

Recommendations of the Task Team for the Decolonisation of the Stellenbosch University Curriculum

31 July 2017

1. Executive summary

This report was produced by a task team appointed by the Vice-Rector Learning and Teaching with the overall purpose of making recommendations to the management of Stellenbosch University on the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* at Stellenbosch University. The report engages conceptually with debates around the issue of the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*, outlines some of the responses to this debate by stakeholders at the university, and considers how to facilitate partnerships between the student community, the academics and the support staff in response to these debates. Finally, the report makes tentative recommendations on how the university should proceed with the issues around the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* at Stellenbosch University.

Institutional level debates around the issue of the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* at Stellenbosch University require deeper and broader consultation with relevant stakeholders. Stellenbosch University is positioning itself as a new African university and deliberations on what this means and how it relates to broader debates on decolonisation, decoloniality and more specifically the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*, are long overdue. This report attempts to contribute to such deliberations.

Coloniality is a system that survived colonialism, and continues to dehumanise the oppressed. Some theorists have argued that dehumanisation is not limited to the oppressed, but extends *from* the oppressors, as they themselves are dehumanised (Freire, 1970). Eurocentric/Western monopolies on knowledge and truth serve to perpetuate dehumanising discourses, which in turn exacerbate socio-economic injustice and mutual exclusion. Socio-economic injustices that directly result from sustained coloniality should be acknowledged and addressed, especially since they inform and are informed by pedagogies at the university. The decolonisation of society and the university thus necessitates the recentering of knowledge to accord Africa a central position of relevance for African knowledge production. Decoloniality thus seeks to challenge the Eurocentric hegemony of power, being and knowledge to reclaim and further forge authentic African scholarship. The Western monopoly on epistemology and the concomitant hegemony of knowledge are directly implicated when addressing the issue of *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*, as called for at the national level. In decolonial terms, Stellenbosch University is experienced as still largely representing the position of the oppressor (e.g. Luister Video 2015). It is thus crucial that any process aimed at decolonising Stellenbosch University and its curricula takes place through dialogue and engagement with and among those who still suffer under coloniality, as well as those perceived by themselves and others to be complicit in coloniality. Any unilateral or top-down action, such as the establishment of a task team by the management of the university in response to a request from the university council, is regarded as a form of coloniality by the Task Team and the appropriation of decolonial discourse¹. In this report, the task team addresses ways in which the university can avoid such appropriation.

Decolonisation of the Curriculum is not a concept that can be definitively interpreted by this Task Team, the university management, the university council, or academic staff alone. Instead,

¹ While it is true that the establishment of Task Teams is common practice within universities, when interpreted through the frame of decoloniality this type of action is regarded as a form of coloniality and amounts to the appropriation of decolonial discourse.

decoloniality in curricula and pedagogy must result from shared processes of dialogue, meaningful engagement and shared meaning making with those who continue to suffer colonial exclusion. This may be a challenging process as it necessitates a personal engagement with historical processes and how we, ourselves, are implicated in processes of domination and oppression today. Such processes of dialogue would need to investigate issues such as *who should teach* in African universities, *what should be taught* at an African university, *who is taught* and what is meant by *the curriculum*. While this report outlines some of the engagement already taking place at Stellenbosch University regarding the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*, much of this engagement is fragmented and driven by pockets of stakeholders rather than a concerted effort by the university to enter into dialogue with those who still suffer from colonial oppression, and those who remain complicit in making it so. This report emphasises that such dialogue and shared meaning-making should steer any attempts at *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* and Stellenbosch University (SU) as a whole.

In making the following recommendations, the Task Team is acutely aware of the limitations of using structures such as task teams, and vehicles such as task team reports, to address an issue such as the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* at Stellenbosch University, as noted by Maldonado-Torres (2016: 3) in the quotation below:

“Responses to the youth ‘menace’ typically start with rejection and indifference, but after pressure from the students it can transform into benevolent neglect disguised as ‘urgent action.’ This is reflected in the organization of special conferences and, specially, in the creation of powerless ad hoc committees and task-teams that are meant to take as much time as possible in generating extremely minimal recommendations that hardly anyone will implement and less follow.”²

In the spirit of the above sentiments, the task team offers the following tentative recommendations, which are expanded upon in section 7 of this report:

- *Restitution and accountability of the university*

It is recommended that the university acknowledges its past and creates spaces for reconciliation and restitution. It is further recommended that this should be done in a spirit of restoration with a view to avoiding alienation.

- *Revisiting Transformation*

It is recommended that the university includes decolonisation as a core aspect of its transformation strategy and that all transformational work needs to embrace principles of decolonisation. It is further recommended that systemic institutional transformation, and its related themes of *Place; Programmes; and People;* cannot assume that decolonisation will automatically be present. Decolonisation and the process thereof need to be deliberately written into all future processes and practices relating to Institutional Transformation.

- *The role of management*

It is recommended that forms of engagement are not dictated by management when it comes to an issue such as *Decolonising the Curriculum*, but that such engagement happens within spaces

² This report is not suggesting that all Task Teams are inefficient but rather that structures such as Task Teams, and their processes, could be limiting when addressing an issue such as *Decolonising the Curriculum* at SU.

that are sympathetic to the needs of marginalised groups. Furthermore, it is recommended that management needs to be aware that *Decolonising the Curriculum* is an on-going conversation and thus there is a need to work continuously to enable staff, students and all the relevant stakeholders to engage in this conversation. It is also recommended that this task team report should not be seen as means to an end, but a start of a journey towards decoloniality.

- *Understanding Decolonisation terminology*

It is recommended that the leadership of SU should explore how they could start and continue conversations within their own spaces on the topic of decolonisation, so that they can better understand the definitions and terminology relating to debates on decolonisation through the conversations currently taking place at the university. It is further recommended that the leadership of SU joins the spaces where these conversations are currently happening.

- *Resources and support for staff members*

It is recommended that resources and support be provided for staff members who engage in decolonising initiatives in teaching, learning and curriculum renewal. It is further recommended that opportunities be created to bridge the gap between the formal teaching space and the co-curricular space where students spend much of their time.

- *Spaces for engagement*

It is recommended that both physical and discursive spaces, as well as the mind space of those teaching the curriculum, should be decolonised. It is further recommended that the classroom space and curriculum be expanded by the open discussion of what social justice may mean in relation to decolonisation.

- *Kinds of engagement*

It is recommended that management encourages individual faculties, support staff and students to continue discussions and other initiatives regarding *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*, and provides the necessary resources and support to the student body and staff, in the form of third-party mediators, to facilitate such engagement processes among themselves and with management.

2. Introduction

At the 28 November 2016 meeting of the council of Stellenbosch University, the university management was requested to consider the matter of *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* and make recommendations as to how the university should respond to this matter. Below is an excerpt (in Afrikaans) from the minutes of the council meeting of 28 November 2016:

*“Die bestuur word versoek om by ’n volgende geleentheid ’n voorlegging aan die raad te maak oor die kwessie van dekolonisering van die kurrikulum, die interpretasie wat hulle daaraan heg, wat hulle voorsien in die toekoms hieromtrent gedoen sal word, en ander tersaaklike aspekte”.*³

³ English translation: *The management is requested to make a presentation to council at a future meeting on the matter of Decolonisation of the Curriculum, the interpretation that they assign to it, what they foresee will done about it in future, and other relevant aspects.*

This request was tabled at the Committee for Learning and Teaching (CLT) meeting on 9 February 2017 and it was decided to convene a task team to respond to the request from the council of SU. Each faculty was asked to nominate a representative to serve on the task team, and representatives were also sought from the Student Affairs Division, the Transformation Office and the student body. The RMT (Rectors' Management Team) then constituted the following Task Team on the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* at their meeting of 7 March 2017:

- Convenor – Cecilia Jacobs (Centre for Teaching and Learning)
- Scribe – Melanie Petersen (Centre for Teaching and Learning)
- Faculty of Theology - Ian Nell
- Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences - Solosh Pillay
- Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences - Usuf Chikte
- Faculty of Science - Karin Jacobs
- Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences - Elmarie Costandius
- Faculty of Education – Ronelle Carolissen
- Faculty of Engineering – Deborah Blaine
- Faculty of Law - Shanelle van der Berg
- Faculty of AgriSciences - Marianne McKay
- Faculty of Military Science – Benjamin Mokoena
- Transformation Office - Monica Du Toit
- Student Affairs Division - Tonia Overmeyer and Ruth Andrews
- Wimbledon Cluster Convenor (as volunteer) - Grace Petersen
- Member of SRC⁴ (as observer) – Mischka Lewis
- Co-opted members – Rhoda Malgas (Faculty of AgriSciences), Yeki Mosomothane (Student Affairs Division), Sim Xeketwana (Faculty of Education)

3. Terms of Reference

At the first meeting of the task team on 23 March 2017, the following proposed terms of reference were discussed:

- Engage with the brief from council, particularly regarding their request to SU management for 'the interpretation that they have' on the matter of *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*, since this is a complex issue with a multiplicity of interpretations and discourses that need to be explored.
- Explore the matter of the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* through intellectual engagement which goes beyond just the curriculum, and includes an interrogation of the processes, cultures and identities at the university which underpin the curriculum.
- Consider how to draw students into this debate and facilitate partnerships between the student community, the academics and the support staff.
- Make recommendations on how the university should proceed with the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* and the broader feelings of alienation that underpin this call for decolonisation.

The task team engaged in deliberations about the scope of the request received from council. Some of the main points are summarised as follows:

⁴ The Rector's Management Team requested SRC and student participation without being prescriptive about whom or how many students participated, or their roles in the Task Team.

- Members agreed that decolonisation was not a topic to be taken lightly and that the complexity thereof should be made clear to council in the report of this task team. Students were calling for the University to take a stance on the issue of decolonisation, however task team members felt that it is not just about taking a particular stance but rather an ongoing process.
- The mandate of this task team was not to solve the issues related to decolonisation, but rather to serve as a barometer of what was happening on the campus. Within different groupings on campus there were different perspectives on decolonisation. Space needed to be created in order to consider and share all these interpretations. Attention also needed to be given to the processes for sharing experiences and interpretations of decolonisation. The feeling was that this should be an open space, where people may have the freedom to share their experiences and interpretations of decolonisation. The task team saw its role as promoting the cultivation of such spaces.
- The task team acknowledged that colonisation had impacted on people's lives for many years and thus had deep historical and emotional roots which needed to be taken into consideration. Some people still suffered from enormous amounts of fear, alienation, guilt and otherness.
- The task team emphasised that decolonisation was not just a SU issue but a global one and that as a university we needed to also draw on experiences from across the country and Africa, as well as other post-colonial communities such as South America and Canada.
- Some task team members questioned the silence from senior management at the university. It was emphasised that senior management and the university council also needed to be engaged in their views on this matter, since they needed to provide leadership and drive this issue institutionally. Since SU was approaching its centenary year in 2018, that would be an opportune time for management to deeply reflect on this matter.
- The task team highlighted the need for academics to reflect on the appropriateness of their curricula within the South African and African context. This requires an interrogation of what is being taught, who is teaching, who is being taught, particularly the relevance of their curricula for the world into which the students were entering. There is also a need for academics to investigate and critically reflect on the how the knowledge bases, from which their disciplines and subject areas draw, developed over time; as well as whose voices have mattered and continue to matter, and what counts as knowledge within these disciplinary spaces. This would necessitate significant support for academics in this journey.
- The task team also emphasised the importance of exchanging views about what was meant by decolonisation and related concepts, and the need to start defining what we meant by those terms and concepts, while keeping in mind the complexity thereof.
- The co-curriculum was also identified as a valuable space where the subject of decolonisation could be unpacked and where interaction among a diversity of students at this university, as well as other universities, could be fostered.

