

**Report on the Transformation Indaba 2019:  
Stellies, where are you?**

## Contents

List of abbreviations.....	iii
Overview .....	1
Welcoming: Prof Nico Koopman.....	1
Keynote address: Prof Loretta Feris.....	2
Inputs from responsibility areas and academic practitioners .....	4
Dr Leslie van Rooi.....	4
Mr Sello Molapo.....	5
Prof Ronelle Carolissen .....	6
Dr Marianne McKay .....	8
Dr Choice Makhetha .....	9
Breakaway discussions.....	9
Transformation Infrastructures .....	10
Student Affairs 1: Discrimination and harassment, gender-based violence and disability .....	13
Students Affairs 2: Mental health, food security and residence culture .....	17
Research at Stellenbosch University.....	20
Teaching and learning.....	23
Human resources .....	24

## **List of abbreviations**

CMPEE – Code for Management Practices for Employment Equity

EEP – Employment Equity Plan

GBV – Gender-Based Violence

HCs – House Committees

HR – Human Resources

ITC – Institutional Transformation Committee

LGBTQI+ – Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning and Intersex

SU – Stellenbosch University

## **Overview**

The *Transformation Indaba 2019: Stellies, where are you?* was hosted and facilitated by Dr Leslie van Rooi and Dr Claire Kelly on Thursday, 17 October 2019, from 08:30 to 17:00 at the Stellenbosch Institute for Advanced Study (STIAS). Throughout the recent anti-gender-based violence – or anti-GBV – protests, the hashtag #StelliesWhereAreYou had been trending. The idea underpinning the Transformation Indaba 2019 was that ‘Stellies’ make itself visible, that leadership and practitioners in various portfolios share their work with and engage with questions from the community that they serve. A second underlying idea was to the contextualisation of discussions taking place at Stellenbosch University (SU) within the broader project of higher education transformation in the Western Cape and South Africa.

The day was divided into two halves. The first half of the day consisted of input from a guest speaker, as well as responsibility areas and academics under the headings of:

1. Transformation infrastructure and visual redress
2. Employment equity and human resources
3. Research
4. Teaching and learning
5. Student affairs

The second half of the day was dedicated to small group discussions under the same headings, culminating in a plenary session sharing the content of these discussions. The following report is an account of the main themes and ideas raised in these discussions. We hope that it will serve as a useful record of our deliberations and provide our university community with some insight into the issues.

### **Welcoming: Prof Nico Koopman**

Prof Koopman welcomed staff members, colleagues who were committed to transformation as well as the students of SU. Prof Koopman briefly explained the rationale of the theme of the Indaba: *Stellies, where are you?* He said that one should make visible what one did amidst complexity and tragedy. Prof Koopman emphasised that complexity includes ambivalence and ambiguity. We should remember that transformation work is born from the tragedy of painful and shameful experiences, experiences that can provoke anger. However, SU must become more inclusive without creating new exclusions, and, when we tell stories of transformation at SU today, we should do so with humility and sensitivity.

Prof Koopman also said that we should also recognise the small steps forward. He said that we should affirm and encourage where we have made progress. The development of the Transformation Plan,

transformation structures and transformation initiatives, increased buy-in and healthy impatience, are important developments. So too the Constitutional Court ruling on the language policy, visual redress processes, the new terms of reference for the Institutional Transformation Committee (ITC), the new Code for Management Practices for Employment Equity (CMPEE) and greater interinstitutional collaboration. There is room for assertiveness.

Finally, Prof Koopman said that we, as an institution, should make visible what we have on paper. He specifically referred to the Transformation Plan, which defines transformation as embedded and systemic transformation, and includes both quantitative and qualitative elements. He also pointed to the articulation of transformation as relating to people, programmes and places, which are all articulated in the Transformation Plan. The Transformation Plan delineates where we, as an institution, would like to be and how we will get there. He said that we were committed to dignity, to the healing of wounds, to freedom and to equality. However, he emphasised that there could be no visible transformation without visible justice. Thus, we should conduct visible transformation as embracive, non-alienating justice discourse.

#### **Keynote address: Prof Loretta Feris**

Prof Loretta Feris, Deputy Vice-Chancellor of Transformation and professor in the Faculty of Law, University of Cape Town, addressed the audience on the theme *Transformation in higher education in South Africa: Current victories, opportunities and challenges*. Prof Feris provided context by referring to her experiences at SU as a student leader. These experiences provided a framework to reflect on the challenges of the past, the challenges of the present and the victories with respect to transformation. She elaborated on this by saying that despite global and national discourse around equality, diversity and inclusion, we still face the challenges of the past, including toxic sexism, toxic masculinity, patriarchy and racial hate.

However, Prof Feris said that we should also acknowledge positive changes. She said that she could clearly see the difference between the SU where she had been a student and the SU of today, but that the change that she saw might not be all that apparent to young black students who had never experienced SU during apartheid. She suggested that her generation might have a higher degree of tolerance for inequality and exclusion because of what they had endured in the past. She emphasised this by stating, 'Imagine not being born into an oppressive regime. Imagine being born and being called a born free', being filled with expectations and then surrounded by so much inequality. It is unlikely that one would experience a 'sense of place'. By 'sense of place' she elaborated (i) a relational experience of place identity as expressed in

culture and heritage; (ii) a place dependence, for example, a place where one could study; and (iii) place attachment, for example, the sense of belonging.

Prof Feris commented on the new challenges that we are facing, one of which is bullying. She mentioned that the University of Cape Town had recently conducted an institutional culture survey amongst the staff and how that had pointed to increasing incidences of bullying by line managers, peers, students and parents. She emphasised that workplace bullying was on the rise and identified a close correlation and overlap between bullying and discrimination. She noted this overlap is specifically affecting the LGBTQI+ community. Prof Feris also pointed out that cyberbullying and sexual harassment was making responding to bullying and harassment a more complex exercise, as they can be challenging to track or identify.

Prof Feris said that a second new challenge was the decrease in mental wellness both in students and the staff. She said that according to research, when people feel marginalised, excluded or discriminated against, they are more likely to experience decreased mental health. Prof Feris stated that a connection between mental wellness and discrimination exists, and needs to be discussed.

The third new challenge was that of artificial intelligence. In the context of equality, diversity and inclusivity, Prof Feris was unsure whether we have engaged sufficiently with the phenomenon of artificial intelligence and how this will inform the higher education space. She raised concern about the decrease in job opportunities as a result of automation and asked what automation would mean for the university. She also asked what kind of impact it would have on people's sense of inclusion and belonging. She said that we had created virtual territory surveillance and monitoring that we would rely on increasingly, for example in our classroom spaces. Prof Feris also mentioned that we should think about the role of transformation and innovation and our response to the social disparities that will continue to grow as we move into the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

Asking the question, 'How do we conceptualise victories if we talk about oppression?' Prof Feris then moved to the victories of transformation in higher education". She said that a victory meant that one has conquered and overcome a problem, which is not our reality. She suggested that we should look at victories differently, laying out three types of victories that we had achieved over the last decade.

