**Minutes**

**Student’ Representative Council Meeting**

17 October 2018 @18:30 (Metanoia Residence)

# Prologue

A regular Students’ Representative Council meeting of Stellenbosch University on (17 October 2018), 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 18:30 and welcomes everyone.

# Attendance

**Present:**

Jane Fourie

Eduard Beukman

Alex van Greuning

Carli van Wyk

Leighton September

Lauren Stevenson

Alchadvon Fransman

Marine Bothma

Mthunzi Matshabane

Tariq Khan

Ute Hermanus

**Absent:**

John Kachoko

Melt Hugo

Tembeka Myeko

Lethiwe Mbatha

**Proxy:**

Alchadvon Fransman: John Kachoko

Paula Joubert: Melt Hugo

Alex van Greuning: Tembeka Myeko

Marine Bothma: Lethiwe Mbatha

# Approval of previous minutes

E. Beukman and T. Khan approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

# Setting of the Agenda

Point 5b will be removed and has changed to fee increment. Point 5c will be added to discuss shuttle service. Under point 7a, general SRC feedback will be discussed which includes feedback from the Prim Committee, Societies Council and Academic Affairs Council. The minutes will be a reflection of these changes.

# Discussion

C. van Wyk reminds everyone that if you are not a SRC member, you are required to send in an agenda point to the Secretary General, one university day in advance according to the student constitution section 41(c) and it has to be approved by the chair of the SRC. Announces that two agenda points brought forth from a student will be discussed.

# SRC budget progress

L. Stevenson says that this week she will be receiving all the SRC members’ preliminary budgets along with their vision and mission documents. She will also be meeting with everyone. During the current SRC meeting, I will discuss the finance guideline I have set up for the SRC as well as the budget outline and processes. Monday I will be having a budget meeting with the executive to get approval of the budget. It will then be sent out to students on Tuesday to receive their input and on Thursday student input closes. Then on Friday the final budget will be sent out before exams. The guideline which I refer to has been made available to SRC members to assist them with setting up their budget to ensure transparency and to allow students to gain trust in SRC methods.

Lauren starts explaining the guideline:

Firstly what happens is that each SRC member needs to draw up a document which contains their vision and mission for their portfolio or council. These visons and missions have to be in line with the vision and mission of the SRC. Each SRC member also need to state the 5 key elements they would like to focus on in their portfolio or council. Once this has been drafted in a document, it is then sent to the treasurer. I then review the document and have a meeting with the SRC member where we discuss these aspects and their budget. In these meetings what we discuss is the five key questions to ensure that the funds are being allocated transparently, responsibly and sustainably.

**Reads out the five key questions:**

1. Does the allocation of funds align with the values of the SRC and your portfolio/council?
2. What value(s) is this allocation exhibiting?
3. Does this allocation of funds align with the vision of your portfolio/council and the vision of the SRC? Student success is at the core of the SRC vision. Therefore is this allocation at the best interest of students?
4. Is this a return of investment? We need to remember that financial resources is an investment in the student community. So the question asks if it is an investment in the student community.
5. Is the allocation of funds sustainable in nature and is there an alternative way to use these funds to create sustainability and achieve the same end.

Concludes by saying that this is the process that will followed to set up the SRC budget.

# Fee increment

C. van Wyk states that there is a proposed fee increment which has been confirmed in Die Matie but the reason why the SRC has not confirmed it yet is because it’s still only a proposal and the Executive had a RMT on 17 October 2018 to ensure everyone is on the same track with the fee committee and to find out when the proposal will go to Council to be approved. Fee increment has followed a range of processes since April. The process is as follows:

A budget is drafted and is first sent to the faculties and then goes to the Student Fees Committee. The proposed increment is 7%. The proposed increment will be discussed at Council on 28November 2018 hence confirmation will only be provided then. As SRC we would like to engage with students regarding their input on the fee increment. Hopefully next Thursday we will have a mass meeting regarding the increment. The time will be confirmed by the Communication Officer.

The fee increment is not the same as previous years due to former president Zuma announcing free education in 2017. NSFAS bracket has increased to R350 000. If you fall in the bracket of earning up to a combined R600 000 gross annual income you will receive gap funding which technically means you will still be paying the fee of 2015. Reason for the increment is inflation and the higher education price index is applied to the fee increment. Next year there will be more people than before attending university who will not be paying fees, as the new policy makes provision for those previously excluded and who are part of the missing middle. The university has also increased their budget for bursaries including the recruitment bursaries.