The work of the task team was subdivided among three smaller sub-groups, each addressing one aspect of the Terms of Reference. Each of the groups was asked to consult outside of the task team and draw in other SU staff members. A Google doc was created so that task team members could work on the draft report simultaneously. Sub-group one engaged with the broader frameworks for understanding decolonisation and the multiplicity of interpretations surrounding the debate (section 4 of this report). Sub-group two explored some of the current processes, cultures and identities at the university in relation to the matter of *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*

(section 5 of this report). Sub-group three explored what *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* meant beyond the mainstream curriculum and in-class learning activities, and included an exploration of the out-of-class experience, as well as considerations of how to facilitate partnerships between the student community, the academics, the support staff, and management (section 6 of this report). The task team met again on 24 April 2017 to consider the inputs from sub-group 1, and on 5 May 2017 to consider the inputs from sub-groups 2 and 3.

4. Frameworks for understanding Decolonisation

Coloniality is a system of power relationships and epistemic domination that survived colonialism, and continues to dehumanise the 'other', the oppressed, or the colonised, primarily on the basis of 'race', although some theorists would argue, gender (Lugones, 2010, Spivak, 2016). There is some contestation whether race or gender is the primary source of colonisation. Lugones is explicit in naming global capitalism as flourishing from the ways in which binary, superior and inferior categories, such as race and class, are created and exploited to serve capitalist goals. She critiques the notion of dichotomous categories of gender, such as man and woman. She says there is an important contribution from intersectional feminism that recognises the importance of multiple subjectivities, race, gender and class. However, she critiques intersectional feminism suggesting that it reinscribes the logic of superior and inferior categories, such as black, poor and woman. In this logic, black women, for example, are erased in institutions because the superior form of a dichotomy can only ever exist. For example, on gender - white women, on race - indigenous or black men. This logic effectively erased black women and their existence. So she produces the idea of coloniality of gender. She argues that historically, the construct of gender itself lies at the heart of a world system of capitalist power.

Eurocentric/Western monopolies on knowledge and truth serve to perpetuate dehumanising discourses, while socio-economic injustice and exclusion likewise persist. The decolonisation of society and the university thus necessitates the recentering of the human from the perspective of 'colonial difference', as well as a recentering of knowledge to accord Africa a central position of relevance for African knowledge production. At the same time, socio-economic injustices that directly result from sustained coloniality should be acknowledged and addressed. Decoloniality thus seeks to challenge Eurocentric hegemony of power, being and knowledge. The Western monopoly on epistemology and the concomitant hegemony of knowledge are directly implicated when addressing the issue of the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*.

It is evident that 'decoloniality' does not refer to a singular theory, approach or discourse, but rather to a "family of diverse positions that share a view of coloniality as the fundamental problem in the modern age" (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015). In decolonial terms, Stellenbosch University is experienced as still largely representing the position of the oppressor (e.g. Luister Video 2015). It is thus crucial that any process aimed at decolonising Stellenbosch University and the curriculum takes place through dialogue and engagement, especially with those who still suffer the impacts of coloniality that pervade contemporary practices. Any unilateral or top-down action can amount to the appropriation of Black pain and decolonial discourse that propagates epistemic violence⁵. Instead, engagement and dialogue should originate from the grass roots level, and occur on terms set by those who remain oppressed. In this way, the oppressed and management structures can assume joint responsibility for a dialogic process "in which all grow" (Freire 1970, 2005: 80). This

⁵ *Epistemic racism* refers to the propagation of epistemology and presumed universality of truth and knowledge by Eurocentric, Western forces that proceeded to eliminate "difference" as represented by the colonised. Closely related to this is the notion of *epistemic violence*, which denotes the geopolitics of knowledge production and the dehumanising effects of denying to the colonised epistemic capacity (De Oliveira Andreotti 2011: 386-387, referring to Maldonado-Torres 2004).

process cannot exclude members of the broader university communities. There are students and colleagues who agree with the cause of the oppressed on campus, but who feel excluded for themselves not being able to identify as victims of coloniality, and by virtue of their 'race' or cultural background, being perceived as perpetrators of the injustice. Decolonisation is the responsibility of every member of the university community and nobody should be excluded or exempted from the necessity of the task.

According to some perspectives, calls for decolonisation or decoloniality in South Africa cannot be equated with transformation. Transformation has been criticised for being slow, cosmetic, superficial and as having a tendency to accord mere recognition and inclusion to the oppressed – thereby assimilating the oppressed into a Eurocentric culture, on Western terms. In contrast, decoloniality commences from an entirely new centre as defined by the oppressed, from which point Western concepts and people can be assimilated on terms set by the oppressed. Moreover, according to some decolonial scholars, transformation as understood in terms of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 is similarly incompatible with decolonisation and decoloniality (Madlingozi 2017). In fact, the Constitution itself is regarded by some South African scholars as a product of liberalism and Western knowledge that stifles genuine socio-economic justice (Modiri 2014), whereas the human rights it enshrines are likewise a colonial construct that serve to catalyse a form of “neo-Apartheid” (Madlingozi 2017).

Decolonisation of the Curriculum is not a concept that can be definitively interpreted by this Task Team, the university's management or council, or academic staff alone. Instead, decoloniality in curricula and pedagogy must result from a shared process of dialogue, engagement and meaning making with those who continue to suffer colonial exclusion. Ngugi wa Thiong'o grapples with the question of decoloniality in education:

“What should we do with the inherited colonial education system and the consciousness it necessarily inculcated in the African mind? What directions should an education system take in an Africa wishing to break with neo-colonialism? How does it want the ‘New Africans’ to view themselves and their universe and from what base, Afrocentric or Eurocentric? What then are the materials they should be exposed to, and in what order and perspective? Who should be interpreting that material to them, an African or non-African? If African, what kind of African? One who has internalized the colonial world outlook or one attempting to break free from the inherited slave consciousness?” (Quoted in Mbembe 2015: 16)

The first question that merits further dialogue and investigation is thus that of *who should teach* in African universities. At Stellenbosch University, this raises obvious issues of representation, in that the University remains significantly untransformed. Epistemic justice⁶ necessitates as many “Black bodies” and “colonised subjects” in universities as possible (Maldonado-Torres 2016: 31). This logically necessitates radical transformation⁷ at Stellenbosch University in order to facilitate decolonisation of the University and the curriculum.

⁶ For Santos, social justice is inextricably linked to *epistemic* or *cognitive justice* (the coexistence of various knowledges and the dismantling of hierarchies leading to the subjugation of certain knowledge systems). Santos accordingly argues that any political resistance must be premised on *epistemological resistance* (De Oliveira Andreotti 2011: 390). As a movement of resistance, decoloniality seeks to establish *colonial difference* as the new centre of knowledge production, and raises questions such as who produces knowledge and what counts as knowledge (De Oliveira Andreotti 2011: 392).

⁷ The relationship between decolonisation and transformation is complex and uncertain. Whereas scholars disagree about precise similarities and differences between these two concepts, the fact remains that these concepts are related. Decolonisation connotes a more drastic process whereby transformation takes place from an entirely new centre, and *colonial influences are assimilated* into an African focal point. Transformation has been criticised as merely including or *assimilating African perspectives* into a colonial paradigm. “Radical transformation” denotes a midpoint between these two concepts, where transformation occurs as a matter of priority, and cannot be perceived as a superficial process amounting to mere “window dressing”. For example, an individual faculty might have a transformation plan that appears legitimate on paper, but is rendered meaningless if resources do not exist to enable

The next question raised pertains to *what should be taught* at an African university. This enquiry centres, in the first place, on an understanding of what is meant by *the curriculum*. Le Grange (2016) explains that different forms of curricula co-exist:

“The explicit curriculum is what students are provided with such as module frameworks, prescribed readings, assessments guidelines, etc. The hidden curriculum is what students learn about the dominant culture of a university and what values it reproduces. The null curriculum is what universities leave out – what is not taught and learned in a university.” (Le Grange 2016: 7)

Le Grange argues that *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* entails a shift from Western/Eurocentric individualism and universalism to an Ubuntu-infused curriculum which acknowledges the interdependence of humans and the more-than-human world. An Ubuntu-infused or African-centred curriculum does not necessitate the destruction of dominant knowledge systems, but rather demands a recentering or integration of African knowledge systems into dominant epistemological discourses. According to Naude (2017), knowledge does not necessarily have to emanate from Africa, but must address the African reality. Naude furthermore highlights the difficulty inherent in trying to define a single system of African knowledge (such as Ubuntu), or to legitimately define it without using Western terminology or paradigms. Moreover, Naude emphasises that the decolonial project faces major obstacles in respect of scientific knowledge, since historically “local” Western scientific knowledge has been superseded by academic and technological globalisation. It merits reiteration that the *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* requires dialogue and engagement which “forces the inclusion of a grassroots perspective into education research and practice” (Higgs 2011). If Stellenbosch University wishes to authentically position itself as an African University, a process of dialogue should be initiated in order to recentre the explicit curriculum with African knowledge as its focal point, and to ensure that the null curriculum does not entail the exclusion of African knowledge from the scope of what is taught.

Whereas a process of dialogue seeks to decolonise the content of the curriculum, and thereby implicates the “explicit” and “null curricula”, the physical space in which education takes place highlights the importance of the “hidden curriculum”. Cognitive justice thus necessitates “spatial decolonisation”. It is the decolonisation of spatial relations, and thereby the partial decolonisation of the hidden curriculum, that led to the rise of the *#RhodesMustFall* and *Fallist* movements. To decolonise the curriculum, Stellenbosch University needs to pay urgent attention to the institutional violence that arises from colonial architecture, colonial names, iconography and symbolism that pervades our campus and serves to consolidate the humiliation of Black staff and students based on “white supremacist presuppositions”.

Finally, another question that arises from calls for *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* is that of *who is taught*. In this context, decolonisation of pedagogical practice is closely connected to *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*. Instead of viewing students as passive recipients of knowledge, the relationship between teachers and students should be reconceptualised as a situation that brings “co-learners” together (Mbembe 2015: 6).