Firstly, concerning demographic change, she suggested that we could claim some victories. Some strong demographic shifts in higher education have occurred, the number of black and low-income students with access to higher education has grown exponentially. Staff demographics are also slowly changing. Secondly, she suggested that we were moving forward with regard to more diverse senior leadership teams, especially in terms of race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, age and nationality. This diversity

has generated different ways of thinking and perspectives that have strengthened the University, especially in terms of innovation. Lastly, Prof Feris acknowledged some of the victories related to how we work with the idea of transformation, in that it is being understood as increasingly embedded in research, teaching and learning and the other core business of the University.

### **Presentations from responsibility areas and academic practitioners**

This session provided the responsibility areas of Student Affairs, HR and Transformation with an uninterrupted opportunity to present a brief overview of their work as it pertained to the themes and questions raised by a campus-wide survey conducted by the Transformation Office two weeks prior to the Indaba. In the areas of Research and Teaching and Learning, the Indaba provided input from academics on how they worked with the notions of decolonisation and transformation in their teaching and research. The presentations also provided the participants with an indication of where to direct which questions at which breakaway discussions.

### **Transformation infrastructure and visual redress - Dr Leslie van Rooi, Senior Director Transformation and Social Impact**

Dr Leslie van Rooi, Senior Director of Transformation and Social Impact, gave input on transformation, including transformation infrastructure, transformation indicators and visual redress. He started the presentation by providing an overview of 2019. Dr Van Rooi said that one of the highlights of 2019 was new SU Vision and Strategic Framework, which has a strong focus on transformation, including a Transformative Student Experience and being an Employer of Choice, as strategic priorities. Dr Van Rooi also referred to the new SU Statute and said that it would embrace a leaner structure that contributed to the transformation processes. Dr Van Rooi further stated that the SU Language Policy (2016) had been reaffirmed by the Constitutional Court.

Dr Van Rooi provided feedback on the article 'Age- and education-related effects on cognitive functioning in Coloured South African women'. He reported that there was an ongoing internal investigation. He also mentioned that restitutive and healing processes with the community in question had been initiated, but that there was still much to be done.

Dr Van Rooi also referred to GBV. The student Anti-GBV Movement had submitted a detailed memorandum to university leadership, who then solicited responses and commitments from the relevant environments at SU. Addressing GBV is an ongoing process. Dr Van Rooi also addressed mental health and wellness. He said that mental health and wellness discussions were part of the Transformation Indaba in 2018 and are an ongoing topic of concern in 2019.

Dr Van Rooi next gave feedback on developments in transformation infrastructure. He indicated that the terms of reference for the ITC had been established during the year. The ITC advises the Rector's Management Team on matters relating to transformation at SU. The ITC terms of reference can be viewed [here](#). Dr van Rooi noted that the ITC would now focus on the establishment of a student ITC and the development of terms of reference for faculty and responsibility centre transformation committees. This will include a closer engagement and alignment between transformation committees and employment equity representatives.

Dr Van Rooi then provided detail on the development of transformation indicators for the higher education sector and SU. He detailed how transformation indicators are being developed by the Department of Higher Education and Training, and are being revised as part of the institutional strategic management process. He also mentioned the new Management Code of Conduct will include transformation as a key performance area.

Lastly, Dr Van Rooi addressed visual redress at SU. He said that visual redress is an important part of the transformation process at SU, that a draft visual redress policy was in progress and would be completed in 2020.

#### **Human resources and employment equity - Mr Sello Molapo, Director of Employment Equity**

Mr Molapo, Director of Employment Equity, provided input on Human Resources (HR), including employment equity and staff wellness. Mr Molapo started the discussion by emphasising that employment equity promote diversity within the university and that Employment Equity must be made visible in transformation

Mr Molapo said that redressing historical imbalances relating to staff appointments and student access is an imperative for SU and that employment equity is an important strategy for accelerating the change process. He noted that employment equity is thus not only a legal requirement but also an HR strategy (Employer of Choice) as articulated in the SU Vision 2040 and the Strategic Framework 2019-2024.

However, affirmative action on its own is not the whole answer—the diversity created by employment equity must be effectively managed. The role of the Employment Equity Office is to establish an integrated approach to employment equity and diversity aligned to the transformation imperatives of the University. In this regard, Mr Molapo mentioned the Siyakhula Diversity Capacity Training Programme.

Mr Molapo detailed the role of HR in transformation at the University. This includes the following: the development and implementation of Institutional Employment Equity Policy, the Institutional



Employment Equity Plan (EEP) and the new Code for Management Practices for Employment Equity (CPMEE), which was approved by the Rectorate on 17 September 2019. Mr Molapo said that the purpose of the CMPEE is to provide a framework to guide management practices at SU in order to advance employment equity. The CMPEE is one of the critical tools for overcoming the barriers identified in the EEP and strengthen the process of eliminating barriers to the appointment of employees from designated groups. For example, job advertisements must contain a brief statement regarding the University's EEP and one of the following formulations must be used: (i) the University is committed to employment equity, and appointments will be made in line with the EEP for the specific environment as well as SU's institutional EEP or (ii) the University is committed to employment equity per SU's institutional EEP, and for the specific environment, only South African citizens from the designated groups will be considered for appointment.

The CMPEE also gives effect to, section 7 of the University's Disability Access Policy, specifically section 7.5, which states that '[a]ll departments must ensure that their processes, protocol documents and procedures comply with the principles and provisions of the Disability Access Policy, and must strive for disability inclusion in the work that they do'.

#### **Research - Prof Ronelle Carolissen, Professor of Educational Psychology and Vice-Dean Education**

Prof Ronelle Carolissen, Professor in Educational Psychology and Vice-Dean of Teaching and Learning in the Faculty of Education, provided input on research, including the transformation and decolonisation of research, and research ethics. Her presentation focused on *conducting* research, *rethinking* research and *redoing* research in higher education. She made the point that research can and must contribute to our understanding of the world and influence our policy and practice, and because of this it must reflect our values. Prof Carolissen went on to address three main issues namely *reflexivity*, *ethics* and *method*.

