



**MINUTES OF THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL  
OF STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY HELD ON 21 April 2016  
IN THE SRC BOARDROOM AT 20:00**

**MEMBERS** Axolile Qina(Chairperson), James de Villiers, Marc Rudolph, Lianda du Plessis, Lwazi Phakade, Wim Steyn, Inge Barac, Kara Meiring, Nonkululeko Radebe, Lethiwe Mbatha, Bradley Frolik, Tumelo Motse, Danny Bezuidenhoudt, Khadija Bawa, Reanne Olivier

**ABSENT WITH REASON** N Wayne, T Motse, D Bezuidenhoudt, F Mubaiwa, T Muzofa, B Mndebele, M Madson-Leibold

**ABSENT WITHOUT REASON**

**OTHER ATTENDEES** Moira Lotz (minute taker)

	<b>AGENDA POINT</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>  Axolile Qina calls the meeting to order at 20:06	
2	<b>WELCOMING AND PERSONALIA</b>  Axolile Qina  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Welcome to:</li> <li>- critical engagement managers; clusters; security committee; Carina and team</li> <li>- All the best with the Toneel fees this week.</li> <li>- Moment of silence given for religious belief</li> </ul>	
3	<b>APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES</b>  <u>SRC meeting minutes of 4 April 2016</u> approved.  The minutes are approved by R Olivier and seconded by N Radebe	

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
4	<p><b>ITEMS FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES</b></p> <p>No items from previous minutes discussed.</p>	
5	<p><b>SETTING OF THE AGENDA</b></p> <p><u>Modifications:</u> 6.1 Shaken Silence campaign moved to 6.3 7.3 Tygerberg and 7.4 MILAC scrapped</p> <p><u>Additional:</u> 6.1 #RegisterALL 7.5 Accountability 9. In camera</p>	<p>Agenda points/suggestions must be sent to M Rudolph 24 hours prior to SRC meeting.</p>
6	<p><b>DISCUSSION &amp; DECISIONS</b></p> <p><b>6.1 #RegisterALL</b></p> <p>Fund allocation not by SRC. Qualifying is based on particular student. Refers to International students, postgraduates etc. Still same procedure.</p> <p>Opportunity given to students for questions:</p> <p>Q: confusion as to criteria and policies surrounding applications for #RegisterALL. Also questioned how much money was raised.</p> <p>A: Apology given for not contextualising</p> <p>Point of departure – Campaign itself needed to be clarified. Not initially raised at SRc camp. It was raised in a subsequent meeting. Process was not known. Initially no policies so they had to be created. The account in itself has not stopped creating money. University was consulted during the process and it was started on assumptions to go ahead. James opened FNB account, in contravention of relationship with Standard Bank. Had to move to Standard Bank. – prolonged the situation. This has never before been part of the SRC, no previous SRc members have done this before. Suggestions</p>	

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<p>from university were given to use cost point so that it forms part of university. (So that STD Bank does not need to be requested. It can be used directly through costs points)</p> <p><u>Aim</u> – this was first within SRC, it was not initially anticipated. Other SRC looked at. Aim has not changed but implementation because it failed.</p> <p>Problem areas: the idea of criteria – the university is unable to fund every student – doesn't have necessary funds. Example is to pay registration fees but not have rest of money.</p> <p><u>Criteria:</u> not strict, students who could not finish paying their fees can also receive grants. Payments throughout equal. E.g. if amount is R15 000, amount payable is R10 512 the amount equated to money payable at registration.</p> <p>point of clarity from students with regard to time frame relating to policies:</p> <p>A: March</p> <p>Point of clarity when payments were made: concern that at the end of march no student was assisted through register all campaign</p> <p>Lwazi - There was money in March and the registration fees were paid to the students.</p> <p>Q: Who were the students that were helped in the campaign?</p> <p>Q: How do students know they will get grants?</p> <p>A: Some students not registered because did not get HEMIS.</p> <p><u>Points clarified:</u></p> <p>No one within SRC anticipated that there will be a need to create fund. James went to FNB, found out needed to create account with STD bank. Marc not present yet to clarify.</p> <p>Process started during registration period and the policy was still being finalised. No other way to initiate policy before</p>	<p>Need letters of surety for payments made.</p>