The crucial importance of meaningful engagement with those who still suffer from colonial oppression is therefore clear, and the responsibility to respond rests not only with those who still suffer from colonial oppression, but also with those who remain at the helm of colonial oppression.

new appointments. Moreover, radical transformation should not be seen as an exercise in altruism or inclusion, but should instead recognise the legitimate claims by Africans to occupy a central position in any university which regards itself as an “African university”.

Dialogue and shared meaning making should steer any attempts to decolonise pedagogical practice, the curriculum and Stellenbosch University as a whole. *[For the full text from which this summary is drawn, please see Appendix A].*

5. Current processes at SU relating to *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*

Student protest action of 2015 and 2016 evoked strong and mixed reactions across the South African academic landscape. Concepts and processes of decolonisation, a theme strongly linked to the student mass action, is to be found everywhere in our academic environment, and is increasingly recognised as a fundamental element to higher education in the African context. This section of the report explores *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* as a plausible response to the social pathologies highlighted during the protests and recognises that the call for a decolonised curriculum is necessarily a call for authentic African scholarship, as outlined in the previous section.

The concept of interrogating the appropriateness of the status quo post-colonial curriculum is not new - it is something that has been debated in different countries, such as New Zealand, Canada and also many African countries, which offer numerous case studies and research that address decolonisation themes. Le Grange (2016) draws connections between the 2015 *#Feesmustfall* student protests and the renewed interest in *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* in South African academia. Our present South African Higher Education student cohort has confronted the academe with the pervasive, chronic socio-economic disparities that acutely marks their lived experiences. They are demanding a more inclusive, socially just landscape, one that is free from racism, class-based privilege, patriarchal, heterosexual and, capitalist themed spaces. They are also seeking a future different from the ones that shackled their parents to poverty, and their parents before them. Students are demanding justice for themselves, their families and their peers, and are intolerant of apathetic, arrogant or mediocre responses to what they feel are pertinent issues. In response, Blade Nzimande, Minister of Higher Education and Training, has called for Africanisation of the curriculum and stated that all universities "must shed all the problematic features of their apartheid and colonial past" (Speech at Higher Education Summit, 15 October 2015).

Amongst universities in the Western Cape, Stellenbosch University has been the last to focus specifically on decolonisation. This request for a Task Team report from council appears to be the first official mandate at Stellenbosch University to address the issue. Nevertheless, several ad-hoc groups have been established and processes undertaken under the leadership of various members of the staff corps and the student body. Generally, the purpose and function of these groups have been aimed at understanding and addressing challenges, opportunities and interpretations of decolonisation. These include:

- Focussed Interest Group (FIG) on *Decolonisation of STEM curricula* initiated by the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL);
- Focussed Interest Group FIG on *Academic Leadership* initiated by the CTL, addressing topics that include decolonisation and transformation;
- The SoTL 2016 Conference closing session on *Decolonising Higher Education Spaces*;

- Programmes of the Transformation Office at the Faculties of Law and Economic and Management Sciences, that have led to discussions and explorations of the concepts of decolonisation;
- Faculty of Education workshops on decolonisation;
- The Critical Citizenship Research Group (Margaret Blackie, Elmarie Costandius, Rhoda Malgas, Marianne McKay, Ian Nell and Evodia Setati) which has an article accepted for publication in SAJHE in 2018 entitled: *#FeesMustFall and decolonising the curriculum: Stellenbosch University students' and lecturers' reactions.*;
- Visual Redress Task Team appointed by Prof Nico Koopman, Vice-Chancellor: Social Impact, Transformation & Personnel;
- A range of informal conversations on decolonisation were also reported, such as one-on-one conversations between the Student Dean and individual students, discussions in small networks of students, Discourse cafes in the residence environment, book clubs etc.
- Meetings of the Staff/Student Alliance.

The above list is not exhaustive and although there appear to be a number of initiatives in this regard at SU, they remain disparate and what is lacking is systemic institutional engagement in these debates. Furthermore, the very environment in which these groups try to operate is problematic, as it is embedded in an untransformed and colonised curriculum.

One of the largest groupings among SU staff, which has engaged the decolonisation debate, was the group of over 100 participants in the closing session of the 2016 SoTL conference. An analysis of their responses to the 2015 student protests points to a staff corps that feels *simultaneously* sympathetic and frustrated with student action [See Appendix B for a more detailed analysis]. One lecturer pointed out that what we teach (the curriculum content) is so enmeshed with who we are, so changes in the curriculum would be superficial unless we ourselves have the opportunities and the will to transform our body of knowledge, our attitudes, and our being in the academe. Feelings of hopelessness, helplessness and inadequacy to address these concerns were perhaps to be expected, but such responses were less frequent than expressions of empathy for the real needs of students. The data pointed to the importance of providing access and inclusivity for previously disadvantaged groups, and for English-speaking students, but there were also real fears expressed, such as fears about "reverse racism" and the future of the white South African Afrikaans-speaking male who was seen as no longer having a voice or a safe space to make a positive contribution. The task team argues that support for the 'personalisation of decolonisation' amongst staff is a positive step towards changing the curriculum, and moreover, changing its effects in society.

Another issue that emerged during the SoTL 2016 Conference closing session was the need to develop common understandings around what decolonising the university means. It was clear that there was no consensus amongst colleagues, and across disciplines, about what decolonising the university means. This in itself is not a problem though, as Le Grange (2016) points out: "the purpose (of the conversation) is not to provide a set of answers but to open up ways of (re)thinking the university curriculum." Such conversations are therefore a long overdue step to *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* at Stellenbosch University.

The issue of decolonising physical *space* also emerged at the SoTL closing session and there were calls for a re-interpretation of spaces on campus. Artefacts (e.g. photographs, memorial

plaques, statues and the design of buildings) served to mark historical events and eras on which university identity and curricula were based. Issues of whether historical artefacts should be retained, discarded or replaced remain unresolved. Intersecting with calls for clear definitions are calls for conversations across campus, especially with and amongst members of the academic staff. As one participant at the SoTL conference noted: “Students have the Rooiplein. What do we have?” There seems to be no space or time to deal with issues of decolonisation, or any other “difficult topics”, as they were referred to at the SoTL conference. Colleagues seem to be aware of structures like Faculty meetings and other platforms for discussion, but it would appear that the deficit of intimate, safe, trustworthy spaces is a significant barrier to progressing beyond feelings of frustration and inadequacy, and realising the agency so clearly expressed. From comments made in the closing session, SU lecturing staff seek [See Appendix B for more examples]:

- Safe spaces in which members of staff can express and discuss ideas about decolonisation and other issues with one another, and also with students;
- Meaningful engagement with Faculty and Faculty Management about these topics;
- A culture of debate in Faculties on issues of national concern;
- Facilitation skills training for lecturers for discussion of volatile topics in the classroom;
- Formalised performance recognition for the time-consuming tasks associated with decolonisation of the curriculum;
- Inclusion in communications across campus of seminars, events and discussions pertinent to decolonisation;
- Flexibility in the curriculum and in the classroom to tackle issues of decolonisation and others topics, through content delivery, assignments, assessments and evaluation.

Ali Mazrui (2014 as cited in Mwesigire) suggests the following five strategies for decolonisation for societies that seek to de-Westernise their education: indigenisation (protecting indigenous knowledge and applying indigenous skills to modern contexts), domestication (using foreign technologies to suit local societies), diversification (gathering knowledge from several centres of production without favouring the West), horizontal interpenetration (partnering with non-Western societies) and vertical counter-penetration (influencing Western societies). Connell (2016) suggests the following ways to decolonise curricula. Firstly, the Westernised history of the discipline should be de-mythologised and historical and contemporary theoretical resources that challenge familiar boundaries of the discipline should be recovered. Secondly, undergraduate course plans should include Southern perspectives and institutional frameworks such as conferences and associations should build South/South links and collaborations. Finally, new research agendas based on post-colonial perspectives and social needs across the global South should be developed. Drawing from examples of efforts on campus, this can mean:

- Creating communicative e-spaces where power-relationships are less oppressive and students engage in class discussions, unafraid of being judged for their accent or novice perspectives, or of being disrespectful by directly challenging a lecturer's point of view;
- Re-imagining localised ways of describing entrenched knowledge;
- Including some of the excellent contemporary African and South African authors in literature studies;
- Designing projects that are socially relevant and feasible within the African context;
- Including South African case studies in course content and looking at African achievements in each subject area; and
- Critically deconstructing the historical development of the knowledge bases of disciplines and interrogating the validity of the theories and assumptions taken as ‘truth’, taking ‘contrapuntal’ viewpoints.

6. Facilitating partnerships between the student community, academics, support staff and management

The Institutional culture and lived experiences are key causes of student discontent. Students view the University as Eurocentric and not representative of its geographical location (South Africa and Africa) as well as the demographics of the country [See Appendix C for a report on a *Decolonising the Curriculum workshop with SU students*]. Students feel that SU is unable to equip them with the skills of locating their educational experience and intended contribution to African scholarship within the context of their own cultural references. This results in an incapacity to relate socially and psychologically to other cultural perspectives at the University (Asante 1991).

Students view the process of radical transformation of the education system as failure. The slow pace of educational transformation has resulted in a climate of volatility and tension within Universities. This has rendered the system susceptible to a barrage of attacks from both internal and external stakeholders, particularly students whose social media *#FeesMustFall* outrage has resembled a renewed onslaught against neo-liberalist features of the past regime. Muswede (2017) writes the following: “Indeed, South African universities remain trapped in a situation where their relevance to the new social order will, to a large extent, be determined by the degree to which they espouse the values of a post-colonial developmental state amid conflicting aspirations”.

The SU campus is calling out for conversational spaces, to listen (Luister video 2015) to people's stories, their feelings, their fears, to engage. According to Mbembe (2015) decolonising the university starts with the de-privatization and rehabilitation of the public space and thereby the democratisation of access. Mbembe (2015) notes that true access includes creating conditions where black staff and students can feel at home and unapologetically belong. Access to conversational spaces that bring together staff, students and management, outside of the formal curriculum, is therefore important. As part of curriculum renewal and decolonisation, it is vital that the co-curricular space be included in the process.

The co-curriculum refers to the intentional process of student development which happens through integrated formal, informal and out-of-class experiential learning experiences. The co-curriculum has become the terrain outside of the formal curriculum which is utilized to shape student experience in such a way that it accelerates the goals of Higher Education. The co-curriculum is the space where issues of social inclusion, social justice and issues of participatory parity are alive and contested. Shaping the co-curriculum in a purposeful way facilitates student engagement and deepens the connection to the social, academic and institutional life (Funston, et al., 2014; Kuh, 2008; Trowler, 2010).