L. Stevenson adds that fees for students is understood by the university as costs that service the university. It is thus not necessarily directly impacting student fees. The 7% means that the general cost for the overall university will be increased and that will have some influence on students. The increment is simply inflation. The increment is just a natural process of how economics works.

**Questions from the floor:**

**What percentage affects the students exactly in terms of tuition fees**?

C. van Wyk responds by saying that even if no student pays fees there will still be an increment due to inflation. Increment includes inflation plus 1%. In essence it is operational but it will be reflected in tuition fees but 7% won’t be applied to tuition fees.

**Is SRC sure about the student fees increment for 2019 being in separation to inflation**?

E. Beukman responds by saying that we are unsure as to the exact increase regarding tuition fees because the university has not decided what the fee increase will be yet. Once it has been confirmed it will be voted on at the next Council meeting.

C. van Wyk then adds that you can’t remove operational increment.

L.Stevenson says that because it’s still proposed, the fee increment is still following the process to discuss how fees will affect the various faculties. Anyone within the R600 000 bracket and below will not be affected by the fee increment as it covered by the university. Only those above the R600 000 bracket will be subject to the increment

**Student requests if it is possible for the SRC to find out how much the fee increment will influence SADC and international students?**

C. van Wyk reminds the student that students across the African continent now pay the same university fees.

**Why are we only being informed about the fee increment now, so late in the year as opposed to 2016 fee increment announcement which was in September**

C. van Wyk states that the SRC has also only been informed now but we have tried our best to find information regarding the fee increment because we have had meetings with previous SRC members, management and the treasurer.

L. September adds we did not want to aggravate students by making the announcement which is why filters have been added to the process to ensure input before its proposed to council on the 28th November 2018. It is important to note that context has changed severely and this influences how the university approaches the fee increment.

E. Beukman notes that the university works on a 7 year budget plan, in light of last year announcement , the budget had to be adjusted immediately within a short notice of time and this had implications

**In 2015/2016 council approved increment in November, my question is the fee committee has a budget regarding the range of the increment. Why isn’t the range being shared to students?**

C. van Wyk says we will follow up on the point and hopefully we will have the answers at the mass meeting next week Thursday.

**Will the increment regarding Inetkey, food quota etc be provided to students?**

L. September says that this is the document the chair is speaking about. The SRC will receive the document before the mass meeting which will then be made available to students

**Can the SRC elaborate which platforms the document will be provided on?**

C. van Wyk states it will be official communication via email and reminds students that it will also be discussed at the mass meeting next Thursday with a projector.

C. van Wyk closes the point off and states that they will follow up on the points mentioned by students.

# C) Shuttle Service

C. van Wyk announces that there will be a R9 fee for the usage of shuttle service on the night shuttles. The day shuttles will remain free.

**Questions from the house:**

**Is it not silly to apply fee on the night shuttle due to the safety risk?**

C. van Wyk states it costs the university more money for the night shuttle and the fee applied is in collaboration with the taxis and busses fee.

L. Stevenson adds that this fee was usually added into students overall fees, it is now paid by the user through their transport bursary.

**What do you mean by night shuttle and what time does it start and asks for clarification regarding the majority?**

C. van Wyk says that the night shuttle runs from 6pm-2am. The majority students use the shuttle during the day although many students use it in the evening, it is not the majority.

**Student then adds that he is a regular user of the shuttle service and there is hardly any seating space in the evening and how would it work for students who do not have a transport bursary as R9 a day is a lot of money. Elaborates that this is not a balance of treatment in comparison to students who are not covered in bursaries?**

L. September states that they also raised this point in RMT meetings in terms of what about students who can’t afford this fee. There is a commitment from bursaries and loans to aid students. As the SRC we are encouraged to inform students to go to the revenues provided by bursaries and loans. Management also encouraged that students use the green route so that more funds can be injected into the night shuttle.

**(Student who proposed the two agenda points arrives)**

Leading to C. van Wyk to remind students that the SRC mandate is to ensure that nobody gets finically excluded hence the reason for the mass meeting.