AGENDA POINT	ACTION
<p>campaign.</p> <p>16 march payments were made.</p> <p><u>Who was paid?</u> Cannot reveal info about students that SRC has helped. It would compromise them – it's a q of funding. The entire team itself does not know about all the students.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;Disruption from floor. Meeting repeatedly called to order.</p> <p>Suggestion to call an extraordinary meeting to allocate more time to topic.</p> <p>Emphasis placed on need for respect towards fellow students and SRC.</p> <p>Student raised concern about the need for letters of surety with regard money being paid to students.</p> <p>We just want proof that the students were registered.</p> <p>Complaint from floor that SRC not communicating with bursaries and loans. Confusion about whether people were registered or not.</p> <p>Student requests facts about the students who were registered. Percentage who applied in relation to who was registered?</p> <p><u>Points clarified:</u> Some of the concerns were going to be addressed before the disruption arose. Proof of students registered cannot be given. Cannot comment on numbers as was not prepared with the statistics. Due to agenda points being added late, adequate preparation is not possible. Sometimes communication with bursary and loans office does not filter through staff office, this can be dealt with.</p> <p>Student from floor insulted SRC member for not doing job. By not granting students funds, have created a corrosive, toxic and unbearable situation. Jeopardised the chance of future leaders to receive an education.</p> <p>Student was asked to apologise and respect for everyone in</p>	<p>Monday Meeting? #RegisterALL</p> <p>Again, letters of surety requested.</p> <p>Address communication channels with bursaries and loans office.</p>

AGENDA POINT	ACTION
<p>the room was again emphasised.</p> <p>Q: why was policy only drafted after the money was obtained? – Worry is that it was reactive and students were let down in process. Just want it to be noted</p> <p><b>6.2 Election of Disciplinary Committee Member</b></p> <p>Candidate: Aden Bartes</p> <p>Q: as a student leader, do you think that you will have sufficient time to serve?</p> <p>A: only has 5 modules. I do have time.</p> <p>Q: Need to be objective and not be unduly influenced, can this be fulfilled?</p> <p>A: Gave example from current service in societies executive council committee: Afri forum's policies do not agree with but it is required of him to put personal feelings aside.</p> <p>Marc: Warned candidate about his commentary towards other institutions as it will appear in minutes.</p> <p>Q: What are you bringing extra in light of your year of studies?</p> <p>A: Have developed people skills since High School. Was the peer mediator and have experience with sensitive cases Also previously served as a mentor. This came with all sorts of concerns. He is capable of dealing with sensitive cases.</p> <p>Code of conduct constantly adapted with each year of study.</p> <p>Q: Should conduct be adapted or should focus be more on representation? Need to uphold own ground.</p> <p>A: Legal system should be representative of everyone. There is a need to adapt conduct in everything we do to be in line with conduct – want to create a culture of accountability.</p>	<p>TAKE NOTE</p>

AGENDA POINT	ACTION
<p>Voting procedure: – yes, no, abstain.</p> <p>Yes = 12, No = 0, Abstain = 0</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Disruption on floor arises again about the #RegisterALL campaign.</p> <p><b>6.3 Task Teams:</b></p> <p>6.3.1. Election convener appointment</p> <p>Decided as SRc to establish a task team. SRc appoints election convener.</p> <p>Nominated Rianne and Dilon. Both accepted nominations.</p> <p>Q: Reasoning why it has taken so long to nominate?</p> <p>A: It only needs to be ready by 3<sup>rd</sup> term.</p> <p>Vote task team: Yes = 12 , No = 0, abstain = 0</p> <p>Task team appointed.</p> <p>Motion by Bradley for mandate to delegate co-opt powers.</p> <p>Yes = 12 , No = 0 , abstain = 0</p> <p>Bradley had proxy for Lwazi. Lwazi left due to illness.</p> <p>Motion proposed to move Shaken Silence to the next point. Was moved to be dealt with after the Matie Diary election.</p> <p>6.3.2. Matie diary editor appointment</p> <p>It's a task team to appoint the editor. Request made for restrictions on advertising.</p> <p>K Bawa was nominated.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt; Disruption from floor. Concern about fairness and inclusivity. Meeting called to order.</p>	<p>Set up inclusive Task Team. Should be balanced.</p>