The student life experiences are not complete without consideration of the co-curriculum given that students spend more than sixty percent of their time within the co-curricular space whilst at university. Most developmental opportunities within the co-curricular space involve some form of learning and teaching, with skills and knowledge transfer, as well as experiential engagement that connects the student to internal as well as external communities. Furthermore, the value of the co-curriculum cannot be ignored as it has a potential to “transcend the various academic disciplines and career trajectories” (Stirling, A. E., Kerr, G. A. and Dean, A. 2015). It is therefore crucial that the decolonisation discourse becomes part of the co-curriculum narrative. Within this space SU students have posed the question: “*How can we decolonise the University when we have not been able to transform it?*” This question implies a distinction between *Decolonisation*

and *Transformation*. While this distinction is briefly explored in section 4 of this report, it requires further exploration when considering how to facilitate partnerships between the student community, academics, support staff and management.

The notion of transformation has gained currency in the twenty-first century, though on many occasions, it is often misused and misinterpreted. Transformation occurs when leaders create a vision for transformation and a system to continually question and challenge beliefs, assumptions, patterns, habits and paradigms with an aim of continually developing and applying theory, through the lens of the system of profound knowledge. Transformation happens when people managing a system focus on creating a new future that has never existed before, and based on continual learning and a new mindset, take different actions than they would have taken in the past (Daszko & Sheinberg 2014). As a process, transformation is an ongoing activity of challenging the status quo by adopting novel ways of creating a different future from that which is currently in existence. In this sense, transformation implies a basic change of character and little or no resemblance with the past configuration or structure. At the heart of any transformative agenda is the dimension of challenging assumptions since these assumptions and standards steer policies, procedures, systems and structures. This implies that there will be a profound change in structure that creates something new through a system of persistent questioning, challenging, exploration, discovery, evaluation, testing, and creation of new theory and practices. The notion of transformation is based on the assumptions that the current situation is untenable, controlling, blemished, or worse off – destructive. In the transformative journey, there is no fixed or foreseen destination since the route has not been used before thereby justifying the unpredictable and uncertain character of transformation. It implies a creation of and an attempt to realise a dream that is profoundly different from what existed before. Hence, it is a conscious decision to functionally adjust and make a difference in a granted reality.

As mentioned in section 4 of this report, decoloniality refers to a family of diverse positions that sees coloniality as problematic. Calls for decolonisation or decoloniality in South Africa cannot be equated to transformation. The notion of transformation within the South African context is viewed as a Western process that aims to maintain the status quo by merely assimilating discrete aspects of African knowledge and culture into a dominant system of coloniality. Whereas transformation connotes reconciliation and reform, decolonisation demands a “complete abolition of and break from an oppressive, global regime and epistemology” (Price & Ally 2016:2). Transformation thus implies transition rather than rupture, the latter which calls for the destruction of obstacles that impede freedom and justice (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2016:17). Students acknowledge the University’s commitment towards transformation and creating a welcoming campus culture that will make students, staff and visitors feel at home irrespective of origin; ethnicity; language; culture; gender; religious and political affiliation and so forth. This includes creating a multicultural environment that allows a variety of cultures to meet and learn from each other⁸. However, the students’ lived experience presents a very different reality. This does not negate institutional efforts at transformation, however, it has proved inadequate. The pseudo-creation of multiculturalism has been viewed as problematic, murky and treated with suspicion by students. The present approach is viewed as giving preference to European and Afrikaner culture with the sentiment that this is imposed on the diverse student population. This raises the question as to whether institutional transformation attempts can be successful when it is framed and created in a colonised environment. It could be argued that the creation of a Transformation Plan that has as its major thrust a colonised institution’s strategy (Institutional Intent and Strategy) and its related strategic priorities, without mentioning decolonisation as a focus, does not see decolonisation as critically important for the future. Therefore, speaking of Africanisation

⁸ Stellenbosch University. *Transformation and Diversity*. Available: www.sun.ac.za

and creating an African footprint for the University is committing to and promising something without the intention or (possibility) of delivering thereon.

The institution is yet to embrace and undergo the “processes of decolonisation” (Burgess 2000). This process includes *Recovery; Mourning; Dreaming; Commitment* and *Action*. At best the University is in the first phase of decolonisation - *Recovery*. This is a crucial phase that sets the foundation for eventual decolonisation of the university and society. It is the phase in which those who have suffered the consequences of colonialism begin to question their assumed place as inferior to the dominant culture. We are still in the process of reconceptualising lost aspects of inclusive language and tradition at the university. The university needs to prepare for the process of *Mourning*, the stage of lamenting victimisation. Students have not been able to navigate this stage in terms of who are the victims or who has the right to claim victimhood. In terms of outside classroom interaction, students struggle to find neutral territory in order to share campus experiences due to the tendency to invalidate the experiences of others in an effort to maintain or claim victim status. The third most crucial stage involves *Dreaming*. This stage will involve exploring better student experiences. This is best done through consultations; debates and visualisation of what we wish the university to look like. Any restructuring must involve a reassessment of the existing institutional power structures and expanding the way we view our spaces so that it resembles the visualised decolonised educational space. The final stages of *Commitment* and *Action* involve committing to achieving the ideals and dreams and finally accomplishing these.

7. Task Team Recommendations

Arising from sections 4, 5 and 6 of this report, the task team offers the following tentative recommendations:

7.1 Restitution and accountability of the university

Stellenbosch University, as an institution, was founded on principles embedded in oppressive ideologies that favoured an elite minority at the expense of a disenfranchised majority. The consequences of this institutional past continues to manifest in the psyche and relationships among people forming the campus community some 20 years after democratic change. Personal experiences of anger, frustration, fear, guilt and shame in the academe are pathologies of systemic violence in social contexts on and off campus. Any attempt at reconciliation without actively seeking restitution will be a further injustice. SU therefore needs to acknowledge that it is associated with historical injustices and institutional inequalities, and that the ideologies that underpinned that era in SU history should be revisited as one station in the process of decolonisation.

The university also needs to recognise that, in the absence of sustained institutional redress, individuals and groups on campus have been engaged in the decolonisation project on the premise of personal initiative and professional ethics. Various levels of engagement with colleagues and students during the protests of 2015 and 2016 could be seen as such an initiative and should be viewed as a powerful opportunity for self-reflection and authentic institutional change. The institution should therefore support new and existing processes of redress and restitution on campus. It should further commit to initiating the facilitation of a sustained process

of truth and reconciliation, which should be open to all sectors of the campus community (alumni and retired members of staff included) and actively seek opportunities for redress in all activities of the academe (e.g. curricula, physical spaces, seminars, debates, research, funding, communication). Such a process would require strong, relational leadership that seeks to lead from behind, and which is proactive (rather than reactive) about the renewal of structures to reflect representivity, especially of hidden or marginal groups. ***It is therefore recommended that the university acknowledges its past and creates spaces for reconciliation and restitution. It is further recommended that this should be done in a spirit of restoration with a view to avoiding alienation.***

7.2 Revisiting Transformation

As mentioned in section 6 of the report, the institutional transformation attempts at Stellenbosch University have been framed by and created in a colonised environment. Since the SU Institutional Intent and Strategy makes no mention of decolonisation as a focus area it can be assumed that decolonisation is not viewed as a critically important part of the institutional strategy. Decolonisation is not listed as one of the Transformation Themes either, or as one of the “Transformation key performance Areas and indicators”. If decolonisation is understood as the liberation or freeing of the mind of colonial shackles before anything else, then we cannot truly transform if we have not been liberated from past mental constraints. Therefore, any attempts to transform, or transformation arising from past mental constraints, will be flawed. ***It is recommended that the university includes decolonisation as a core aspect of its transformation strategy and that all transformational work needs to embrace principles of decolonisation. It is further recommended that systemic institutional transformation, and its related themes of Place; Programmes; and People, cannot assume that decolonisation will automatically be present. Decolonisation and the process thereof need to be deliberately written into all future processes and practices relating to Institutional Transformation.***

7.3 The role of management

In light of Stellenbosch University existing within a very traditional Western/Eurocentric framework, with strong hierarchical structures; power, gender, language and race continue to control the institutional environment and impact decision-making. This is an institution that is still perceived as one that promotes colonial ideals. Previously disadvantaged groups who are still suffering oppression within this institutional climate are asking to be seen, acknowledged, heard, consulted, and respected. Management must be seen to be willing to respect these groups, to sit in uncomfortable spaces and engage with difficult emotions and pain with their people. They need to create an empowering, inclusive and humanising environment, a space of Ubuntu where everyone matters. Management should consult the relevant stakeholders in order to determine how this space and these conversation should look, rather than dictating the terms. In order to engage authentically, management needs to become aware of the struggles of the oppressed (staff, student and academics) and to be sensitive to the constructs that have created the oppression. To do this, serious reflection on the institutional climate and structures that exist, and that continue to sustain a hostile environment for those suffering under colonial oppression, is required. ***It is recommended that forms of engagement are not dictated by management when it comes to an issue such as the Decolonisation of the Curriculum, but that such engagement happens within spaces that are sympathetic to the needs of marginalised groups. Furthermore, it is recommended that management needs to be aware that decolonising the curriculum is an on-going conversation and thus there is a need to work***

continuously in supporting the staff, students and all the relevant stakeholders. It is also recommended that this document by the task team should not be seen as means to an end, but a start of a journey towards decoloniality.

7.4 Understanding decolonisation terminology

The intellectual labour of learning and engaging with discourses around topics such as decolonisation cannot be delegated to task teams, committees or any other organs of the university. The onus to familiarise ourselves with the positions of others rests with each of us in the campus community. An important part of the journey of understanding debates about decolonisation is developing a familiarity with the lexicon that accompanies contemporary engagement around this topic. Definitions are a useful start, as they do not merely name concepts, but are an integral part of the development of understanding. In this regard the Transformation Office has developed a set of cards providing a working list of definitions and terminology for the changing higher education environment. The set of cards, which were developed by a group of staff and students, aim to provide a starting point for engaging in open and honest conversation and is a tool meant to build a shared language and understanding. A lack of understanding can be self-isolating and exclude the possibility of a constructive voice in conversation. However, nuances are often missed in a set of definitions, when the meanings of words are taken literally and understood outside of the context of the debates in which they are used. This can give rise to the misinterpretation and confusion that can sometimes lead to conflict. Processes of shared meaning-making are essential to developing understandings of the definitions and terminology relating to debates on decolonisation. There are a number of energetic conversations on decolonisation that occur in formal and informal spaces, inside and outside of the university. If the leadership of the university does not engage the Discourse and come to grips with the definitions and terminology relating to debates on decolonisation, they could miss the sensitivity and scope of these conversations, as well as the opportunity for participation. Students are clear that the leadership of the university cannot, in the form of a Task Team, prescribe *how* a conversation will happen, *where* it will take place, nor the language or tone that is used. ***It is therefore recommended that the leadership of SU should explore how they could start and continue conversations within their own spaces on the topic of decolonisation, so that they can better understand the definitions and terminology relating to debates on decolonisation through the conversations currently taking place at the university. It is further recommended that the leadership of SU joins the spaces where these conversations are currently happening.***

7.5 Resources and support for staff members

Stellenbosch University needs to demonstrate the sincerity of its commitment to decoloniality by supporting staff members, who engage in decolonising initiatives in teaching, learning and curriculum renewal, with serious input of resources and incentives. Without institutional support and recognition, few academics are likely to take on the additional workload and effort entailed. Such resources and support could include, but are not limited to:

- Funding for renewal of the course content where appropriate
- Research costs and/or monitoring and evaluation of initiatives before, during and after implementation (questionnaires, surveys, consultation etc.);
- Time out for staff members from teaching/research and other activities in order to be able to reflect, research and plan for a changed curriculum;

- Upskilling and re-skilling lecturers and support staff resources through workshops and courses;
- Wellness aspects where trained professional counsellors may be required to guide staff through the emotional issues involved in this process;
- Time allocated within work agreements;
- Incentives and recognition at departmental, faculty or institutional level for successful efforts.