**Why is it that funding allows the day shuttle to be free and fees to be applied during the evening when students need it the most?**

C. van Wyk says that according to the data more students use it during the day. The payment is aligned with tax and bus services hence R9. It is more expensive to ensure that taxi drives operate in the late hours of the night.

**Surely there is a possibility that students will gather and oppose fee applied to night rathen the day?**

E. Beukman says that is an important question but management did not want to put pressure on the majority if students who use it during the day. Rather the minority of students will be subject to the fee.

**Suggestion, if the aim is to see the students needs why don’t you conduct a survey of students who use the shuttle service ?**

C. van Wyk states that this is a good idea and will look into the matter

**If students are encouraged to use the green route, it is quite dangerous especially for students that stay at Nooitgedacht as they have to use Bird Street. What was interaction behind the green route from the RMT meeting?**

C. van Wyk states that the Green route was simply a suggestion, it has not been finalized. What we were told is to finalize our safety and security committee as soon as possible in order to improve the safety of our green routes.

**The people who use the shuttles during the day are the same students who have vehicles hence stats reflect that the majority shuttle users are during the day. So what is the stance with regards to the way forward from the SRC.**

**Fees being applied to shuttle service have always been rejected by students. Fees have existed since 2015/2016 . What will the mass meeting entail?**

C. van Wyk states that the mass meeting will explain the fee increment and allow student input. Fees applied to student shuttles have been in debate since last year but it has changed. As all students using the night shuttle will receive a travel bursary. International students will not be excluded as provision will be made for them. SRC is currently placing focus to prevent student exclusion.

**Who will be able to afford the R9 fee?**

C. van Wyk says that students who are not covered by NSFAS and other bursaries. Seeks clarification from student regarding to the question so they can engage.

**Student responds that there are a lot of fees applied by the university. Does it mean that those who have no university placement they need to pay for transport. Those staying off campus should not have to pay the fee. It comes down to the question will the university build more residences. Forcing this fee to be applied will create more debt as Inetkey is already an issue. I’m not saying the SRC has all the answers. These are the arguments that I will raise at the** **mass meeting. I would like you as student leaders to put yourself in these students shoes.**

C. van Wyk says that all she can say is that we will have to get back to you as you raised several points.

L. September recognizes student’s points and states that bursaries and loans will cover most of these fees. What we need to focus on is students who are not covered by this to provide funding for them.

**Student further adds that the students suffering the most are the missing link and we should not forgot about them.**

C. van Wyk says that she will unfortunately have to close this point. Reminds there are several platforms and there will be a mass meeting. The SRC mandate is the financial needy and the missing middle. Encourage all students to apply for gap funding that accommodates the missing middle and NSFAS. Also states that she would like to have a meeting with the student, if he would like to engage in this conversation further.

A. Fransman asks what the management stance is regarding the implementation noting the exam period and the SRC stance in terms of how they will provide assistance to ensure all students will be able to write both the first and second exam opportunity in light of the metro-rail concern and the possibility that its services will be suspended?

C. Van Wyk closes points and reminds students once again according to the Student Constitution section 41(c), agenda points are welcome as they are keen to engage to ensure student success. She also states that she will look into all the matters and concerns raised.

# Voting

# Code of conduct

A.van Greuning explains that according to section 29 of the student constitution, the SRC must conduct a code of conduct to lay down the rules of conduct and disciplinary measures for SRC members. According to the student constitution section 22(2b) as vice-chair person, I am responsible for the disciplinary of the SRC and in collaboration with the policy officer, M. Bothma, in terms of section 22(5a) policy officer is responsible for ensuring that the policies of code of conduct aligns with that of the core functions of the SRC.

2017/2018 code of conduct has been sent to all SRC members on the 22nd September. The proposed amendments was sent out on the 7th October to all SRC members. We will now vote to approve the amendments to the code of conduct for 2018/2019. 2/3 majority vote is required to approve it.

**Code of conduct is approved by a unanimous vote**.

# Inetkey Policy

L. Stevenson explains to ensure that our funds are utilized responsibly we have formulated a policy to govern our expenditure in terms of Inet-key. There were various proposals and we will now vote by means of an open ballot.

