says there will be a task team and discussion on possible bus terminal points to arrange sitting areas for commuters.

Mr Landman informs members of his current task team that is also focusing on the Shuttle Service and a meeting taking place on Thursday, 30 April 2015, to discuss different aspects of the Shuttle Service, and a questionnaire to assess the effectiveness of the service.

Mr Pakade (*Varia* Capacity: SU Student) addresses the shuttle and shelter point by asking if there have been any contingency plans [arrangements] made regarding the possible rain impacts and safety concerns in light of the winter season, having already commenced.

Mr Greyvenstein responds and says despite the parking problems, the shuttle will not depart afar from the roads encircling Merriman street and the Neelsie and mentions the difficulties of a temporary shelter and safety reasons associated therewith. Mr Laing says this concern should be considered and prioritized by Facilities Management to ensure the system is working efficiently. Mr Coetzee interjects the fact that Neelsie

Student memorandum to be completed and circulated by 15 May 2015 for SU Council consideration.

Ms Williams to communicate on link setup on my.SUN and SRC website.

Mr Greyvenstein to provide feedback on meeting with Shuttle Services Manager, the check-up and terminal points of Shuttle Service.

Questionnaire for commuters to be sent out as soon as practicable.

Shelter arrangements to be referred to and prioritized by Facilities Management.

|           |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|
|           | <p>Student Centre is privately owned and affiliated.</p> <p>Mr Pani suggests that students should be allowed to wait in the Neelsie as an alternative and temporary shelter considering the constraint that it might be completed within 2 weeks. Ms Nel brings to attention the defective security cameras on the Rooiplein [Neelsie] that are ineffective.</p> <p><b>6.12. Society Feedback.</b></p> <p>Mr Ritter says he needs to be notified on protests and marches from societies to be executed and adapted in accordance with the newly voted procedures wherein the society chairperson has no authority in approving the march, as also disclosed in the SU Calendars, adds that he has forwarded this to Mr Kloppers (SU Director: Centre for Student Structures and Communities) and management is well aware of the new required procedures which will remain in place until the end of Mr Ritter's tenure, and mentions that there will be another societies fair for the sake of international students on Thursday, 23 July 2015, and notifies members of an upcoming meeting which will be minuted and will provide subsequent feedback in this regard.</p>  | <p>Societies are to adopt new procedures [protocols] on protests and marches.</p> <p>Societies Fair to find place on 23 July 2015.</p> <p>Mr Ritter to inform members on meeting with management.</p>   |
| <p>7.</p> | <p><b>General:</b></p> <p><b>7.1. SRC Reports.</b></p> <p>Ms Brand reminds members about the term report deadline on Thursday, 14 May 2015, the last SRC meeting for the Semester.</p> <p><b>7.2. Anti-Xenophobia Competition.</b></p> <p>Mr Muzofa gives a summary of the anti-Xenophobia campaign outlining the march to having received collaboration from societies, shares the challenges incurred pertaining the tacit event, says the campaign was successful given a 17 hour official approval prior the march, urges members to advertise the campaign on social media platforms <i>i.e.</i> Facebook, and mentions that the competition prizes are limited to 3 as to the prior 4. Mr Landman suggests that Mr Muzofa forward a link regarding the campaign via email.</p> <p><b>7.3. Mzoli's Tour.</b></p> <p>Mr Muzofa says Mzoli's tour, a free event mainly aimed at integrating international students and in collaboration with the PGIO, is on Friday, 8 May 2015 and requires 15 people to attend, outlines the informative interaction and dinner discussion therein entailed, gives insight on the tentative criteria to adjust according to available group dynamics, and briefly provides a background on the original tour package in response to Mr Mathieledzha's inclusion base inquiry. Mr Laing recommends that the people can be equally allotted to a group of 5 from Tygerberg, the Military base, and Stellenbosch respectively.</p> <p><b>7.4. Branding.</b></p> <p>Mr Pani informs members of the change in structure of 'Maroon Monday' which is finding place on Monday, 4 May 2015, and outlines the approach of having SRC members spread out on campus from the Rooiplein, from 12-2pm, to engage with students.</p> | <p>Members to submit term reports by 14 May 2015.</p> <p>Mr Muzofa to forward campaign link to members.</p> <p>Mr Muzofa to send out emails regarding the attendance criteria of the tour.</p> <p>Mr Pani to finalise the SRC week <i>viz-à-viz</i> member suggestions and send out meeting dates to members.</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Mr Pani requests members to bring suggestions on SRC week to finalise the week and brings to attention the student life meeting which includes the TSR, SRC, and MASK, and will send out different dates regarding the meetings.</p> <p>Mr Pani says he requires more clarity regarding the SRC Conference proposal to judiciously decide on the point and details surrounding the Conference. Mr Laing suggests that the SRC can present the SRC restructuring idea, <i>inter alia</i>, at the conference and the tentative day [date] of the Conference will be deliberated.</p> <p><b>7.5. Open Stellenbosch.</b></p> <p>Mr Muzofa apologises for the late agenda point but seeks to find clarity on the SRC’s official stance on Open Stellenbosch and suggests that the SRC release an official statement regarding student representation and to Open Stellenbosch after informing members of having received allegations of his lack in student representation, and dispels the racially inclined representation stigma [mindset].</p> <p>Mr Laing (Capacity: <i>Personal</i>) says there are certain students on campus who are dissatisfied about campus issues, <i>i.e.</i> the Language Policy and Transformation, and some who are affiliated with an unregistered student society that expresses their dissatisfactions without proper decorum and disrespecting procedures, clarifies on the jurisdictions of representation as an SRC Chairperson as being solely limited to Stellenbosch University, and mentions the difficulties associated with affording legitimacy to an unregistered student body.</p> <p>Mr Greyvenstein refers to his supportive pledge made to Open Stellenbosch in a meeting on tackling institutional racism, the Language Policy, <i>inter alia</i>, however warns that his support will cease if any agenda or goal incites chaos or is not aimed at constructively changing and engaging with the university.</p> <p>Mr Muzofa responds to Ms Troup’s enquiry on the possible execution Mr Muzofa undertook and the guidelines for the statement regarding the issue by using ensample of drafting a risk and safety contingency plan prior the anti-xenophobia march, alludes to the integrity of students being marginally tainted by the ‘#RhodesMustFall’ initiative, advocates and motivates the need of releasing a statement by expounding on the possible media portrayal as the SRC failing to represent students, further expresses his concerns about the image of Stellenbosch University, moreover the possible stigma attachment as a black student <i>viz-à-viz</i> the activism on campus, urges the SRC to support students on legitimacy and warns on the pitfalls of activism using ensample of his native country wherein activism has brought ruin. Ms Nel states that the PK has been collaborating and sending emails with Open Stellenbosch and thanks Mr Duma for the email correspondence.</p> <p>Mr Duma (Spokesperson: Open Stellenbosch) states that there has been a great misunderstanding regarding the mandate and intentions of the movement and clarifies by elaborating on the mandate as being not limited to the Language Policy, but includes expressing black pain, adequately addressing white supremacy in an institution that was a protagonist thereof, and decolonising Stellenbosch University and as such, is unashamedly unapologetic on the stance, efforts, and approaches</p> | <p>Members to deliberate further on the SRC Conference date and nature [content].</p> |
|---|---|