A decolonial effort requires a holistic change, and it is vital that the formal teaching space be linked with the co-curricular space. ***It is therefore recommended that resources and support be provided for staff members who engage in decolonising initiatives in teaching, learning and curriculum renewal. It is further recommended that opportunities be created to bridge the gap between the formal teaching space and the co-curricular space where students spend much of their time.***

7.6 Spaces for engagement

Spaces that need to be decolonised include physical and discursive spaces, the mind and classroom spaces/curricula. Approaches to these spaces can be to erase, replace or re-interpret them. We need to realise that some spaces are inherently unsafe due to unequal and discomforting power relations. We should ask how we can turn the institution into something with which black, coloured and Indian (BCI) students and lecturers can identify, where they feel recognised, and of which they can take ownership. Both physical and discursive spaces need to be decolonised. The transformation of buildings and public spaces is vital for decolonisation.

Virtual spaces, symbols, offices, buildings, architecture, artefacts, photographs and statues should also be considered. Suggestions for safe spaces include a virtual space such as anonymous forums; spaces outside of the classroom such as workshops, conferences and informal gatherings; and suggestion boxes where students and lecturers can safely communicate their needs and opinions. Disproportionate links to the past to satisfy alumni should be dismantled. Students should be involved in discussions about this process. Tronto (2010) notes the need for discursive spaces where the needs of all members of an institution can be communicated, understood, negotiated and evaluated. This should occur within and across academic environments. A Task Team for Visual Redress, initiated by Prof. Nico Koopman, has been established and should be supported and financed.

The mind space of those teaching the curriculum, and those learning its content, should be decolonised. Some lecturers fear decolonisation and this unmasks an unwillingness to decolonise the institution, perhaps because it will dislodge those power structures and cultures from which a few greatly benefit. Lecturers should therefore humbly and pragmatically experiment with ways of addressing decolonisation, a process that will inevitably lead to self-transformation, and without which self-transformation is impossible. There is a need for guidelines on how to open the space in the classroom and how to set the rules of engagement regarding the decolonisation agenda. Conversations should start with vulnerability and should be open and honest. A space should be created where students and lecturers can freely communicate with one another and with the management team of the university. It is crucial that the decolonising project takes place through in-depth engagement with those who still suffer under coloniality. Programmes should be in place that prepare current and future academics for experiences in terms of protests, violence, questions and emotional responses. Existing opportunities such as transformation workshops and discussions can be utilised towards this goal. The relationship between lecturers and students will have to adapt or change in order to foster plurality where all cultures are valued. Learning does not take place only cognitively; bodily learning is also crucial. To address decolonisation,

more interaction between people who have and have not suffered or do not suffer under coloniality is necessary to understand the pain, otherness, alienation, fear and guilt of all parties. To change the mind space of lecturers and students, an extensive campaign should be launched to inform and engage lecturers and students in conversations on social issues on campus. This could be done by adding television screens to all entrances of buildings and residences broadcasting stories, lectures, conversations, guidelines for engagement in social issues, examples of good practice, African case studies and lists of relevant readings. There should also be free broadcasting time for students to voice their opinions, and these student engagements could also inform management about issues with which students are struggling. This should also be accessible through e-spaces with a link on cell phones or computers. This means that lecturers and students can in their own time and space familiarise themselves with relevant social issues. This could encourage lecturers and students to read further and become informed, learn the terminology and therefore become more comfortable with the topics to engage in conversations with one another. These engagements will occur outside the formal curriculum, but once lecturers and students feel better informed, there is a stronger probability that it will become part of the formal curriculum in the form of conversations in class or linking it with the curriculum content. Social justice conversations should enter the co-curriculum or hidden curriculum space, because this is where the students spend much of their time.

A commitment to social justice highlights the need for decolonisation. The three areas of concern when taking social justice as a guide for decolonisation are redistribution and maldistribution, recognition and misrecognition, and representation and misrepresentation (Fraser, 2007). Fraser's major goal of social justice is 'participatory parity', where all can interact as peers in an equitable manner in their social lives:

- Redistribution and maldistribution: SU should consider how participatory parity is prevented by economic structures that institutionalise deprivation; exploitation; and gross disparities in terms of wealth, income, labour, leisure time, etc. through maldistribution of resources. The *#FeesMustFall* protest was a cry for eliminating the economic barriers to higher education for students without the necessary resources. A more flexible degree structure and grants towards appointing staff to help renew curricula are suggested.
- Recognition and misrecognition: Misrecognition involves institutional hierarchies of cultural value that cause certain groups of people to suffer from status inequality. This misrecognition prevents equal participation and equal respect of students and lecturers in higher education settings. BCI students call for recognition within higher education spaces. Recognition and misrecognition include the level of comfort people experience in certain spaces on campus. Deliberate inclusion of African authors (or authors from the South) would result in a recentering of knowledge relevant to an African context. Referencing African authors would break the cycle of aspiring to whiteness and give recognition to a variety of knowledges, resulting in the experiencing of being acknowledged.
- Representation and misrepresentation: Misrepresentation occurs when political and social belonging are unequal and where certain groups of people do not count as citizens. In higher education settings, some groups and communities are framed to have more agency, voice and rights to claim social justice than others. Often BCI students and lecturers are misrepresented in historically white higher education contexts such as at Stellenbosch University. More BCI students should be accepted into university programmes and more BCI lecturers should be employed.

Social issues should be linked to academic content. Lecturers should, and some already do, use examples based on South African history as a teaching strategy to highlight social injustice. Additional teaching strategies include inviting people involved in social justice work to the

classroom, creating safe spaces for students to discuss difficult issues and enabling students to attend workshops on social justice topics. In the classroom, lecturers and students should strive to define decolonisation, take responsibility for it, foster openness and promote African centrality. When lecturers become informed and familiar with social issues through extensive exposure to lectures and discussions as described above, they would have more courage to engage with students and give them a space to freely communicate and have a voice. ***It is therefore recommended that both physical and discursive spaces, as well as the mind space of those teaching the curriculum, should be decolonised. It is further recommended that the classroom space and curriculum be expanded by the open discussion of what social justice may mean in relation to decolonisation.***

7.7 Kinds of engagement

Just as the concepts of “decolonisation”, “decoloniality” and “decolonisation of the curriculum” are highly contested and evoke emotive responses, the initiation and continuation of processes of meaningful engagement regarding *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* raise complex issues. A balance needs to be struck between the risk of top-down, unilateral action by Stellenbosch University (which can amount to the appropriation of decolonial discourse), and the need for institutional support of and participation in engagement processes. Engagement processes regarding *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* should take place at all levels of the university community: Amongst the student body, between the student body and staff, amongst academic and support staff, amongst management and council, and between management and the student body, and management and staff.

Engagement amongst the student body should continue without interference from management or academic staff. Once safe places for engagement are established, as outlined in the previous recommendation, students should be allowed to arrange engagement sessions in these spaces, on terms set by those students who still experience colonial oppression. However, it is crucial that no voices emanating from the student body are marginalised. For those students who are unfamiliar with decolonial discourse, or who do not support calls for decoloniality, the university should offer additional support to the student body in the form of third-party mediators to facilitate such engagement processes.

Management should encourage individual faculties, as well as support staff, to continue discussions and other initiatives regarding *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*. Management should also recognise the time and resources required for this type of dialogue, as outlined in recommendation 7.3. Dialogue amongst staff should allow for disagreement and uncertainty, without any professional or other repercussions. The decolonisation project is a process for which the academe is not traditionally equipped. While its members can offer intellectual debate, ideation and research-led analyses, seeking external expertise is appropriate, and may be essential. For those staff members unfamiliar with decolonial discourse, the university should offer additional support in the form of workshops by internal or external academics to facilitate reading and discussion regarding this complex field. Engagement between staff and students should be guided by the students concerned, or facilitated by third parties who are trained in mediation.

It is crucial that management meaningfully engages with students regarding *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*, and the university management and council should read further on the issue of *Decolonisation of the Curriculum* in order to ensure that engagement with students, staff and other stakeholders is meaningful. Given the perception of some students that management is isolated from discourse in the student community, coupled with any remnant hostility following the 2016 protest action and interdict, it is strongly recommended that management solicits the input from

third-party mediators, such as *More than Peace*,⁹ to facilitate discussions with students. Management should also enter into dialogue with staff in order to solicit their responses to, and consequent action in connection with, calls to *Decolonise the Curriculum*. In order to empower staff and students to successfully navigate complex and emotive issues surrounding debates on *Decolonisation of the Curriculum*, management should provide the resources and support necessary for the Equality Unit to offer mediation training as a matter of priority. ***It is therefore recommended that management encourages individual faculties, support staff and students to continue discussions and other initiatives regarding Decolonisation of the Curriculum, and provides the necessary resources and support to the student body and staff, in the form of third-party mediators, to facilitate such engagement processes among themselves and with management.***

8. References

Asante, M. (1991). The Afrocentric Idea in Education. *Journal of Negro Education*, 60(2), 170–180.

Burgess, H. F. (2000). Processes of Decolonisation; pp150-160. In M. Battiste. (2000) *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. UBC Press, Canada.

Connell, R. (2016). Decolonising Knowledge, Democratising Curriculum: For University of Johannesburg discussions on Decolonisation of Knowledge seminar. March 2016. Available at: [https://www.uj.ac.za/faculties/humanities/sociology/Seminars/PublishingImages/Pages/Seminar-2016/Raewyn Connell Paper on Decolonisation of Knowledge.pdf](https://www.uj.ac.za/faculties/humanities/sociology/Seminars/PublishingImages/Pages/Seminar-2016/Raewyn%20Connell%20Paper%20on%20Decolonisation%20of%20Knowledge.pdf)

Costandius, E., Nell, I., Alexander, N., Blackie, M., Setati, E., Malgas, R., McKay, M. (2016). #FeesMustFall and decolonising the curriculum: Stellenbosch University students' and lecturers' reactions. *Draft publication in progress*.

Dastile, N. (2013). "Beyond Euro-Western dominance: An African-centred decolonial paradigm". 43 *Africanus* 93.