She noted three different levels of **reflexivity**, which include *intrapsychic*, *interpersonal*, *institutional and historical reflexivity*. She used the example of the recent visit by American academic/writer Dr Robin DiAngelo, who writes about whiteness and what it does to privileged and marginalised groups. Prof Carolissen mentioned that when she saw the advertisement for an event at UWC, she wondered how many white colleagues from SU and SU's sister institutions would attend this event or whether Dr DiAngelo would be talking mostly to people who are already working hard at understanding and healing their internalised racism. She explained that what she usually saw at these events was black people, and a small number of more 'progressive' whites. According to Prof Carolissen, reflexivity is an ongoing process, one that is so deeply entrenched that she has to 'work' on this all the time. She said that work

meant different things to different people. She explained that all of us, white and black, are burdened by ideology, a social system within which whiteness is a dominant norm and into which all of us must fit. In addition, for her, work means that she needs to reflect daily; she needs to understand why people respond in a particular manner.

Prof Carolissen referred to the 'infamous paper about the coloured woman' that had been published in her faculty. She said that when former colleagues published the article, she felt defeated, not only for herself but for her daughters and her students who always had to prove their intellectual worth, even when they obtained better marks than white students. Thus, she needs to understand her vulnerability, her shame, her justified anger when someone publishes an article that negates the joy and achievements of women who look like her.

She also referred to the deep internalisation of whiteness. She said that this might leave some black people believing that white products, shops and universities were better than their counterparts regarded as 'black'. She had heard that 'community people' were saying that the researchers were so kind and respectful, but how do we understand that? She often sends black and white students into surrounding communities, and it is almost certain that outstanding black students receive less attention than their white colleagues, while often communities are overjoyed at white students working in their midst.

Prof Carolissen said that when we talk about reflexivity, we often speak about interpersonal and intrapsychic reflexivity. She stated that for some, respect means that we are 'nice' to each other yet we have no empathy for the structural and historical injustices that many of our students and academics face. She said that it was in response to this that she and her colleague, Rob Pattman, produced *Transforming Transformation in Research and Teaching at South African Universities* in 2018. The book reflects research with and by students across nine universities and, makes visible the 'hidden stories' and conversations about of transformation – graffiti on toilet walls, in experiences of deeply racialised friendship groups etc.

Next, Prof Carolissen addressed **ethical research practice** (research ethics versus living ethically for justice). She told a story about one of her students who had obtained her degree last year. The student had conducted an exploratory study among a group of marginalised students who had received a national bursary). Prof Carolissen said that all the students had spoken about their experiences of racism in a particular department. Prof Carolissen said that she had asked the student to remove the name of the department from her final thesis as it was the 'ethical thing to do'. However, the student did not comply. Consequently, one of the examiners indicated that it was unethical. Prof Carolissen asked the student to remove the name of the department in her final copy. She stated that she still wondered what she should

have done about the situation. She raised the following concern: Does she collude with the protection of institutional racism? Does she uphold ethics? How does she talk about the practices that minimise the humanity of people who look like her? Are we talking here only about research ethics, but what about living ethically in the world, in terms of the definition given at the beginning of her presentation?

Finally, Prof Carolissen deliberated on methodological essentialism (quantitative versus qualitative research: can these spectra of methods be transformative?). She said that many colleagues believed that qualitative research (narrative methodologies, for example visual methodologies) was more conducive to transformation work than quantitative methods (for example multiple regressions and chi-squared analyses), which had little to offer. She said that this was not true and that essentialism existed about methodologies too. Prof Carolissen said that last year, she guest-edited a special edition of the *American Journal of Community Psychology* in which the authors detailed their praxis of decoloniality (or decolonialism) in the context of a community-based study that employed a quantitative experimental methodology to evaluate an intervention for girls involved in the juvenile legal system. She said that the researchers resisted the essentialising of methodology that positioned quantitative paradigms as impermeable to reflexivity and decoloniality.

### **Teaching and learning - Dr Marianne McKay, Lecturer in Oenology**

Dr Marianne McKay, lecturer in oenology and member of the Decolonising the Curriculum task team, provided input on teaching and learning, including curriculum renewal and decolonisation.

In November 2016, the SU Council tasked management with looking into how the university should respond to the challenge of decolonising the curriculum, as part of the ongoing curriculum renewal process. The Decolonising the Curriculum task team was convened to this end.

Dr McKay noted that transformation had been used as much to denote the repositioning of higher education to serve as a more efficient 'handmaiden' to the economy than to signify the drive to align itself with the democracy and social justice agenda of the new polity in South Africa (Singh, 2001). She made the point that higher education was not neutral but was highly political and that universities had a particular place and role in society. Moreover, she said that from a critical point of view, a university should be a place of relevance and play a useful role by serving the needs of society—higher education cannot occupy some mythical middle ground as 'sitting on the fence', would make them irrelevant. Therefore, society should hold such institutions accountable for their contribution to the public good (Botma, 2012).

Dr McKay noted that the transformation of higher education after 1994 has focused on issues such as governance, mergers and incorporations, and quality assurance regimes. She said that matters of the curriculum have been neglected (Le Grange, 2016). Consequently, higher education still reflects colonial and apartheid worldviews and is disconnected from African realities, including the lived experiences of the majority of black South Africans (Ramoupi, 2014). She also said that epistemologies and knowledge systems at most South African universities remain rooted in colonial, apartheid and Western worldviews and epistemological traditions (Heleta, 2016). Dr McKay stated that the latter was not about closing the door to European or other traditions but was about defining clearly what the centre was (Mbembe, 2016). She said that Europe could not remain at the centre of the universe at African universities and that Africa had to be at the centre (Ngugi, 1981).

Lastly, Dr McKay addressed transformation in higher education curricula. She said that transformation was seen as greater contextualisation of course content towards social justice, relevance and the professional needs or lived experience of students and that indigenisation and localisation should be regarded in a broader cultural sense. She also said that transformation in higher education curricula should follow a more humanising pedagogy such as being learner-centred, interdisciplinary, multilingual and blended. Dr McKay quoted Janssen (2016), stating that ‘transforming university campuses into deracialised spaces requires attention to both the academic and the human project ... how students see themselves’.

#### **Student Affairs - Dr Choice Makhetha, Senior Director Student Affairs**

Dr Choice Makhetha, Senior Director of Student Affairs, provided input on Student Affairs, including discrimination and harassment, GBV, disability, mental health, food security and residence culture.

#### **Breakaway discussions**

The breakaway discussions mirrored the input areas with Student Affairs being provided two breakaway sessions to cover the full range of their responsibilities. Thus Student Affairs was represented in two breakaways, one focusing on Discrimination and Harassment, GBV and Disability the other Mental Health, Food Security and Residence Culture. The breakaway sessions provided the participants with the opportunity to engage more directly and closely with responsibility areas and academic practitioners on the themes, issues and information presented. The presenters (and in some cases their teams) were there to listen, answer questions and engage. There were note-takers at each table to take notes and report back, the content of which makes up the rest of this report.