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>undertaken by the movement, and further thanks the SRC members, in their various capacities, who approached the movement for clarity.</p> <p>Ms Williams refers to and recounts on the exclusion of the SRC in the ‘Who Belongs Here’ debate as being preventive and divisive on the progressive mandate of adequately resolving the issue and mentions the received approach on sexual violence and other campus issues.</p> <p>Mr Muzofa attributes the aftermaths and shortcomings to a lack of communication between all stakeholders and is willing to forward communication documents to Ms Williams, stresses that due to the lack of holding the organisation [movement] accountable it remains difficult to monitor communication lines, however recommends in setting a meeting with the leadership of Open Stellenbosch wherein outstanding accreditation issues, <i>inter alia</i>, may be addressed to remedy the situation, advocates the need for the SRC to release an official statement on whether or not the movement receives SRC support.</p> <p>Mr Muzofa responds to Mr Greyvenstein’s suggestion of having the meeting in public to safeguarding the interests of the SRC, reiterates the decisive stance of the SRC, refers to Prof de Villier’s (Rector and vice-Chancellor: SU) inaugural speech that challenged the issues Open Stellenbosch addressed, and profusely emphasises that irrespective of racial category or age, protocols ought to be observed and a rightful respect for elders displayed and as such the SRC should not condone any contrary behaviour in this regard.</p> <p>Mr Ritter mentions an executive meeting with SASCO and says members thereof were independent from Open Stellenbosch as SASCO members, is utterly infuriated by the alleged discrepancy and dishonesty of SASCO in their actions and intentions to bring anarchy through illegal marches, and states that such is unacceptable and disrespectful to the current leadership of SU.</p> <p>Ms Brand shares her reservations and fears on engaging and communicating with Open Stellenbosch however says she would be willing to have communications and future engagement with Open Stellenbosch despite this.</p> <p>Mr Muzofa highly stresses that inclusive leadership at student level in a higher tertiary institution should not be demeaned [reduced] to racial constraints or illegitimate factors and elaborates by using ensample of a heterosexual leader to represent unequivocally a homosexual student, His Excellency Barack Obama (President: USA), and his personal efforts to represent students <i>viz-à-viz</i> xenophobia march.</p> <p>Ms Williams reveals that some of her sub-committee members are also members of Open Stellenbosch and the organisation has been successful in what they wish to represent, however, lacked the ability to approach Ms Williams or the available systematic structures to address transformative issues <i>i.e.</i> faculty names and plaque removals.</p> <p>Mr Duma brings to attention the failure of the SRC on the point of student leadership, stresses that management should not make it difficult and complex for students to have discussions on SU campus, remains</p> | <p>Meeting to be set up with the executive of Open Stellenbosch.</p> |
|--|--|