Daszko, M., and Sheinberg, S. (2014) cited in Ndofirepi, A., Cross, P., and Cross, M. Transforming Epistemologies in the Postcolonial African University? The Challenge of the Politics of Knowledge. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(4), 291-298.

De Oliveira Andreotti, V. (2011). "(Towards) decoloniality and diversity in global citizenship education". 9 *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 381.

Fanon, F. (1961. transl. 2004). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Fraser, Nancy. (2007). Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. In *Global Inequality: Patterns and Explanations*, edited by David Held and Ayse Kaya, 152–168. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Freire, P. (1970, 2005 ed.). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

Funston, A.; Gil, M. & Gilmore, G. (2014). *Strong Starts, Supported Transitions and Student Success*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle: UK.

Higgs, P. (2011). "African Philosophy and the Decolonisation of Education in Africa: Some critical reflections". *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 1.

⁹ *More than Peace* has facilitated negotiations between #FeesMustFall student protestors and management of several universities. Mediators from *More than Peace* have addressed the Student-Staff Alliance.

- Kress, G. (1990). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuh, G. (2008). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 66(2), 123-155
- Le Grange, Lesley. (2016). Decolonising the University Curriculum. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 30, 2: 1–12.
- Lugones, M. (2010). The coloniality of gender, *Hypatia*, 25(4), 742-759.
- Luke, A. (1996). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Review of Research in Education*, 21(1), 3–48.
- "Luister" video. (August 2015). Available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sF3rTBQTQk4>
- Mackinlay, E., & Barney, K. (2014). Unknown and Unknowing Possibilities: Transformative Learning, Social Justice, and Decolonising Pedagogy in Indigenous Australian Studies. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 12(1), 54–73.
- Madlingozi, T. (2017). "Social justice in a time of neo-apartheid constitutionalism: Critiquing the anti-black economy of recognition, incorporation and distribution". *Stellenbosch Law Review* (forthcoming)
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). "On the Coloniality of Being". 21 *Cultural Studies* 240.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2016). "Outline of Ten Theses on Coloniality and Decoloniality". <http://frantzfanonfoundation-fondationfrantzfanon.com>
- Mbembe, A. (2011). *On the Postcolony*. London: University of California Press Ltd.
- Mbembe, A. (2015). "Decolonizing Knowledge and the Question of the Archive". *Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research* [http://wiser.wits.ac.za/system/files/Achille Mbembe - Decolonizing Knowledge and the Question of the Archive.pdf](http://wiser.wits.ac.za/system/files/Achille%20Mbembe%20-%20Decolonizing%20Knowledge%20and%20the%20Question%20of%20the%20Archive.pdf)
- Modiri, J. (2014). "The crises of legal education". 46 *Acta Academia* 1
- Modiri, J. (2016). "In the Fall: Decolonisation and the rejuvenation of the academic project in South Africa". *Daily Maverick*.
- Muswede, T., 2017. Colonial legacies and the decolonisation discourse in post-apartheid South Africa. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 9 (5), 202-211
- Mwesigire, B. (2014). Five strategies for de-Westernising globalisation, by Ali Mazrui. *This is Africa*, Nov 21. Available at: <https://thisisafrika.me/5-strategies-de-westernising-globalisation-ali-mazrui/>
- Naude, P. (2017). "Decolonising Knowledge: In what sense is an 'African' ethic possible?". *Inaugural lecture*, Stellenbosch University.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. (2015). "Decoloniality as the Future of Africa". 13 *History Compass* 485.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. (2016). "Decolonizing the University and the Problematic Grammars of Change in South Africa". Keynote Address Delivered at the *5th Annual Students Conference on Decolonizing the Humanities and Social Sciences in South Africa/Africa*, University of KwaZulu-Natal, 6-7 October 2016.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo J., Zondi, S. (2016). *Decolonising the university, knowledge systems and disciplines in Africa*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Price, M. & Ally, R. (2016). "The challenge of decolonisation: UCT's transformation journey". <http://www.uct.ac.za/dailynews/?id=9659#.VwVwFliRp1k.email>

Quijano, A. (2007). "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality". 21 *Cultural Studies* 168.

Speech by Minister Blade Nzimande at the Higher Education Summit held at the Inkosi Albert Luthuli ICC, Durban (15 Oct 2015). Available at <http://www.gov.za/speeches/speech-minister-be-nzimande-higher-education-summit-held-inkosi-albert-luthuli-icc-durban>

Spivak, G. (2016). *Still hoping for a revolution*. Public lecture in the Great Texts/ Big Questions series, the Institute for Creative Arts (ICA), University of Cape Town, 22 June.

Stellenbosch University, (2017). *Transformation Plan 2017-2022*. Unpublished document, Stellenbosch.

Stirling, A. E., Kerr, G. A. and Dean, A. (2015). Creating Meaningful Co-Curricular Experiences in Higher Education', *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 2(6), 1–7

Tronto, Joan. (2010). Creating Caring institutions: Politics, Plurality, and Purpose. *Ethics and Social Welfare* 4(2):158–71.

Trowler, V. (2010). *Engagement Literature Review*. York: The Higher Education Academy.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization Indigeneity, Education et Society. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1).

9. Appendices

Appendix A: Full text for Section 4 of the Task Team report: *Frameworks for understanding Decolonisation*

Appendix B: In support of Section 5 of the Task Team report: *Current processes at SU relating to Decolonisation of the Curriculum* [Analysis of the closing session of the 2016 SoTL conference]

Appendix C: In support of Section 6 of the Task Team report: *Facilitating partnerships between the student community, academics, support staff and management* [Report on a *Decolonising the Curriculum* workshop with SU students]

Appendix D: Stellenbosch University Transformation Plan (TP). March 2017.

APPENDIX A: Full text for Section 4 of the Task Team report: *Frameworks for understanding Decolonisation*

Coloniality is a system of power relationships and epistemic domination that survived colonialism, and continues to dehumanise the “other”, the oppressed, or the colonised, primarily on the basis of race. Eurocentric/Western monopolies on knowledge and truth serve to perpetuate this dehumanising discourse, whereas socio-economic injustice and exclusion likewise persist. The decolonisation of society and the University thus necessitates the recentring of the human from the perspective of “colonial difference”, as well as a **recentring of knowledge to accord Africa a central position of relevance for African knowledge production**. At the same time, socio-economic injustices that directly result from sustained coloniality should be acknowledged and addressed. Decoloniality thus seeks to challenge Eurocentric hegemony of power, being and knowledge. The Western monopoly on epistemology and the concomitant hegemony of knowledge are directly implicated when addressing the issue of decolonisation of the curriculum.

“Decoloniality” does not refer to a singular theory, approach or discourse, but rather as a “family of diverse positions that share a view of coloniality as the fundamental problem in the modern age” (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015). In decolonial terms, Stellenbosch University is experienced as still largely representing the position of the oppressor (Luister Video). It is thus crucial that any process aimed at decolonising Stellenbosch University and the curriculum takes place through dialogue and engagement with those who still suffer under coloniality. Any unilateral or top-down action can amount to the appropriation of Black pain and decolonial discourse that propagates epistemic violence.

According to some perspectives, calls for decolonisation or decoloniality in South Africa cannot be equated with transformation. Transformation has been criticised for being slow, cosmetic, superficial and as having a tendency to accord mere recognition and inclusion to the oppressed – thereby assimilating the oppressed into a Eurocentric culture, on Western terms. In contrast, decoloniality commences from an entirely new centre as defined by the oppressed, from which point Western concepts and people can be assimilated on terms set by the oppressed. Moreover, according to some decolonial scholars, transformation as understood in terms of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 is similarly incompatible with decolonisation and decoloniality (Madlingozi 2017). In fact, the Constitution itself is regarded by some South African scholars as a product of liberalism and Western knowledge that stifles genuine socio-economic justice (Modiri 2014), whereas the human rights it enshrines are likewise a colonial construct that serve to catalyse a form of “neo-Apartheid” (Madlingozi 2017).

“Decolonisation of the curriculum” is not a concept that can be definitively interpreted by this Task Team, the University’s Management or Council, or academic staff alone. Instead, **decoloniality in curricula and pedagogy must result from a shared process of dialogue, engagement and meaning-making with those who continue to suffer colonial exclusion**. Ngugi wa Thiong’o grapples with the question of decoloniality in education:

“What should we do with the inherited colonial education system and the consciousness it necessarily inculcated in the African mind? What directions should an education system take in an Africa wishing to break with neo-colonialism? How does it want the ‘New Africans’ to view

themselves and their universe and from what base, Afrocentric or Eurocentric? What then are the materials they should be exposed to, and in what order and perspective? Who should be interpreting that material to them, an African or non-African? If African, what kind of African? One who has internalized the colonial world outlook or one attempting to break free from the inherited slave consciousness?" (Quoted in Mbembe 2015: 16)

The first question that merits further dialogue and investigation is thus that of *who should teach* in African universities. At Stellenbosch University, this raises obvious issues of representation, in that the University remains significantly untransformed. Epistemic justice necessitates as many "Black bodies" and colonised subjects in universities as possible. This logically **necessitates radical transformation at Stellenbosch University in order to facilitate decolonisation of the University and curriculum.**

The next question raised pertains to *what should be taught* at an African university. This enquiry centres, in the first place, on an understanding of what is meant by *the curriculum*. Le Grange (2016) explains that different forms of curricula co-exist:

"The *explicit curriculum* is what students are provided with such as module frameworks, prescribed readings, assessments guidelines, etc. The *hidden curriculum* is what students learn about the dominant culture of a university and what values it reproduces. The *null curriculum* is what universities leave out – what is not taught and learned in a university." (Le Grange 2016: 7, emphasis added)

Le Grange argues that decolonisation of the curriculum entails a shift from Western/Eurocentric individualism and universalism to an *Ubuntu*-infused curriculum which acknowledges the interdependence of humans and the more-than-human world. An *Ubuntu*-infused or African-centred curriculum does not necessitate the destruction of dominant knowledge systems, but rather demands a recentring or integration of African knowledge systems into dominant epistemological discourses. According to Naude, knowledge does not necessarily have to emanate from Africa, but must address the African reality. Naude furthermore highlights the difficulty inherent in trying to define a single system of African knowledge (such as *Ubuntu*), or to legitimately define it without using Western terminology or paradigms. Moreover, Naude emphasises that the decolonial project faces major obstacles in respect of scientific knowledge, since historically "local" Western scientific knowledge has been superseded by academic and technological globalisation. It merits reiteration that the decolonisation of the curriculum requires *dialogue and engagement* which "forces the inclusion of a grassroots perspective into education research and practice" (Higgs 2011). **If Stellenbosch University wishes to authentically position itself as an African University, a process of dialogue should be initiated in order to recentre the explicit curriculum with African knowledge as its focal point, and to ensure that the null curriculum does not entail the exclusion of African knowledge from the scope of what is taught.**

Whereas a process of dialogue seeks to decolonise the content of the curriculum, and thereby implicates the *explicit* and *null curricula*, the physical space in which education takes place highlights the importance of the *hidden curriculum*. Cognitive justice thus necessitates *spatial decolonisation*. It is the decolonisation of spatial relations, and thereby the partial decolonisation of the hidden curriculum, that led to the rise of the #RhodesMustFall and Fallist movements. **To decolonise the curriculum, Stellenbosch University needs to pay**

urgent attention to the institutional violence that arises from colonial architecture, colonial names, iconography and symbolism that pervades our campus and serves to consolidate the humiliation of Black staff and students based on “white supremacist presuppositions” (Mbembe 2015).