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<p>Vote: Yes = 12, No =0 , Abstain =0</p> <p>Vote to mandating task team: Yes = 11 , No = 0 , Abstain = 0</p> <p>1 spoiled ballot</p> <p><b>6.4 Shaken Silence Campaign</b></p> <p>Marc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could not attend exec meeting due to illness.</li> <li>- It was revived because of a specific reason.</li> <li>- Asked what was the mandate, plan, statement etc?</li> <li>- Statement was sent to him and commented on points that were also in contention during the evening.</li> <li>- Statement was subsequently not released.</li> <li>- Had issue with campaign itself. Also wants clarity on it.</li> </ul> <p>James</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- headed the campaign with PC, SC, mfm UNASA, &amp; BASK.</li> <li>- Plan was to have critical discussions</li> <li>- Statement was not released because poorly written</li> <li>- Comments were only received on Wednesday and by then had already received negative feedback.</li> </ul> <p>Student from floor requested for all the members part of the team to identify themselves.</p> <p>Questions from floor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What was the rationale behind the release of the topic?</li> <li>- Why was the talk cancelled?</li> <li>- Who was the executive committee? Who spoke about Africanism? After years of oppression – needs to be a disciplinary hearing.</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>Student commented on how offensive the topic was. Another student commented that students are offended because of the lack of understanding that came from the organisers. This was elaborated on.</p>	

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How can student parliament be dissolved? There is no student parliament.</li> <li>- Fear raised about speaking freely in front of a space that is dominated by Afrikaans white heterosexual men. Association of this was made with PC.</li> <li>- Concern raised that black women should not have to educate white people about their offenses.</li> </ul> <p>James: Claims accountability as head organiser, his initiative, was personally involved, apologised, made a mistake, topic was changed, and new topic was not acknowledged. Mfm spoke out of turn.</p> <p>Wim – initially invited due to other initiative that we would launch later. Did not talk about any of the topics. PC was not involved in the initiative. They were just present. They also did not send out the statement. They needed to discuss it first. They did not condone any of the topics. Did not comment on the topics either.</p> <p><u>First round of questions/concerns from the floor:</u> Student(s) from the floor commented that white men are not specialised in this area. Women of colour were not contacted. Why were the women not approached? Not enough for James to just take accountability.</p> <p>A: Kara was invited to meeting, Farai was also contacted several times.</p> <p><u>Second round of questions/concerns from the floor:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Student(s) queried Marc's presence and names of other attendees, content in statement, apology?</li> <li>- There was an apology.</li> <li>- Student(s) disappointed with SRc members. Concerned whether apology is sincere – reference was made to "spice" being equated to the topic. Also do not see missing meetings as an excuse. Black presence in SRc not enough to eradicate white mandate in the institution. Agreed topic undermined African culture only once students challenged it.</li> <li>- How has the SRC promoted African cultures? What has been done? Plans moving forward?</li> </ul>	



	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Want the names behind the campaign.</li> <li>- Highlighted as a serious issue. The people who were there need to be able to speak for themselves, they need to be able to say what Africanism means to them. If they are not here then they cannot be speak for themselves. Whoever came up with it needs to address it.</li> </ul> <p>James:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spice – don't recall it. Other people sent him messages that included that reference. Himself very involved in transformation. Farai commented, Marc also commented. Cannot comment on Africanism.</li> <li>- Entire SRc knew about topic.</li> <li>- Apologised that black men now feel responsible for the rape culture. He failed in his responsibilities.</li> </ul> <p>Student(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questioned why James is always the scapegoat.</li> <li>- Confusion as to Farai's view on the matter.</li> <li>- People who are affected by the issue are the black women – victims of patriarchal violence.</li> <li>- Again request for content of statement and names of parties present at the intial meeting.</li> <li>- How did the SRc agree?</li> <li>- James needs to answer the Q</li> </ul> <p>Marc:</p> <p>Comments with regard to SRc members not in attendance should be avoided. Future reference e.g. references to Farai are out of order and must be refrained as it is damaging and will be inflammatory to issue.</p> <p>Student(s) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cannot accept apology yet. An Apology does not solve the issue. Conduct can be repeated with apologies simply following.</li> </ul> <p>Chair:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Problem – not done enough in terms of Africanism. Agrees an apology will not do. Does not know what happened, was not present. Suggestion to find out more info first &amp; get on same page with team. If</li> </ul>	<p>In house meeting with exec to find out what happened and get on same page.</p> <p>Will have a follow up</p>