unapologetic on the Open Stellenbosch's approaches on white privilege in SU 'bubble', alleges that SASCO spearheaded student representation on the NSFAS financial crisis by expounding on Wit's and UCT's execution and strategies as SU's SRC failed in this regard, reiterates the need of student representation, and adds that black pain is purely about black students expressing themselves.

Mr Swigelaar says as a protagonist for procedures and protocols, he urges members to stick to and enact efficient procedures to render some mandates more effective, *i.e.* name changing of buildings.

Mr Frolick (*Varia Capacity: Personal*,) says the SRC should focus on how they shall respond and approach [stance] the matter and further discussions [action] will be undertaken thereafter, elaborates on Mr Swigelaar's procedural point that inasmuch he supports procedures, which are fundamental to prevent anarchy, they are however a limitation in achieving certain goals of student leaders, mentions that he does not fully support some approaches of Open Stellenbosch on discussions, and stresses the need for more leadership which can be given on implementing different strategies to better achieve ultimate goals which can lead to less unfounded sentiments.

Mr Greyvenstein says the NSFAS allegations should be factually revisited and demands a promise from Open Stellenbosch to purely base motives on student matters rather than political agendas, emphasises that he will not stand [allow] any conceited mandate to interfere with student success and betterment, mentions his concerns about a possible proxy fight, and adds that he still grasping the Black Consciousness Movement.

Mr Ritter says there should be an open mind to consider what the organisation stands for and as such is willing to accept an urgent society application, its political agenda, and actions regarding the issues and what needs to be achieved in this regard credibly. Mr Laing adds that there should an active participation in campus issues.

Ms Nel is grateful for her recent personal discomfoting experiences on campus as it helps her understand what students go through, and does not exactly [fully] understand the pain, the black pain, which Open Stellenbosch is challenging. Mr Mathieledzha also says that the SRC should be open and inclusive in dealing with Open Stellenbosch.

Ms Brand refers to the procedures and lags by advocating that events ought to happen immediately in line with its occurrence and further advocates the need for an open and honest discussion where such matters can be addressed.

Members agree on Mr Laing's outline of the official statement, which will include, *inter alia*:

- Non-support or endorsement of illegitimate and illegal actions;
- Call for the society's registration;
- Construction of formal procedures to work constructively with the SRC;
- Clear and tangible outcomes on what Open Stellenbosch seeks to achieve;
- Publicly invite society to bring issues to the SRC.

Statement to be drafted and released *viz-à-viz* meeting minutes.

|            |  |   |
|------------|--|---|
|            | Mr Muzofa refers to <i>Die Matie</i> 's article (circulation and print date: 11 March 2015) on the task teams on politicising the SRC, clarifies his stance on the polarised student representation of residences on the SRC and as such student representation is not across broad, and provides a background of the social media tracking of the of the organisation.  |   |
| <b>8.</b>  | <p><b>Questions and Varia</b></p> <p>Mr Greyvenstein advertises the MFM's 'Penny Coin Boot' campaign. Ms Joubert adds that there is an incentive for the public to engage with the initiative. Mr Pani reminds members to get back to him with suggestions.</p> <p>Mr Muzofa brings to attention the discrepancies [ambiguity] on a document circulated by Ms Fouché and Mr Laing refers this to the onus of Ms Fouché.</p> <p>Ms Joubert brings to attention the Mandela Day initiative and program and encourages members to also inform her on their plans and preliminary dates in this regard. Mr Mathieledzha inquires about the inadequate inclusion of the MASK on campus issues and events.</p> | <p>Ms Fouché to address the ambiguities of circulated document.</p> <p>Mr Laing to get back to Mr Mathieledzha on his concerns.</p> |
| <b>9.</b>  | <p><b>Next Meeting</b></p> <p>Next meeting is set for Thursday, 14 May 2015 in the SRC Boardroom.</p>  | None  |
| <b>10.</b> | <p><b>Closing.</b></p> <p>Mr Laing adjourns the meeting at 00:08.</p>  | None  |