First matter we need to vote on is if people who hold more than two portfolios should have an increase amount in Inet-key due to the portfolios bearing in mind if you are an executive member it counts as a second portfolio. You will then receive half of the fixed amount.

**50 % plus one votes hence policy is approved.**

Reads out the three proposals thereby stating that they would have to vote on one of them. Also mentions that there are amendments as suggested by some of the members.

**Proposal 1:**

R50 per month that we are in term of our office. The people holding two portfolios and the executive will receive an additional R25( R75 in total). This will then equate to a total of R15 750.

**Proposal 2:**

Each SRC member will receive a R100 and then the additional R50. In total this will result to R26 100.

**Proposal 3:**

Is that we receive no Inet-key.

**There is a fixed part of this policy which is subject to a possible amendment.**

L. Stevenson reads out the fixed section of the policy which is that the communication officer, marketing manager and secretary general will receive R200 a month. Mentions that the amendment is suggested by E.Beukman. Further states that the amendment will be voted on first and then only will the vote on the three proposals be conducted

E. Beukman states that its quite an extra expense , this additional Inet-key needs to be motivated by a reason and thinks a R100 seems more reasonable.

L. September says that he does not support the secretary general receiving this money but states that the marketing manger and communication officer should receive these funds based on his previous experience as communication officer. He is thus willing to remove himself as SG from the fixed section thereby receiving the normal rate.

A. Fransman supports the proposal made by E. Beukman. Further states that the concern is that this is provided on a monthly basis and it won’t be depleted monthly. So the member would receive a lot of Inet-key as it is carried over.

T.Khan agrees with E. Beukman and A. Fransman point, that R200 is quite a lot. He thinks that the large amount is not needed and as communication officer will inform Lauren if more Inet-key is needed.

C. van Wyk suggests that the marketing manager and communication officer should receive R200.

**Vote on amendments:**

The suggestion is that the SG be removed from this fixed section but due to the SG being willing to remove himself from the fixed position, the amendment is then made.

The next suggestion is that the marketing manager and communication officer additional amount should be lowered to a R100 as opposed to R200. These two portfolios due to the 50% plus one vote will now receive R100.

**Proposal 1 is voted in according to the 50% plus one vote. SRC members will then receive R50 per month. Those who hold two portfolios or more will receive an additional R25. The communication officer and marketing manager will receive an additional R100.**

# Short term Strategic Fund

L. Stevenson explains that this fund was devised by the previous financial officer of the SRC. The policy states that for it to be applied in the following year, it has to be approved by the executive for it to come into force and does not need to appear in an SRC meeting. It has been approved by the executive and will be applied.

Also takes the opportunity to inform students on the purpose of the fund.

The fund takes 10% of all money allocated to portfolios and injects into a fund. The fund is regulated as it can also be used for initiatives that promote sustainability. SRC and non SRC members are allowed to use this fund by means of an application.

# Financial Report Policy

L. Stevenson elaborates that the financial report policy was developed by herself in collaboration with the policy officer, M. Bothma

Constitution states that we have to provide a term report but it does not include our financial activities. This policy thus calls for the SRC to account for their financial activities. One single document will be released which will include the budget and the actuals when the termly report is released. Each SRC member is responsible for tracking their own expenses. Tracking and actuals will be compared thereby creating transparency and accountability. It also creates more responsibly towards financial resources.

**Question from the house:**

**Student parliament has a budget meeting with the SRC. Will the new SRC be considering this?**

L. Stevenson says that we have a proposed budget plan which the executive will vote on, student input will be open on Tuesday and closed on Thursday. Then it will be released to all students.

**Policy is voted in by means of 2/3 majority.**

# Disciplinary Committee

A.van Greuning explains that voting will occur to decide which SRC member will be sitting on the disciplinary committee alongside him. The member who is not voted in will serve on the panel. We will vote by closed ballot to decide on whether we want E. Beukman or M. Hugo to serve as a member on the committee.

A.Fransman seeks clarity if motivation has been provided for this position?

C.van Wyk cautions as this would be unfair due to Melt absence and stresses that we should know each other well enough by now to vote.