## Transformation Infrastructures

The discussion on Transformation Infrastructures was led by Dr Leslie van Rooi and Ms Babalwa Gusha.

The discussion mainly focused on transformation infrastructure, visual redress and social impact.

Vocabulary	<p>A member of the discussion group said that as an institution, we should change the way in which we speak about transformation. As an institution, we should refrain from referring to how we are ‘working towards’ becoming transformative but rather speak about ‘taking action’. By doing so, we place the responsibility on one another to act accordingly. By continuously referring to the redress that we are planning on implementing, we are allowing for slow progress.</p> <p>Furthermore, SU and its structures have a reputation for slow progress, and the question was raised whether this slow progress had become the product of the policies within the different structures of the SU. This question will be dealt with in later discussions.</p>
Voices in visual redress	<p>Members of the discussion group asked how one should discuss visual redress when one had so many structures still named after oppressive apartheid leaders and why these names and statues meant so much to white people. The concerns of people of colour are heard, but no action is being taken. Thus, whose voices are being heard?</p> <p>An example of a vital decision yet to be made is the presence of the Jan Marais Statue on the Rooiplein.</p>
The role of white men	<p>A remark was made with regard to the presence of white men within the spaces created explicitly to discuss and implement transformation. White men are often absent from these spaces despite the importance of their function as policy role players. These role players are thus seen as a part of those obstructing the changes necessary for transformation to occur. This absence, however, should be seen not as a disadvantage but rather as an opportunity to make sustainable changes and to move forward in the process of transformation. This is by no means to attempt to make the necessary changes without due regard but is a way to move forward without those who have opted not to be present in these conversations.</p>

<p>Policy on visual redress</p>	<p>Following the previous theme, it was noted that the past influences both people of colour as well as white people, and this has influenced the visual redress policy. The voice that should mostly be heard is the voice of the ‘collective’. The collective, however, consists of a wide variety of persons and sets of interests.,</p> <p>It is important to note that there are clear steps to be taken and procedures to be followed in actioning visual redress. Policies are put in place to ensure that redress happens according to the statutes regulating the actions of the University, with due regard to public policy.</p> <p>The question of whether the SU policies slowed down the progress that we are making with regard to transformation was raised in this discussion.</p>
<p>The Wilcocks building</p>	<p>A hotly debated topic during most of the discussion was the Wilcocks Building and the longstanding debate relating to renaming the building. The position stated by Dr van Rooi was “that it is not whether the change will happen but rather when the name will change”. Due to the processes in place, renaming a building can take longer than one would expect, which has left many parties frustrated. Suggestions were that management could remove the name and leave the building nameless until a suitable name has been selected. A participant suggested that the name on the building could easily be removed; thus, why was the removal of the name such an issue? They suggested that management ‘solidifies’ the time-consuming nature of this process due to the public interest involved in this specific act.</p> <p>Dr van Rooi noted that we, as a University, would like to be proud of the removal and wished to provide a suitable name, adequately portraying the redress at SU in moving towards the future. He reiterated that it is not as easy as simply changing a name and ‘calling it a day; there are procedures that need to be followed and many factors that need to be considered. He shared the example of Coetzenburg Stadium which used to be known as DF Malan Stadium. The redress necessary here happened without the necessary policies due to University and public policy. This change had a significant impact on many individuals and left interested parties in a state of confusion, which essentially created a distrust of the University and its procedures and policies.</p>

	<p>He noted that management would like to steer clear of the reoccurrence of redress happening in the same way as the DF Malan–Coetzenburg redress and would prefer to work according to the processes in place. Thus, a committee has been formed to grapple with this specific topic of redress. The idea is that all members of the public with the necessary interests are informed and included.</p> <p>In response to this, a comment was made that the process of engagement needs to be more proactive and robust. The question of student inclusion was raised. When would they be able to give their input? Are they not considered integral members of the ‘community of the building’, attending class every day in those lecture halls? A suggestion was made that for the time being, the name should be removed and that a more significant effort should be made towards the conceptualisation of the history behind RW Wilcocks - why it was problematic and why the name should be removed. It was felt that it’s the University’s duty to give more significant consideration to students who attend class in the building, the trauma that they suffer due to the name of the building and the possibility of future generations attending class in the building.</p>
<p>Institutional dishonesty</p>	<p>There were questions about the way in which SU presents its history. This came up specifically in relation to photographs of student protests during #FeesMustFall, which are on display on the SU Library. It was noted that these photographs were taken without the consent of any of the students and depict what happened during these protests dishonestly. They depict a peaceful process, the enactment of a right that was respected by the University and an action welcomed on campus. However, this is not the truth. Certain questions were raised: ‘How can the University use these portraits but not be held accountable for the part that it has played in pushing students to this point?’ ‘Why is the unwilling to recognise and take ownership of what it has done to students but takes pride in the “wins” of these students?’</p> <p>It was suggested that these images need to be more honestly contextualised including the fact that SU suspended and expelled students, had them followed and brutally treated for exercising a constitutional right. This is the type of conceptualisation necessary to move forward and to affect the true and honest redress.</p>

	<p>It was suggested that with these actions, whether consciously or not, the University robs the students of their narrative and claims it for itself; these students were willing to be incarcerated for what they believed in, but the extent of their commitment is erased in these depictions. Furthermore, before they can claim this narrative as their own, it is co-opted by the university. This same dynamic was seen in the recent anti-GBV movement. It was felt that it is time that the University takes ownership of its wrongdoings and honestly grapples with these. It needs to apologise and admit its inability to acknowledge the struggles of its students. This is a crucial part of transformation.</p>
Contract service staff	<p>There was a suggestion that visual redress should take place within all spaces with regard to the people who clean the bathrooms and who work in the kitchens, who are as much a part of the history of the University as the students and management. There should be a greater emphasis on the importance of these staff members and the essential roles that they play.</p>
Access	<p>There was a question about how visual redress is related to universal access. As a University, we need to do more to make our campus spaces accessible to differently-abled persons. With today's technology and innovation, there can be no excuse for the prevailing inaccessibility.</p> <p>However, there was a question of whose responsibility this form of redress is.</p>

**Student Affairs 1: Discrimination and harassment, gender-based violence and disability**

The discussion on discrimination and harassment, LGBTQI+ inclusion, GBV, HIV/AIDS and disability was led by Dr Choice Makhetha, Mr Jaco Brink and Dr Marcia Cleophas. The discussion included the involvement of the Equality Unit and the Disability Unit in the course of transformation. The discussion addressed the roles of the Equality Unit and the Disability Unit and the projects that they were involved in, such as the End Rape Culture Report and the Disability Access Policy.