AGENDA POINT	ACTION
<p>Unanimous support.</p> <p>Wim left due to illness – James had proxy.</p> <p><b>6.6 Renaming Committee member election</b></p> <p>Has to do with the renaming of buildings etc. Lead by Johan Aspelling.</p> <p>Nominees: Kule Duma (nominated by Lethwe)</p> <p>Bradley nominated by Chair</p> <p>Vote: Bradley Frolick: 3; Kule Duma: 9</p> <p>1 spoilt ballot</p> <p><b>6.7 Portfolio Restructuring</b></p> <p>Vague portfolios. Want set portfolios to be included into the Constitutions. PGIO e.g. represents students but has no voting rights. How should the election process work etc.</p> <p>Proposal to mandate a task team. Task team to form part of constitution – looks at the other challenges. Mandate a task team to do all this.</p> <p>Marc proposed to discuss with chair first. Does not want to appoint a task team solely for this purpose. His task team is already dealing with it. Prof Quinot is also helping.</p> <p>Proposed that Chair and Marc work on it, to make it more efficient and quick.</p> <p>Q from floor: With regard to public hearing will there be a time frame? Before end of term?</p> <p>A: Could not work on it for personal reasons, try to fit a hearing in this term and hopefully 2 next term.</p> <p><b>6.8 Handover Period Motion</b></p>	<p>Marc and Axolile to deal with portfolio restructuring.</p>

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<p>Proposed a motion where SRc members are forced to work to 31 September to ensure handover. Admin is not great in the beginning. Want a motion that subsumes administration issues.</p> <p>Talk about voting being earlier, thus we need the info first before including dates in motion.</p> <p>There was a mandate last year that was not followed. This needs to be structured so that commitment is enforced. Talk about possible deductions from honorariums but this will ultimately be up to the evaluations committee.</p> <p><b>6.9 Ex Officio:</b></p> <p>6.9.1. AAC</p> <p>Had ADR meeting, ADR events, not all were successful due to timing and lack of advertising.</p> <p>Had an outreach together with recruitments as well as admissions office and probably another one coming up; work in community, help students with application forms. Thulani asked to please give more feedback.</p> <p>Students' fees will be waived if admission requirements are met. – see previous meeting minutes.</p> <p>Thulani:</p> <p>There were problems, which were changed last minute that needed to be changed. Issue of schimatus and NBTs, recruitment to handle this.</p> <p>Who are the new people who coming in now – prospective students. Communicate to Wim.</p> <p>Task team currently comprises of Nonkululeko, Thualni, Jodi Williams, Adele, Prof Johan Hattingh, Natasha brown, rep from ssvo - drafted proposal in the form of a memorandum, attached supporting documents. Will be sent to SRc when ready but ultimately to executive of senate. Premature to speak of implementation, needs to be approved first. Will</p>	<p>Follow up on motion once voting of new SRc dates more clear.</p> <p>Communicate to Wim about prospective students.</p> <p>Give more Feedback in May.</p>

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<p>happen in May then more feedback will be given.</p> <p>6.9.2. PC</p> <p>Meeting will happen on Monday. No feedback yet.</p> <p>6.9.3. SC</p> <p>Problem with cost points. Person did not open attachments. Money not paid to societies as a result. Problem eventually solved.</p> <p>Also reforming constitution – last revised in 2006.</p> <p>Looking at an SC week.</p> <p>Next week will have meeting, Khadija is invited.</p>	
7	<p><b>GENERAL &amp; Feedback</b></p> <p><b>7.1 Language Policy --- Structural feedback</b></p> <p>RT meeting gave feedback to faculties to implement practical measures for implementation. If there were issues they should have been taken to dean. Due date: 22 April 2016.</p> <p>Requested structures to give feedback, no one responded, all SRC invited to meeting. Please be alert with emails.</p> <p>Meeting any time from 2pm but Marc will be in office in the morning.</p> <p>Funding – money being allocated for dev of language policy?</p> <p>It has been queried how funding will be implemented because all faculties have reverted to language policy since court decision. What about the faculties who are not following? Engineering?</p> <p>Some faculties have for example requested extra lecture times in the interim but still need extra funding in the long run.</p>	