Finally, another question that arises from calls for decolonisation of the curriculum is that of *who is taught*. In this context, decolonisation of pedagogical practice is closely connected to decolonisation of the curriculum. Instead of viewing students as passive recipients of knowledge, the relationship between teachers and students should be reconceptualised as a situation that brings *co-learners* together (Mbembe 2015).

The crucial importance of **meaningful engagement** with those who still suffer from colonial oppression, is therefore clear. **Dialogue and shared meaning-making should steer any attempts to decolonise pedagogical practice, the curriculum and Stellenbosch University as a whole.**

Decolonisation of the curriculum

4 1 Introduction

“Responses to the youth ‘menace’ typically start with rejection and indifference, but after pressure from the students it can transform into benevolent neglect disguised as ‘urgent action.’ This is reflected in the organization of special conferences and, specially, in the creation of powerless ad hoc committees and task-teams that are meant to take as much time as possible in generating extremely minimal recommendations that hardly anyone will implement and less follow.” (Maldonado-Torres 2016: 3)

Decolonisation of the curriculum is a complex and contested issue, as is recognised in this Task Team’s Brief. However, calls for decolonisation of society and epistemological decoloniality are not new. All stakeholders in the debate on decolonisation of South African universities and curricula – including Management and Council – are therefore urged to engage with the voluminous scholarship relating to decolonial discourse. The following narrative merely seeks to provide a broad – and necessarily reductionist – overview of the main issues and questions raised by calls to decolonise the South African university and curricula.

Essentially, coloniality is a system of power relationships and epistemic domination that survived colonialism, and continues to dehumanise the “other”, the oppressed, or the colonised primarily on the basis of race. Eurocentric/Western monopolies on knowledge and truth serve to perpetuate this dehumanising discourse, whereas socio-economic injustice and exclusion likewise persist. The decolonisation of society and the university thus necessitates the recentring of the human from the perspective of “colonial difference”, as well as a recentring of knowledge to accord Africa a central position of relevance for African knowledge production. At the same time, socio-economic injustices that directly result from sustained coloniality should be acknowledged and addressed.

For a university that still largely represents the position of the oppressor, it is crucial that any process aimed at decolonising the university and curriculum takes place through dialogue and engagement with those who still suffer under coloniality. Any unilateral or top-down

action can amount to the appropriation of Black pain and decolonial discourse that propagates epistemic violence, while actualising Maldonado-Torres' observation that institutional responses to calls for decolonisation often amount to mere lip-service.

4 2 Decolonisation

4 2 1 Colonisation and coloniality

Colonisation and colonialism refer to historical facts of conquest, according to which the sovereignty of “nations” in the Americas, Asia, Africa, and elsewhere – as well as the borders of such nations themselves – depended on and were determined by imperialist European nations (Maldonado-Torres 2007: 43). Colonialism constituted an overwhelmingly violent, predominantly European movement marked by the dispossession and exploitation of indigenous land, slavery and compulsory labour, torture and, ultimately, protracted wars of independence. Today, many African nations remain politically unstable and suffer from the “resource curse”, according to which countries rich in natural resources possess no real wealth while Western nations continue to profit from the exploitation of African soil. Colonialism's ultimate violent legacy is the *dehumanisation* of colonial people through the utter subjugation of their power, culture, knowledge and being. Following guerrilla warfare, massive civilian casualties and torture, most African countries gained technical independence in the 1960s and 1970s. Whereas South Africa gained formal independence at a much earlier date, its people were only liberated in 1994. Today, 53% of South Africans live in poverty, and our country is amongst the most unequal in the world. This begs the question as to whether true (material) freedom has been achieved.

According to Maldonado-Torres, the colonisation of America created a “model of power” which was to exert global influence and become constitutive of the “dark side” of modernity as discourse and practice, remaining inextricably linked to world capitalism and domination based on race (Maldonado-Torres 2007: 44). Thus, even as colonised nations achieved technical independence, coloniality continued unabated:

“Coloniality... refers to long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism, but that define culture, labour, intersubjectivity relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations. Thus, coloniality survives colonialism. It is maintained alive in books, in the criteria for academic performance, in cultural patterns, in common sense, in the self-image of peoples, in aspirations of self, and so many other aspects of our modern experience. In a way, as modern subjects we breathe coloniality all the time and every day.” (Maldonado-Torres 2007: 243)

Coloniality therefore refers to the various manifestations of power-relationships that originated in colonial conquests, but continue to be prevalent at a global level today – especially in those regions that were directly colonised (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 487). Put differently, coloniality denotes the continued Western domination and control (through invisible power structures) of the economy, authority, knowledge and subjectivity (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 487 referring to Quijano 2007). Coloniality thus amounts to a Western or Eurocentric appropriation of power, knowledge, culture, civilisation itself and, ultimately, the ability to be human.

4 2 2 Decolonisation and decoloniality

Just as colonisation is a historical episode that can be distinguished from the on-going prevalence of coloniality, decolonisation can be interpreted to refer to the massive historical event of anti-colonialism that took place in the twentieth century. According to Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2015: 488), anti-colonialism or decolonisation was a movement largely driven by elites, aimed at replacing colonial administrators and achieving national sovereignty. However, instead of leading to a rebirth of humanity as espoused by Frantz Fanon, a complex situation, which Mbembe terms the “postcolony” (Mbembe 2001), resulted.

Fanon’s ground-breaking scholarship (*Wretched of the Earth* and *Black Skins, White Masks*) continues to inform recent calls for decolonisation in South Africa. Fanon sought to analyse the assimilation of Black colonial subjects by White colonists, and the dehumanisation of Black subjects that resulted. Fanon advocated the rise of a *new humanity*. He penned the seminal work on colonisation and decolonisation during the protracted Algerian Revolution, during which time he was stationed in Algeria and became a member of Front de Libération Nationale. When interpreting Fanon’s work, including the first chapter of the *Wretched of the Earth* (entitled “On Violence”) the context in which he wrote should thus be borne in mind. For Fanon, “decolonization is always a violent event” which contemplates the absolute and total “substitution of one ‘species’ of mankind by another” (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 1). In response to a system of violence perpetuated by the oppressor or colonist, decolonisation posits an agenda for “total disorder” (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 2):

“To destroy the colonial world means nothing less than demolishing the colonist’s sector, burying it deep within the earth or banishing it from the territory...Challenging the colonial world is not a rational confrontation of viewpoints. It is not a discourse on the universal, but the impassioned claim by the colonized that their world is fundamentally different.” (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 6)

Nonviolence is regarded as a colonial value which is assimilated by certain colonised intellectuals (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 23). In rejecting the oppressor’s normative value system that is based on universalism and individualism, Fanon further unambiguously links the struggle of decolonisation with a struggle for land – land being the most important value from the perspective of the colonised (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 8-9). Land is conducive to catalysing dignity in the colonised subject, and the redistribution of wealth is a crucial need which must be addressed by humanity regardless of any “devastating” consequences that might ensue (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 55). Where the violence of the colonised people succeed in defeating the violence of colonialism, the colonist is no longer interested in co-existing with the colonised (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 9). This proposition was borne out when close to a million European-Algerians fled back to France in the wake of a gruesome war of independence. In any event, the colonist remains forever the “foreigner” (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 5), and what the colonised seek is not the status of the colonist, but the colonist’s place and land (Fanon 1961 transl 2004: 23).

According to Mbembe (2015: 10), decolonisation in the 1960s and 1970s was closely linked to Africanization and nation-building. It is noteworthy that Fanon was severely critical of efforts to Africanise post-colonial societies. Mbembe notes that Fanon regarded Africanization as a process captured by a corrupt and lazy African middle-class, who viewed

nationalisation as the mere transfer of unjust colonial privileges into new hands. Moreover, Fanon associated Africanization with xenophobia, or the desire to get rid of the “foreigner” (Mbembe 2015: 11). However, it is noteworthy that Mbembe’s criticism of Africanization as leading to chauvinism and “intellectual ghettos” has itself been critiqued (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 491-492). Some scholars continue to develop and utilise scholarship related to Afrocentrism, Africanity and Afrikology in creating decolonial paradigms (Dastile 2013).

Mbembe further opines that recent calls for decolonisation can likely be traced to the scholarship of Ngugi wa Thiong’o, who used the term to describe a continuing process of “seeing ourselves clearly”, as the starting point of an entirely new struggle which impacts on questions as to who teaches what to whom, and as a process of *re-centring*, in terms of which Africa is no longer regarded as an outpost or extension of the West (Mbembe 2015: 15-16). The idea of re-centring knowledge and truth, with Africa as the central point of reference, remains integral to much scholarship concerning decolonisation and decoloniality.

In contrast to “decolonisation” interpreted as an event “locked in the past” (Maldonado-Torres 2016: 10) and closely linked to the violent acts of decolonisation necessitated by European violence-as-domination in the 1960s and 1970s, “decoloniality” can be conceptualised as a mode of resistance that originated simultaneously with and in response to imperialism and conquest. Coloniality dehumanises the oppressed (predominantly on the basis of race) and denies them a place in creation, history or futurity, while laying claim to only one, universal body of knowledge and truth. In response, decoloniality seeks to *rehumanise* the oppressed, to redefine what it is to be human, to recognise the capability of the oppressed to engage in creative acts of futurity, and to introduce fundamentally different ways of being human, of knowing and of producing knowledge. Maldonado-Torres (2016: 10) conceptualises “decoloniality”:

“If coloniality refers to a logic, metaphysics, ontology, and a matrix of power that can continue existing after formal independence and desegregation, decoloniality refers to efforts at rehumanizing the world, to breaking hierarchies of difference that dehumanize subjects and communities and that destroy nature, and to the production of counter-discourses, counter-knowledges, counter-creative acts, and counter-practices that seek to dismantle coloniality and to open up multiple other forms of being in the world.”