Equality Unit	Clarity was provided about the role of the Equality Unit. The Equality Unit provides a service to students <i>and staff</i> in reporting unfair discrimination, carrying out GBV projects, presenting HIV/AIDS workshops and supporting the LGBTQI+ community. The Equality Unit is currently working closely with the anti-GBV movement and the rape culture task team.
Disability Unit	Further clarity was provided about the role of the Disability Unit. Like the Equality Unit, the Disability Unit forms part of the Centre for Student Counselling and Development. The Disability Unit offers a support service for students and staff with disabilities in the form of assistive technology or devices, extra writing time and residential placements for students with disabilities. The Disability Unit has existed for 12 years and has recently revised the Disability Access Policy for staff, students and visitors with a disability.
Putting policies into practice	The point was made that all units and University staff should familiarise themselves with the University policies and how to use them. Staff should advocate more student involvement and listen to students. Students are not the only drivers of policies, and it is not the students' responsibility to promote an initiative. Staff should engage more in initiatives driven by students and should not allow policies to be restrictive or used to tick a box.
Rape culture task team report	It was reported that the functionaries of the task team made recommendations when the report was released in 2017. However, there is a lack of shared responsibility by the institution for actioning these. The Equality Unit has specific responsibilities in relation to these recommendations but needs other structures such as HR and Faculties to engage more fully. There is a Rape Culture Monitoring task team in place, but rape culture and sexual harassment need to be monitored by all structures and reported correctly. There is a guideline in the report on how to monitor and report sexual assaults and discrimination. It was noted by one participant that student support is accessible.

Rape culture survey	<p>A 'rape culture' survey was recently conducted by the Equality Unit. The survey focused on experiences and perceptions of rape culture and sexual assault. The survey received over 1 200 responses, and the data is in the process of being collected and analysed. The information will inform management of the issues on campus and give feedback on these issues. The Equality Unit is currently developing a systems survey for staff. The survey was developed by Dr Alten du Plessis and Pieter Kloppers and adopted by the Equality Unit, and follows international good practice</p>
Training for outside service providers	<p>The question of whether the University has a responsibility to train outside security service providers on matters such as sensitivity, disability and equality came up.</p> <p>The Equality Unit's reporting and the End Rape Culture Report showed that students were harassed by outside service security providers. This led to a meeting with management and a declaration regarding harassment which all security personnel are required to sign. It was suggested that the Equality and Disability Units should offer training to service providers to sensitise them regarding the needs of students. It was suggested that this training be made mandatory.</p>
Advertising for the Indaba	<p>Some of the advertising for the Indaba did not reach the students and staff. Notifications on SUNLearn and faculty involvement will increase advertising to students. Next year, a Student Transformation Indaba will be hosted by the Student Transformation Committee. The Indaba will be cluster-based and will be advertised per faculty.</p>
Transformation portfolios	<p>There was a feeling that faculties are neglected with regard to transformation.</p> <p>There should be Transformation committees in all faculties and responsibility areas. The work for the TO for next year includes getting the transformation committees within the respective environments to function as they should, and involving student leaders in transformation decisions.</p>

<p>Suggestions for student training on University systems</p>	<p>It was suggested that students need to be trained on structures at SU. Especially mentors and house committees (HCs) need training on the services at the University, such as the Centre for Student Counselling and Development and the Centre for Student Communities.</p>
<p>Shortage of counsellors at SU</p>	<p>There was discussion about the shortage of counsellors at the University and a long waiting list for students to see a counsellor. Students are especially struggling to see counsellors during emergencies. However, it was mentioned that ER24 offers medical and psychological trauma services during emergencies. The University covers the cost of these services for a certain number of sessions.</p>
<p>Focus on the Equality Unit</p>	<p>It was suggested that a counselling psychologist should be included in the Equality Unit. The need to train staff on skills and techniques such as empathy, listening, and relational and interpersonal skills is increasing and there are some skills training and short courses. However, there is not enough and even if there were it would not negate the need for a more active counselling service.</p>
<p>Adapting to challenges</p>	<p>The point that new challenges arise all the time was made. But what is being done consistently to adapt to and address these challenges? For example, the Disability Unit regularly faces issues regarding students having to declare and verify their disabilities. Physical access issues can be addressed by having someone present at monthly meetings to discuss various structural issues on campus. Going to the right person in top management or speaking to the facilities person in one's faculty can help with addressing access issues. The units must take the initiative to adapt to situations and research issues where necessary.</p>

## Students Affairs 2: Mental health, food security and residence culture

The discussion on mental health, food security and residence culture was led by Dr Choice Makhetha, Dr Munita Dunn and Mr Pieter Kloppers.

<p>Relationship between Student Affairs and students</p>	<p>A participant asked how relationships between Student Affairs and students could be rebuilt to ensure that Student Affairs was aware of the ways in which it could assist students. It was noted that Student Affairs could not say that it didn't know what students wanted, when students were very clear about what they wanted. An example that clearly shows this is the student LGBTQI+ community, who are the most knowledgeable people on this matter. Furthermore, they are more than willing to educate fellow students, staff members and guests on it. How then can student access to Student Affairs be improved?</p> <p>Dr Makhetha, in response to this, made a comparison with other universities. She highlighted that this problem was faced not just at SU but nationwide. To combat this problem, she uses every possible opportunity to bring across the point that students come with their own experiences. Hence, they know what they want, and the role of Student Affairs is to meet those particular needs instead of focussing on what it assumes is a need. A step towards rebuilding relationships with students is to restore relationships within Student Affairs itself. These healthy relationships can then naturally filter down to the students.</p>
<p>Transformation and student participation</p>	<p>Lack of student participation is a problem that is common to the transformation journey at SU. Without students, transformation cannot be attained. Therefore, students need to be included in conversations on transformation and need to be invited into the Transformation and Student Affairs offices. Dr Makhetha lastly emphasised that there could be no Student Affairs without students.</p>
<p>Residence culture</p>	<p>A question was raised about, what was considered, an ongoing dilemma noticed in the Division of Residence Placement, namely that students are placed in residences but that their retention of these placements is low. The way in which newcomers are treated was cited as one of the reasons for this attrition. It is non-negotiable that all students, including newcomers, should be treated with dignity and respect. If students are treated</p>