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<p><u>Concerns raised from floor:</u></p> <p>When the afri forum interdict given to university, law faculty said ask for second opinion, the law firm university used didn't want to challenge the interdict.</p> <p>Can the university please seek a second law firm for an opinion?</p> <p>Idea of having classes after class - need to take into account safety and outside class work responsibilities.</p> <p>Biggest concern from faculty, feedback from students?</p> <p><b>7.2 Arts &amp; Culture</b></p> <p>ATKV nationals went well, Toneel fees at 6 Gala (finals) R50 pp</p> <p>English debating: Majuba won</p> <p>If you want SER tickets speak to Marike.</p> <p>Moved to endler, sprak to</p> <p><b>7.3 Belgium Trip feedback</b></p> <p>Feedback on academics development program, met with other SRc members.</p> <p>Many meetings, with different members what they do etc. Met with students from different universities.</p> <p>Met with company – builds wind turbines, not the small ones for a house, or large for factory, med size, can give 50 households electricity. Maintenance is easy and it's small. Went to see how they can expand it to South Africa. It's a possible project. Deadline for projects to pick is July. Students will probably be appointed at beginning of new term.</p>	<p>Follow up so that University seeks a second legal opinion.</p>

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<p>Referential agreement: Problem is that they send 15 students to us and we send 3. Argued that the cost of living in Belgium and SA are the same. It's NOT. They will pay for 2 more students to go. Qualification: need to motivate themselves through some sort of project that they have done.</p> <p>Meeting later with Cloete and Kotze</p> <p>Q: partnerships with university? Where located? Have they done research? What is their hidden agenda?</p> <p>A: Belgium (Dutch and French based) also in Netherlands.</p> <p>South African turbines power corporate companies. Projects from 9/10 different countries. In Senegal built solar light connected to battery. Cost of solar light = years' worth of candles. Needed time to convince people to buy it.</p> <p>These people (in Belgium) are students, they come with their projects and then they leave, the stuff is sustainable without them.</p> <p>Academics for developments similar to think tanks.</p> <p>Students do the research and then practically used in communities.</p> <p>Student(s) comment:</p> <p>IPP independent power procurement - concentrated in EC and NC, belongs to Eskom. We have some of the highest renewable energy.</p> <p>Academics for development? An SRC initiative? Need to look within our own country, let's use our own people. Why go outside? Africa should learn how to develop on its own.</p> <p>A: We are looking at academics to develop, the turbines are just an option.</p> <p>Kara: we were approached by Belgium. They wanted us to</p>	

	AGENDA POINT	ACTION
	<p>be involved, they wanted to learn from us too. We want to adapt what they do and use it accordingly. It's great to learn from others.</p> <p>Engineers are also doing something like this already. We know this already.</p> <p>We want to develop Africa. We just went to get questions.</p> <p><b>7.4 Accountability:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Call a general meeting</li> <li>- Topics to be addressed:</li> <li>- Register all - clarity</li> <li>- Clarity in general</li> <li>- Call the HR to help</li> <li>- In light of handout, worker and student alliance somehow collapsed.</li> <li>- SRc does not have power, management has power?</li> <li>- Constitution of SRc?</li> <li>- Outsourcing</li> </ul> <p>Student(s) raised the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issue of student parliament being dissolved by student affairs. Who has the power to do this? Are they being held accountable?</li> <li>- Come to meetings.</li> </ul> <p>Marc:</p> <p>Busy looking into a possible declaratory order, it halts a lot of processes. The moment this is released its content can become public knowledge.</p> <p><u>Response with regard to Student Parliament:</u></p> <p>Asked management – students didn't ask management. Until the students ask for it, it's not coming back.</p> <p>Marc – looking into sending a letter of demand to Pieter Kloppers and 2 others</p> <p>Clarity about old student parliament? Is he still willing? First</p>	<p>General meeting: #RegisterALL -Invite HR SRc constitution Outsourcing</p>



	<b>AGENDA POINT</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
	<p>reinstate student parliament and then will look at willingness to stand.</p> <p>When is gen meeting going to happen?</p> <p>Logistics need to be discussed with council first whether topics to be addressed alone or together. Exec needs to meet as soon as possible. The meeting will happen.</p>	
8	<b>QUESTIONS AND VARIA</b>	
	<p>Marc: Reiterate on formalities pertaining to agenda points. It must include a subject line or it will be regarded as spam.</p> <p>Who can use the SRc board room? Inconsistencies about who has to pay and what kinds of meetings are allowed to take place.</p> <p>Wits SRc invited US SRc to attend an event, 29 April. Full email still awaiting.</p>	Bradley to confirm event.
9	<b>IN CAMERA</b>	
10	<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	
	The next general meeting is to be confirmed.	
11	<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	
	Axolile Qina adjourns the meeting at 23:30.	