

**Meeting Minutes**

**Students’ Representative Council Meeting**

**Date: 15 April 2020**

**Time: 14:00-16:00**

**Venue: Online**

1. **Welcoming**  Lewis
2. **Attendance**  Fadeelah

**Present**

Luiga Nicholas

Michael Burke

Ingrid Heydenrych

Philip Visage

Eric le Roux

Christina Brazier

Chloe Krieger

Tebogo Ndaba

Yanga Keva

Fadeelah Williams

Lwazi Phakade

Brandon Murray

Lewis Mboko

Jeff Ngobeni

Tebogo Mphahlele

Robynne Boonzaaier

Grace Mngadi

Sifiso Zungu

Ntsako Mtileni

**Apologies**

Wama Ngoma

Xola

**Absent**

Shilela Bopape

Tembakazi Swaartbooi

Joconde Nsumbu

1. **Setting of the Agenda**

Sifiso proposes that the agenda point: SAUS letter to the minister be discussed before voting if SRC will be joining in 2020. Proposal denied by on the basis that the points are dissimilar and need to remain separate further one point is a voting point and the other a discussion point therefore as there are other voting and discussion points it would mess up the agenda.    
   
General Point is added to discuss the SRC manager’s statement against change in honorarium.

1. **Voting**

1. Policy Officer

The SRC elected Policy Officer, Jonty Stokes, has resigned at the beginning of March. An SRC member, Sifiso Zungu, has availed himself for the position. A vote of confidence in this SRC Member will take place.

Lwazi proposes that Sifiso present a short motivation for the SRC’s confidence. The chair approves the proposal. Therefore, Sifiso motivates.

A vote of confidence is taken through the chair via WhatsApp the results of which are confirmed by the secretary-general through screenshots. The vote of confidence is positive and Sifiso Zungu becomes the new SRC Policy Officer.

1. SAUS Fadeelah

The SRC must decide whether they will become official members of the South African Union of SRC’s (SAUS).

Fadeelah elaborates that SRC is not part of SAUS in 2020 due the fact that no decision on the matter has yet been taken by the SRC and no membership fee has been paid as a results SRC is not part of SAUS in the year 2020.

Jeff suggests that the letter from SAUS must be read aloud so that the role of SAUS is explained. Lwazi argues that by this time every SRC member must already know what SAUS is and know what it means.

*Discussion before voting; members of the SRC are given the opportunity to discuss the implications of the decision by the chair. After which, the voting proceeds in the same manner as established previously.*

*Yanga motivates his position against joining SAUS by noting that while Stellenbosch University issues might be similar to the issues of higher education, the solutions might differ, therefore SAUS may present one size fits all solutions that may not apply to the context of SU. The structure of SAUS is not ideal for student because it is a union run by an executive, thus most of the control of saus decisions would be in the hands of this executive of which is elected every two years and this SRC will only be eligible after three years of membership.*

*Lwazi opposes Yanga that issues affecting Stellenbosch are issues that affect other university and department of Higher education; therefore we should not isolate ourselves from SAUS, we must be part of it because we will be affected by the decision of SAUS as it continues to department of Higher education. Sifiso adds that SAUS gave us invite last year, also SAUS has capacity to respond to the minister in unavailability of SRC members of each university, which at the later stage a follow up will be made based on the response that SAUS has made therefore we should not isolate ourselves from SAUS.  Jeff adds that SAUS is good representation for mainly for bursary purposes, therefore we should be part of it and being part of it will also help and contributes to the issues that are confronted by other universities that don’t have capacity to deal with certain issues. Tebogo Ndaba supports that we should be part of SAUS, any other concerns we will transaction with them while we are within SAUS and Joining SAUS is not about us, but also for upcoming SRC.*

*Concerns are raised with regard to the responsibility of spending R30 000 on the membership fee for SAUS because a)of the circumstances we are currently in and b) the year is already almost over and a new SRC will have to pay another fee in order to join SAUS if they so choose. Brandon adds, looking at the budget concerning joining SAUS, Student affairs has motivated that SRC should be part of SAUS and if they do Student affairs will be able to pay for affiliation fee, but it should be discussed with student affairs after the decision has been made.  Jeff emphasis that SAUS is a national structure therefore SRC should be part of it.*

Lewis concludes the discussion and commences the voting process. A decision through voting is taken to join SAUS.