**E.Beukman is voted in to serve on the disciplinary committee.**

**A.Van Greuning also announces that applications for the disciplinary committee will be sent out tomorrow**

# General Points

# General SRC Feedback

**C. van Wyk reads out the allocated portfolio positions:**

Carli van Wyk: chairperson

Alex van Greuning: vice-chairperson

Leighton September: Secretary General

Lauren Stevenson: Treasurer

Melt Hugo: Postgraduate and Student Wellness

Lethiwe Mbatha: Strategic Initiatives and Leadership Development

Mthunzi Matshabane: Student Access

Tariq Khan: Communication and Transformation

Marine Bothma: Policy and Sustainability and Innovation

Eduard Beukman: Academics Affairs Council Chair

Paula Joubert: Prim-Committee Chair

Jane Fourie: Prim-Committee Vice-Chair

Alchadvon Fransman: Societies Council

John Kachoko: Tygerberg(TSR) Chair

Tembeka Myeko: Military Academy Student Captain

**C. van Wyk proceeds to read out the available managerial positions and encourages everyone to apply:**

* Sport
* KUKO
* Special needs
* Women empowerment
* Critical engagement with sexuality and consciousness
* Safety
* Branding and marketing
* SU International

**Prim-Committee**:

* P. Joubert states that they are currently working with SU leads due the complaint raised that there was a lack of student representation. An advisory steering board is being developed and consist of 16 prims and will then include other non-positional members. This board functioning will commence as of next year in February
* Non-positional leadership will be promoted in terms of co-curricular activities which will require hours to be logged in so it can be awarded to academic transcripts
* Visiting hours document has been developed and hopefully it is approved. It will allow residences more freedom with regards to their visiting hours.
* The PC is also currently working with the Maties Shop to see how the process works and to make it more effective.
* Planning phase of the dream launch is underway and will occur on the 24th January and Vensters will be on the 1st February. MAD2 partners have been allocated and partners seem generally happy
* The connect team consists of females soley which happened by chance. The chair might approach SRC members to be a judge for the night.
* They are also investigating ways to equip student learners to approach mental health in a more effective way
* J. Fourie mentions the problem of office space for societies and PSO. States that PSO that have hubs can use those spaces but for PSO who have houses it is a safety risk as it removes a room which is problematic. There is no solution at the moment , the alternative remedy is thus for PSO and societies to possibly share office space.

**Student seeks clarity regarding visiting hours. Who are the residences accountable to this?**

P. Joubert responds that residences are encouraged to set up a framework for visiting hours , then discussed at house meeting and has to be approved by the head of residence through the student communities(SSG).

**Academic affairs council**

* E.Beukman explains that a lot of focus has been placed on yearlong programs.
* The university Programs are more than 25 years old, this will be replaced as they are very outdated. An online hemis calculator will be implemented hopefully by next year. The readmission committee will have student representation. As to which students will serve on this committee is currently being discussed
* Prof Skoonwinkel is currently developing a tracking system to track what students are doing. It is a 7 year long developing program which began last year and the aim is to track what alumi does. I am also invited to attend the working group in November.
* From the council side we are finalizing the welcoming program.
* I have also had conversations with the various SRC members to provide training and co-curriculum activities to ensure its flawless before it is sent to the co-curricular committee and office.
* I have met several deans this week to sort out fine details. One faculty committee does not receive funding and another faculty is not invited to be on the board. I am currently trying to resolve
* Planning regarding an undergraduate research and co-curricula conference for next year is currently underway.
* New organizational model has also been finalized
* Our leadership and training development budget for this weekend has been limited to a R1000.

**Societies council**

* A.Fransman states that he had his first society council meeting last night and a major problem is a backlog in funds. Currently looking into ways to ensure these funds are provided to societies by January 2019.
* Regarding the office space, that is the alternative solution for the moment although some societies have opposed this remedy.
* I will also be meeting with Tygerberg to see if we can have future collaboration in April and other alternative collaborations
* I have also spoken to T. Myeko to collaborate but she said that she does not think that their program will allow it but is thankful for the consideration.
* Closing date for re-registration and e-registration is the 23 October and we are currently planning our first year societies fair which will be at Coetzenburg for next year

# Next Meeting

# Proposed date: Wednesday, 24 October 2018

The next meeting will be communicated.

# Closing

C. van Wyk closes the meeting at 20:28 . Thanks everyone for attending and for their input. Also reminds everyone of the student parliament speakers elections taking place next week Monday

.