	<p>with respect and dignity, they will most likely stay in residences for the duration of their degrees. It was suggested that a task team be assigned to explore this question</p> <p>It was noted that HCs tend to have more power than residence heads and that this should be changed. The power of the HCs should be less than that of the residence heads, and the residence heads should be well trained for their positions.</p> <p>It was also noted that the system whereby individual residences can have constitutions independent of the university is flawed. It was suggested that standard templates for residence constitutions should be created and given to residences. These will act as guidelines to ensure that residence constitutions remain in line with the University values. Furthermore, it was emphasised that the values of the University should supersede any other values.</p>
Student success	<p>It was noted that for student success to be achieved, support structures must be put in place. The concept of one size fits all does not apply when dealing with students. Each student must be assessed individually and must have his or her needs met as per the assessment. It was said that there was a need to acknowledge that inequality did exist.</p>
Dean of Students	<p>A concern was raised concerning the role of the Dean of Students. It was said that the University, particularly management, tended to recognise this role only when there was a need for someone to represent management during a crisis.</p>
Students' Representative Council	<p>There was a suggestion that the Students' Representative Council was dysfunctional, the main reason for this being the GBV allegations. It was suggested that when applying for a position on the SRC, students should be required to elect a particular portfolio and to motivate their choice.</p>
Food security	<p>A question about food security was raised. The question was aimed at measures put in place by the University to achieve food security. Among others, the Department of Student Affairs and Bursaries and Loans, who both deal with food security, have offered bursaries and loans to needy students. Multi-layered approaches are in the process of being finalised, which will include working with non-governmental organisations.</p>

	<p>There have, however, been a number of challenges with proposed solutions. For example, late payment of bursaries and loans mean some students go through periods of food insecurity. Another example is the concerns about health raised by students, during an attempt to partner with large retail stores such as Pick 'n Pay, to give away foodstuff that has almost reached its sell-by date. This method also undermines human dignity.</p> <p>An additional challenge concerning food security is that students must 'share their pain' and 'perform their poverty' to obtain food. This, amongst other things, means reliving painful moments of their past, which affects their mental health.</p> <p>It was also noted that most food security projects placed their primary focus on undergraduate students while there are postgraduate students who are also struggling. A suggestion was made that different offices should deal with food security for postgraduate students and for undergraduate students.</p> <p>Another possible solution suggestion to help reduce food insecurity was financial education. It was a suggestion that a session should be held with newcomers at the beginning of each year to educate students on how to manage their funding. The release of funds should also be revisited, for example the food funding quota could be released monthly to prevent students from using all their money on COB and being left with no food towards the end of the year. A vending machine that would allow students to swipe a limited number of times for necessities, such as toiletries, was also suggested.</p>
National Student Financial Aid Scheme	<p>An attendee asked whether there was any way to alter the NSFAS' payment methods, for example receiving early payments for food and reverting to the old system of purchasing books since students tended not to buy the required books. Dr Makhetha highlighted that the reason behind the new system was to avoid fraud in the NSFAS whereby student monies would not reach students.</p>
Inetkey	<p>There was a concern about Inetkey and its rates. It was noted that the University was in the process of revisiting the rates.</p>

Mental health	<p>It was noted that mental health is a serious challenge, one that the University should prioritise. A lack of social workers, councillors and psychologists was noted and seems to be a challenge nationwide. Although SU is privileged in the number of mental health support staff that it has, it should be noted that this does not diminish the need.</p> <p>A possible solution to this problem is considering an additional division of people who are already offering mental health assistance even though they are not qualified mental health professionals. These people could assist in preassessment to ascertain whether students need to see a mental health professional, or not. Additionally, faculty staff should be trained to handle the mental health issues of students. It was also mentioned that there was a need to differentiate between mental health issues and ‘broken hearts’, which would assist in not overloading the social workers.</p>
Alcohol and substance abuse	<p>It was noted that alcohol and substance abuse has had terrible consequences within the University, including the death of a student in 2019. It was suggested that there should be a codified policy regulating alcohol use within the University to replace the policies that residences and different divisions have created for themselves. Although alcohol is technically not allowed to be sold in residences students simply purchase alcohol elsewhere and consume it in their residences.</p> <p>A possible reason offered to explain the drinking culture at SU was the lack of other spaces for socialising at night. Clubs are the only places open at night where students can meet. If, for example, coffee shops would be open till late, the consumption of alcohol could possibly be reduced.</p>

### **Research at Stellenbosch University**

The discussion on research at SU was led by Prof Ronelle Carolissen. The discussion included the transformation and decolonisation of research. SU has the potential to be a leader in research production and publication. However, several concerns raised by the participants show that issues within the research environment at the University interfere with this potential.

<p>Transformation and decolonisation of research at SU</p>	<p>The general feeling about transformation was that it was not necessarily linked to issues such as gender and race but rather entailed a far broader spectrum of ideas and ways of thinking. We cannot solve the issue of transformation in research by obtaining more diversity from those who publish (although this is an essential factor as a starting point). A mindset shift with regard to how a particular research topic is approached is needed to address the issue of transformation. ‘How can this be implemented across all the different disciplines?’ was a question that provoked some thought amongst participants.</p> <p>It was pointed out that decolonisation and higher education did not mesh together well. Higher education institutions as we know them today are built upon a colonial heritage. Too often, people latch onto the idea that decolonisation involves getting more ‘African people’ on board, but this is a rather narrow way of approaching the topic. We need to draw upon multiple pieces of knowledge and not solely on Western ones to address this issue.</p> <p>It was suggested that getting more ‘Africans’ involved in the research space did not decolonise research per se; it merely provided a moral high ground to those insisting on decolonising research. However, it seems that this way of decolonising research is popular as it is relatively easy to achieve and does not require an in-depth analysis of what it means to decolonise research.</p> <p>SU can change this outlook and truly transform how research is done; however, little was noted regarding the University’s effort to address the issues that were discussed.</p>
<p>Quantitative and qualitative research relating to transformation</p>	<p>Quantitative research has been instrumental in transformation work at SU. However, reflexivity with quantitative research is not always practised. The importance of developing case studies was stressed as it is valuable because one can study a case in-depth and gain a qualitative view of transformative research.</p>



<p>Experience of research at SU</p>	<p>SU has the infrastructure and intellectual resources to facilitate world-class research output. From the discussions, it was clear that SU encourages transdisciplinary research but that the structure and culture surrounding research in academia makes this difficult. Particular research topics and ideas are not published in international journals because they do not conform to what is deemed acceptable in the research space. Some ideas do not translate into what is demanded by these journals, and since research can be expensive to produce and publish, it is not always feasible to publish a research article in a journal if there is simply no demand for it.</p> <p>Quantity over quality was also a discussion point that the University could improve on. Currently, there is pressure to produce large amounts of research. According to one of the participants, SU has one of the highest levels of research output in South Africa. Therefore, it seems as if the quality of the research produced is not valued nearly as highly as the quantity of the research output, which is problematic.</p> <p>The income stream that research output generates is significant to the University, according to one of the participants. With government reducing subsidies available for research, it seems as if now, more than ever, the quantity of output is highly prioritised. The current system focuses on generating income and not on producing excellent academic content. There is a risk that if this does not change, research output from SU will be of reduced quality in comparison to other institutions.</p> <p>Another critical concern regarding how research is conducted at SU is that researchers do not partner enough with each other to gather the data that they need. Plenty of data is available, but the culture is that people want ‘to build their own kingdom’ instead of working together (which would probably lead to more effective research being done). A culture of individualisation exists in the research sphere, which is something that the University needs to address actively.</p>
<p>2040 Vision</p>	<p>It appears as if no clear goal towards the decolonising project is addressed in the University’s 2040 Vision. Upon enquiry by one of the participants, the person was told that decolonisation was implied in the Vision (commitment to the decolonising project). This appeared to be problematic, implying that the University is still colonial in its approach. From the discussions, it seems that most of the participants would</p>