1. **Discussion**
2. G2G Task Team Brandon

Brandon Murray, Treasurer, presents a proposal for a Task Team he wishes to begin. G2G is the student upliftment task team of which the clean campaign branched from. It enforces ideas for student to learn from leaders on campus also for student to know what SRC does and how is of importance to the students which It compromises with different student strictures, such as resident HK, student from different faculties and other structure to enhance better influence on the portfolio.

Lwazi asks what G2G is, what it is meant for on campus and how it is of benefit to SRC and SU students.

Brandon says that G2G is the name of the task team to attract students, but the role of G2G is that it will assist student in raising their voices, concerns and ideas to the SRC through the task team. Brandon claims that the budget comes from fundraising and does not come from SRC budget however some funds are allocated to it from the budget to cover functioning costs.

SRC members bring up a variety of issues with regard to this task team ranging from confusion with regards to its purpose, to noting that none of the constitutional requirements for this task team as stipulated in the constitution were met prior to its formation.

Lewis concludes the discussion by stating that Brandon will have to write document to support his point and fulfil the necessary requirements that the constitution stipulates. The budget allocation that this task team currently has as written in the latest budget document will not be allocated until after the team is confirmed through the SRC

*Sifiso Zungu leaves*

1. SAUS Letter to the Minister

Fadeelah calls for:

1. Any SRC questions/concerns about the letter to be raised
2. A response to the letter with regard to the SU SRC’s stance on the various contents of the letter.
3. The potential implications for Stellenbosch if 4.3 of the letter (which proposes that the academic calendar is reconfigured to start in August) is accepted by the Minister of Higher Education.

No other concerns are raised by SRC members with regard to this letter.

Lwazi notes that the University has already made decision on the resuming of academic calendar. Fadeelah responds noting that while this is true the SRC needs to prepare for the event that the minister of Higher education accepts this letter as well as discuss whether or not to share this letter with management as it is relevant to their scenario planning teams and she is unsure of whether they have seen the letter.

Lewis clarifies that the university has seen the letter and that regardless the University has already indicated that the academic calendar is resuming on 20 April. Further Ingrid notes that a stance on the letter is unnecessary, to which the Chair agrees despite protest from Fadeelah.

1. **General Points**
2. The SRC manager’s statement against change in honorarium.

Philip notes that he does not wish to repeat the words said in the statement of complaint that the managers released to the SRC last night but rather he calls for

a) A response to how this appalling constitutional breach took place (referencing the unconstitutional decrease in managers honoraria as outlined and decided in the executive SRC meeting of 29 March 2020) and

b) A confirmation that this breach will be rectified and managers will receive their full R10000 honoraria as stipulated in their contracts.

Lewis calls on Brandon to explain some of the reasoning behind the decision to decrease to which Brandon replies explaining that the rationale was to align the managers honoraria with the amount of time they spent in office. He goes on noting that the previous year's managers were paid R12 000, R3000 per term and that if this year's managers were to be paid per term in office they would be paid around R7000. Brandon continues to explain how the amount of R7000 was reached mathematically. Brandon concludes asking the Managers to explain to him why the R10 000 would then be more favourable than R7000 considering this Maths.

Grace is recognised and responds noting that there in Brandon’s conclusion lies her first issue. No consultation with the managers was made when it came to this decision. Had consultation been had the managers would have explained that if anything the workload was not cut due to the shortened term but doubled respective to the time managers are able to fulfil their mandate in. Grace further continues that regardless of the math presented the decision made was illegal unconstitutional and undermining to the managers. The managers are not asking [the exec] to justify the decision they are asking [the exec] to account for how this unconstitutional, illegal decision was made and why there were no measures in place to prevent it from occurring.