	<p>prefer an explicit statement in the 2040 Vision addressing the issue of decolonisation as well as how the University plans to deal with it. A key issue raised was that we did not have a collective understanding of the nature of transformation.</p>
<p>Prescribed topics in research</p>	<p>While it is stressed that interdisciplinary research is of the utmost importance, it does not always seem as if it is valued. The University wants research to be descriptive, not prescriptive. Some departments, however, prescribe research topics. This infringes on the academic freedom to freely research a particular topic that interests the researcher, as pointed out by a participant.</p> <p>Arguments are made that one needs to get the publication done; otherwise, the researcher is putting her or his career in jeopardy. The prescribed or regular route seems to be to publish your prescribed research now and follow your passion later. This pathway was frowned upon by most of the participants. The consensus was that choosing a particular research topic should not cause someone to be penalised for wanting to follow his or her passion, although this is how the current system seems to work.</p>
<p>Practitioner research</p>	<p>It was stated that there was currently no allowance for research to be published outside of one's practitioner environment. While the University does have the systems in place, there does not appear to be a natural flow in terms of practitioners' orienting themselves, especially if they are not familiar with SU. They may feel lost, and could thus be deterred from researching at this University. The importance of practitioner research was emphasised to prevent these types of occurrence.</p>

### Teaching and learning

The discussion on teaching and learning was led by Dr Marianne McKay. The conversation included curriculum renewal and decolonisation, and lecturer capacity development.

Teaching methods	Regarding delivery of content, it was stated that academic staff who had been lecturing for a long time used teaching methods that were not suited to the current era of students. Academic staff have been using the general method of giving students information to copy down and testing students on it. It is advised that new teaching methods be used to encourage and develop students' interest in their respective fields.
Decolonising	At the discussion, new teaching methods were suggested. Suggestions included re-educating older academic staff, modernising the curriculum and introducing African content (decolonising the curriculum), and introducing e-learning resources such as podcasts as learning material. To ensure that the level of teaching is of a high standard, people who are not part of the SU education system must evaluate the system.
Engagement: #FeesMustFall	It was suggested that there was a disconnect between activism and academia at SU. The University does not foster any form of engagement in activism, especially in the technical faculties such as Science and Engineering. #FeesMustFall was used as an example. It was felt that lecturers who try to implement transformative programmes dealing with current pressing issues do not receive any form of support from the University.
4 <sup>th</sup> industrial revolution	Regarding the Fourth Industrial Revolution and the needed skills, it was suggested that academics and management had not yet had a critical discussion on this topic. Therefore, it was not clear how the University could formulate a policy on this issue. It was noted that the University had done well in establishing the School of Data Science. It was recommended that degrees offered at the University be evaluated to determine their relevance in the digital era or whether they could be modified to meet the current needs of the workplace.

### **Human Resources**

The discussion on HR was led by Mr Sello Molapo and Ms Shibu Mamabolo. Participants asked questions about HR, specifically regarding employment equity and staff wellness; they also shared their experience of HR with regard to employment equity and staff wellness at SU.

<p>Resistance to transformation</p>	<p>An academic staff member said that transformation was not an event but was a process for everyone from lower management to senior management. Transformation should be embedded in everything that employees do. People not adhering to transformation key performance areas should be held accountable.</p> <p>‘Resistance from certain Council members and senior management who are not for transformation should be pointed out’, said a member of the group. An example was given of someone in a senior position who had resigned due to the change in the language policy. The same member said that SU should draw up a five-year plan and be clear about targets for top management positions. He said that HR had met with faculties to familiarise them with the targets. He further stated that the EEP was ready and only needed to be signed by the deans. He concluded by saying that in appointments, diversity should be considered and when posts were advertised, if there was a preferred race, it should be stated and HR could help the faculty in identifying a person to suit the demographic profile.</p>
<p>Power/bullying</p>	<p>A lecturer from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences posed a question to HR about staff members’ being treated differently, for example permanent staff members and temporary staff members. The feeling was that permanent staff denigrate temporary staff and make them feel inferior because they are not permanent and merely on contracts. This impacts the wellness of the temporary staff. Although the permanent staff may say that it is not personal, someone’s job security is personal if his or her livelihood depends on it. The lecturer also said that this power hierarchy exists between employees on the same level. Some temporary staff find that they are not invited to meetings and when they ask questions, they are disregarded and made to feel as if it is not their place to talk.</p> <p>Moreover, the lecturer raised a point regarding the lack of a proper structure to appoint contract workers to permanent positions. He said most appointments were subjective and that the panel would know already whom it wanted to appoint. Shortlisting and interviewing people for the sake of procedure wasted candidates’ time and mostly happened when the preferred candidate had a personal connection with the panel.</p>

	<p>Mr Sello Molapo noted that such appointments needed to stop with immediate effect and that the new clause included in the CMPEE should be used as a guideline for new appointments. If the Dean involved does not follow the guidelines included in the clause for a permanent staff member, he or she will be penalised.</p> <p>A participant in the discussion said that the faculty should also take responsibility for addressing these issues and that the Equality Unit should also assist. If it is an issue related to discrimination or power relations, HR together with the Equality Unit should investigate the claim.</p>
<p>Junior staff overwhelmed</p>	<p>An academic staff member suggested that there should be support for junior staff members before they moved to higher positions. She further stated that junior academics and lecturers should be empowered to find their voice because they did have a voice but it was often silenced due to racial dynamics.</p> <p>The Employee Wellness department's response was that it was working together with line managers and faculties to find strategies to support junior staff members to voice their concerns because the more they bottled things up, the more it would weary and overwhelm them, causing them to regress in terms of performance. If a regression in performance is noticed, the line manager can make a referral to Employee Wellness, which will then investigate what is happening within the environment and advise appropriately. This same staff member said, 'The institutional structure is still white-dominated at senior levels and if you do not have enough power, you cannot rebel against the system; you will have to adapt.' These hierarchal systems cause problems that resemble colonialism and apartheid. Junior staff are not allowed to speak to senior directors because of their junior status. This makes the junior staff feel inferior and excluded due to their lack of power.</p> <p>It was felt that staff members are fairly passive about staff issues. More staff engagement in staff issues and challenge management is needed, especially in issues such as institutional culture and the hierarchical system that favours whiteness.</p> <p>Another academic staff member raised the concern that many young people joined their faculty but soon dropped out because they felt overwhelmed by the closed organisational culture. They are not part of the buddy system of lunch groups, there is</p>

no one to speak to about these issues and they do not see the need to work in such a closed organisational culture where they are scared to express their views and are not allowed to grow and excel. The lecturer said there should be a proper orientation process for new people coming in so as not to end up losing excellent employees after a short period.