Lewis responds stating that Wama was in charge of the managers interviews and everything related to that including the contracts and that somehow a miscommunication occurred about the amount that the managers were meant to receive as stipulated in that contract. Lewis continues noting that when Brandon was initially drawing up the budget, he was unaware that any decision was already taken regarding managers salary and so he calculated an amount himself. Lewis agrees that the decision taken was unconstitutional and declares that the decision will be reversed and the managers will receive their full honoraria but he objects to the claim that the decision was undermining as he views the intention behind the decision to make the remuneration fair for both SRC members and managers.

Grace notes that the undermining nature was a result of the lack of consultation. Lewis apologises for the lack of communication.

Fadeelah calls a **Point of Order** -*The SRC exec did decide that the managers honoraria would be R10 000 in the 18 February Meeting* Lewis interrupts with a **Point of Order** - *Brandon asked for the minutes of that meeting and they were not provided to him.*

Lwazi is recognised and he summarises that since the decision will be reversed, and the chair has apologised regarding any harm caused by the decision being taken in the first place, we should move on. Lewis follows saying that he deeply apologies both to SRC members and to managers as SRC members may be shocked by the disparity of the pay and the managers are angered by the decision initially taken.

Philip responds noting that either the people responding currently have not read the complaint statement completely or they are really misunderstanding it. While the amount may be unfair or unethical, the point now is that the manner in which it was done was unconstitutional as per Chapter 3 section so subsection 5 of the SU Constitution reads:

*T****he remuneration of each SRC Manager must be determined before they are appointed, after which the amount in question can be adjusted downwards by both the SRC and the Evaluation Panel on the grounds that the SRC manager did not perform their duties.***

He notes: The R10 000 remuneration was confirmed before the managers were appointed. The amount could not be adjusted because

* 1. the evaluation committee was not at the time confirmed and
  2. never did the SRC nor the SRC exec who made the decision show that the managers did not perform their duties,

Thus, the src exec did not have the constitutional power to make that deduction and yet they did so anyway which was unconstitutional.

Lewis responds that Philip should note that the decision was reversed on its unconstitutionality, the Chair has issued an apology for its unconstitutionality he continues stating that he did not have the constitution memorised, and no policy officer was present at the time to guide him on such. Further, Lewis notes that, in the future, he will improve consultation and he again apologises for not consulting on this matter.

Yanga is recognised. Yanga highlights that the SRC managers has sent the SRC a letter concerning their grievances, which were:

1. A reversal of the decision- which the SRC has agreed to complying with
2. A response regarding how this issue will be stopped from occurring in the future - which the chair has not yet addressed
3. How did this happen and why there were no mechanisms to insure that it didn’t happen

Yanga says that point three concerns him as the explanation that was given by the chair is that Fadeelah was asked to give Brandon minutes to which she did not. Yanga clarifies that it is not the secretary-generals job to provide people with minutes, it is the secretary-generals job to make minutes available after meeting so that whenever someone wants to refer to the minutes they are able to, a job Fadeelah fulfilled. Further, it is the responsibility of whoever does not attend a meeting to read the minutes after. The explanation given by the chair makes it seem as though the accountability mechanism which failed, was the secretary general of which it was not so Yanga asks that wording be used carefully when describing the accountability measures, which failed in this regard.

Lewis responds to concern two by saying that in the future any decision taken by any member of the executive as well as the executive as a whole will go through the policy officer. Lewis also notes a *Point of Clarity* on the reason behind the request of minutes as he says it was not to put blame onto the secretary general but because upon Brandon’s revision of the minutes he did not see the R10000 decision noted in the minutes.

Fadeelah responds noting that while the decision was not minuted due to personal oversight, Yanga, Wama and herself *previously* a tested to the fact that that decision was made in that meeting.

1. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting is suggested to take place next week Wednesday being 22nd of April 2020 at 19:30 venue Microsoft teams.   No objections were made

1. **Closing**

Lewis thanks everyone for attending the meeting and for productive discussion.