She said that this also related to the classroom context. If a student of colour sees a lecturer of colour standing in front of the class, it gives the student the impression that the University has transformed. However, the people who run the departments are not interested in changing who stands in front of the students; they are not transformed. They are close to retirement, so they pass the responsibility for bringing about transformation to the next person who will occupy the position. A common excuse given for slow demographic change is that there are not enough lecturers of colour to teach at the University. The participant said that she considered this reasoning strange.

An executive member of staff commented that if that would be challenged, one would be accused of being a rebel and a problematic character and the response would be that 'we do not see colour'.

The member said that he had joined SU nine years ago. By his second or third year, he was highly frustrated with the numbers and he wrote a letter to top management stating that he was not happy with the diversity profile. He was bullied, labelled a rebel and criticised; as a result, he withdrew because he did not want to stir up trouble and his wife advised him to stand back and protect his salary. He said that since then, the behaviour has continued. There are still departments run predominantly by white people, one consists of four white people, and the last three consecutive appointments were white candidates. There has been one, a black potential candidate, who was number one on the list, but he withdrew because he did not want to work in Stellenbosch. However, to this executive member, this does not seem like a valid reason.

<p>Culture of fear</p>	<p>Junior staff members are struggling due to the institutional culture and power hierarchy that makes it difficult for them to adjust to and excel within their environment. Often, the junior staff, due to their low level of power, are afraid to voice their grievances or to report incidents. A suggestion box will make it easier for junior staff to report issues while remaining anonymous. This will protect their identity and prevent them from being judged by their co-workers.</p>
<p>Unions</p>	<p>There was a question about staff support from HR in the form of organised labour and maybe a union later. The HR representative said that SU was not highly unionised and that he did not know why people did not have an interest in coming together in the form of a union. Some respondents said that it was mainly due to hierarchical systems and that people ended up not wanting to engage in staff issues because they feared that they would be suppressed. Temporary staff are not prepared to question or argue because they are afraid of not being appointed permanently. The expectation is that they should conform and do as expected. The HR representative further said that union representatives were trying to mobilise members but were unsuccessful.</p> <p>A comment was made that the majority did not want to join these unions because their lives were easy and they had a buddy system in place through which they received support. Everything seems to be going their way, and as a result, they do not see any reason why they should join a union. It is the minority that is affected by the power dynamics and feels afraid to raise the issues that bother them. They fear being marginalised, being branded as problem characters or rebels who do not want to conform to the institutional culture/system and being seen as too smart for their own good. Hence, people keep quiet and some leave; therefore, there is no membership of unions.</p>
<p>Black women in senior positions</p>	<p>The University appoints white women to senior positions and say that it has effected transformation. HR responded by saying that in the CMPEE, there is a clause that means that if there is an instance where a particular group is overrepresented, someone from the least represented group should be appointed. This clause has been recently adopted, and it will be communicated as soon as HR receives the Afrikaans version.</p>

<p>Lunch groups/buddy groups</p>	<p>Many decisions and power deals are made in social groups during lunch. This excludes employees who are not part of such groups. Later, when the matters are formally addressed, social group members are already informed or allocated opportunities. To the excluded employees, this is a form of apartheid, and they asked how HR would address this issue going forward. A member from HR responded that it was difficult to tell people how to socialise, but he suggested that such groups should be broken up if they caused such division within the environment.</p> <p>People are directly appointed and when the formal procedure begins, selections have already been made so the process will tick the box. The HR representative further stated that there should be a transparent selection panel that understood transformation. HR has also included guidelines in the CMPEE that will guide appointments. In cases where the person was directly recruited, the person who recruited must write a motivational letter to Mr Molapo for review. In terms of inclusivity, the employer must specify that there was no black candidate with the skills required to fill the position and research that supports the motivation must be presented. If Mr Molapo is not satisfied with the motivation, he will send the letter back to the faculty, and if he is satisfied, the appointment will be processed further. Mr Molapo will monitor direct appointments to ensure that they are fair and non-discriminatory. He further stated that the institutional guidelines existed to regulate appointments.</p>
<p>Diversity in top positions</p>	<p>The question was raised how long it would take to change the profile of senior management and convince it to commit to transformation, entrust to change. There are designated people who are eligible to fill senior positions; however, the members of management who decide on the composition of these positions are untransformed. Hence, an untransformed committee decides on the next leadership committee. The bodies that make the decisions are not representative. Transformation should take place from top to bottom and not from bottom to top.</p> <p>A support staff member commented that well-written documents outline what needs to happen, but everything ends on the paper and no formal action is taken to ensure that what is written is implemented. The institution is responsive rather than an action-</p>



	orientated institution; it waits for something to happen and does not respond unless something happens. Change should not only be documented but also needs to be seen.
HR operational training for line management	SU staff members raised concerns about the lack of training for line managers. Such training was requested for line managers to have a clear understanding of how to deal with employee issues. For example, if an employee is often absent from work or not performing as expected, guidelines should be in place both for the employer and the employee to follow. Line managers have limited knowledge of and skills for managing employees. Basic leadership skills are required. Leadership workshops are, unfortunately, not well developed.
HR policies	The HR policies are not clear on specific issues, and there are new policies of which the line managers are not yet aware. When HR adjusts policies, it should make the policies clear and available to line managers.

### **Concluding remarks**

This report has provided an account of the deliberations of the 2019 SU Transformation Indaba. It has shared inputs from transformation leadership, responsibility areas and staff and student thoughts on the area of student affairs, human resources, teaching and learning, research and transformation infrastructure and visual redress.

We trust that this document will serve as a useful resource to those colleagues working in these respective areas, as well as provide insight into these issues for the university community in general.

Aluta continua. Masiye phambili.

### **Contact:**

Claire Kelly - [clairekelly@sun.ac.za](mailto:clairekelly@sun.ac.za)