It follows that “decoloniality” does not refer to a singular theory, approach or discourse, but rather as a “family of diverse positions that share a view of coloniality as the fundamental problem in the modern age” (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 492). Decoloniality thus seeks to challenge Eurocentric hegemony of power, being and knowledge (Dastile 2013: 103). Ndlovu-Gatsheni postulates that decoloniality is premised on three analytical concepts, namely (i) *coloniality of power* (which analyses the construction of today’s “racially hierarchized, Euro-American-centric, Christian-centric, patriarchal, capitalist, hetero-normative, hegemonic, asymmetrical, and modern power structure”); (ii) *coloniality of knowledge* (which analyses the politics of knowledge production, the identity of knowledge producers and the purposes for which knowledge is produced); (iii) *coloniality of being* (which analyses the making of subjectivities in the context of the dehumanising effects of coloniality) (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 489-490). Whereas all three of these issues merit earnest engagement, for purposes of this report, attention is focused on the question of coloniality of knowledge, in that the Western monopoly on epistemology and the concomitant hegemony of

knowledge are directly implicated when addressing the issue of decolonisation of the curriculum.

4 2 3 Decoloniality and transformation

Finally, according to some perspectives, calls for decolonisation or decoloniality in South Africa cannot be equated with transformation. Transformation is viewed as a Western process that aims to maintain the *status quo* by merely assimilating discrete aspects of African knowledge and culture into a dominant system of coloniality. Whereas transformation connotes reconciliation and reform, decolonisation demands a complete abolition of and break from an oppressive, global regime and epistemology (Price & Ally 2016: 2). Transformation thus implies transition rather than rupture, the latter which calls for the destruction of obstacles that impede freedom and justice (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2016: 17). Transformation has furthermore been criticised for being slow, cosmetic, superficial and as having a tendency to accord mere recognition and inclusion to the oppressed – thereby assimilating the oppressed into a Eurocentric culture, on Western terms. In contrast, decoloniality commences from an entirely new centre as defined by the oppressed, from which point Western concepts and people can be assimilated on terms set by the oppressed (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2016: 18; Madlingozi 2017).

Moreover, according to some decolonial scholars, transformation as understood in terms of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 is similarly incompatible with decolonisation and decoloniality (Madlingozi 2017). In fact, the Constitution itself is regarded by some South African scholars as a product of liberalism and Western knowledge that stifles genuine socio-economic justice (Modiri 2014: 10-11), whereas the human rights it enshrines are likewise a colonial construct that serve to catalyse a form of “neo-Apartheid” (Madlingozi 2017). Indeed, viewed in a context of coloniality, where only the White and Western are regarded as “human”, “the extension of human rights from those who have arrogated to themselves the status of humanity to those previously deemed sub-human perpetuates coloniality of being” (Madlingozi 2017).

4 3 Decolonisation of the curriculum

4 3 1 South African calls for decolonisation of the curriculum and the need for epistemic justice

Recent calls by South African student movements and Fallists for decolonisation of the curriculum should be understood in the context of colonial epistemic racism, epistemic violence and epistemicide. *Epistemic racism* refers to the propagation of epistemology and presumed universality of truth and knowledge by Eurocentric, Western forces that proceeded to eliminate “difference” as represented by the colonised. Closely related to this is the notion of *epistemic violence*, which denotes the geopolitics of knowledge production and the dehumanising effects of denying to the colonised epistemic capacity (De Oliveira Andreotti 2011: 386-387, referring to Maldonado-Torres 2004). Maldonado-Torres extends his criticism of epistemic racism and violence to forms of *multiculturalism* that seek to “domesticate” difference and assimilate it into European universalism (De Oliveira Andreotti 2011: 388). *Epistemicide* refers to the annihilation of and denial of the very possibility of knowledge

existing on the “other side of the line” in a bifurcated social reality defined on Western terms (De Oliveira Andreotti 2011: 389-390 referring to Santos and his concept of “abyssal thinking”). For Santos, social justice is inextricably linked to *cognitive justice* (the coexistence of various knowledges and the dismantling of hierarchies leading to the subjugation of certain knowledge systems). Santos accordingly argues that any political resistance must be premised on *epistemological resistance* (De Oliveira Andreotti 2011: 390). As a movement of resistance, decoloniality seeks to establish *colonial difference* as the new centre of knowledge production, and raises questions such as who produces knowledge and what counts as knowledge (De Oliveira Andreotti 2011: 392).

The neoliberal academic project, as represented by universities and exacerbated by the *commodification of education*, reproduces epistemic racism, epistemic violence and epistemicide. Epistemic coloniality as perpetuated by universities thus consolidates socio-political coloniality and perpetuates exclusion based on difference. As a result, whereas we have universities *in* Africa, we do not have African universities (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 489). Many scholars have thus called for the complete decolonisation of universities, leading to a future, African-centred *pluriversity*:

“By *pluriversity*, many understand a process of knowledge production that is open to epistemic diversity. It is a process that does not necessarily abandon the notion of universal knowledge for humanity, but which embraces it via a horizontal strategy of openness to dialogue among different epistemic traditions.” (Mbembe 2015: 19)

“Decolonisation of the curriculum” should thus be interpreted in a broad sense, as a call for decoloniality that is closely linked to the decolonisation of society (Maldonado-Torres 2016: 31). Moreover, it calls for a re-imagining of the university, the recentering of Africa as the central point of epistemic relevance, the promotion of epistemic diversity, and concomitant spatial, curricular and pedagogical decolonisation. Decolonisation of universities is not a singular event, but an on-going process which cannot commence from a clean epistemic slate (Le Grange 2016: 5). *Engagement* with students and other stakeholders who occupy the “other side of the line”, is of crucial significance. Any attempt by a colonial university administration to appropriate or define decolonisation and decoloniality will merely lead to further epistemic violence. Maldonado-Torres, a leading scholar on decoloniality who spent some time with the South African Fallist and #FeesMustFall movements, cautions in this respect:

“While colonization gives rise to questions, it also seeks to mute these questions and to provide false responses to whatever questions emerge. This means that *no one can assume to have all the relevant questions or all the answers that would lead to decolonization*, which is why the decolonization *project needs to be a collective one* where subjects give themselves to each other and are receptive to each other in love, understanding, and their shared rage against modernity/coloniality.” (Maldonado-Torres 2016: 31, emphasis added)

4 3 2 Curricular and pedagogical decolonisation

It is clear from the above discussion that “decolonisation of the curriculum” is not a concept that can be definitively interpreted by this Task Team, the University’s Management

or Council, or academic staff alone. Instead, decoloniality in curricula and pedagogy must result from a shared process of dialogue, engagement and meaning-making with those who continue to suffer colonial exclusion, oppression and injustice. Coloniality and decoloniality, including epistemic decoloniality and questions of Africanization, raise many complex and contested issues. What follows is a broad and simplified overview of some of the questions raised by calls for the decolonisation of the curriculum.

Mbembe recalls the questions Ngugi wa Thiong'o grapples with, and relates them to our own:

“What should we do with the inherited colonial education system and the consciousness it necessarily inculcated in the African mind? What directions should an education system take in an Africa wishing to break with neo-colonialism? How does it want the ‘New Africans’ to view themselves and their universe and from what base, Afrocentric or Eurocentric? What then are the materials they should be exposed to, and in what order and perspective? Who should be interpreting that material to them, an African or non-African? If African, what kind of African? One who has internalized the colonial world outlook or one attempting to break free from the inherited slave consciousness?” (Quoted in Mbembe 2015: 16)

The first question that merits further dialogue and investigation is thus that of *who should teach* in African universities. At Stellenbosch University, this raises obvious issues of representation, in that the University remains significantly untransformed. Even where Black academics are employed as part of a project of transformation, it must be asked whether these academics have perhaps assimilated coloniality, in which case they would perpetuate epistemic violence and racism in education. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire addresses the predicament of the educator who is an oppressor but wishes to actively create a relationship of solidarity with the oppressed student:

“Discovering himself to be an oppressor may cause considerable anguish, but it does not necessarily lead to solidarity with the oppressed. Rationalizing his guilt through paternalistic treatment of the oppressed, all the while holding them fast in a position of dependence, will not do. Solidarity requires that one enter into the situation of those with whom one is solidary; it is a radical posture... true solidarity with the oppressed means fighting at their side to transform the objective reality which has made them these ‘beings for another.’” (Freire 1970, 2005: 49)

Epistemic justice necessitates as many “Black bodies” and colonised subjects in universities as possible (Maldonado-Torres 2016: 31). This logically necessitates *radical transformation* at Stellenbosch University in order to facilitate decolonisation of the University and curriculum.

The next question raised pertains to *what should be taught* at an African university. Joel Modiri, a young legal scholar at the University of Pretoria, criticises the Fallist movement for its seeming unwillingness to engage with global scholarship (from Mignolo and Santos to Fanon and Biko) on decoloniality. Nevertheless, Modiri acknowledges the need – as articulated by the movement – for academics to earnestly reflect on what they teach, and its relevance to our own social context (Modiri 2016: 3).

This enquiry centres, in the first place, on an understanding of what is meant by *the curriculum*. Le Grange analyses the rethinking of the curriculum with reference to Aoki's distinction between the curriculum-as-plan and the curriculum-as-lived by students, and

suggests that the latter can be used as a basis for engagement regarding decolonisation of the curriculum (Le Grange 2016: 7). He goes on to explain that different forms of curricula co-exist:

“The *explicit curriculum* is what students are provided with such as module frameworks, prescribed readings, assessments guidelines, etc. The *hidden curriculum* is what students learn about the dominant culture of a university and what values it reproduces. The *null curriculum* is what universities leave out – what is not taught and learned in a university.” (Le Grange 2016: 7, emphasis added)

Le Grange goes on to reconceptualise the curriculum as a fluid and changing concept, which cannot be closed or fixed at a certain point of time. He argues that decolonisation of the curriculum entails a shift from Western/Eurocentric individualism and universalism to an *Ubuntu*-infused curriculum which acknowledges the interdependence of humans and the more-than-human world (Le Grange 2016: 9; see also Mbembe 2015). An *Ubuntu*-infused or African-centred curriculum does not necessitate the destruction of dominant knowledge systems, but rather demands a recentring or integration of African knowledge systems into dominant epistemological discourses (Le Grange 2016: 10; Higgs 2011: 10). It merits reiteration that the decolonisation of the curriculum requires *dialogue and engagement* which “forces the inclusion of a grassroots perspective into education research and practice” (Higgs 2011: 10).

Whereas a process of dialogue seeks to decolonise the content of the curriculum, and thereby implicates the *explicit* and *null curricula*, the physical space in which education takes place highlights the importance of the *hidden curriculum*. Cognitive justice thus necessitates *spatial decolonisation*. Mbembe argues that “[t]he decolonization of buildings and of public spaces is therefore not a frivolous issue, especially in a country that, for many centuries, has defined itself as not of Africa, but as an outpost of European imperialism in the Dark Continent; and in which 70% of the land is still firmly in the hands of 13% of the population” (Mbembe 2015: 5). It is the decolonisation of spatial relations, and thereby the partial decolonisation of the hidden curriculum, that led to the rise of the #RhodesMustFall and Fallist movements. In this respect, to decolonise the curriculum, Stellenbosch University needs to pay urgent attention to the institutional violence that arises from colonial architecture, colonial names, iconography and symbolism that pervades our campus and serves to consolidate the humiliation of Black staff and students based on “white supremacist presuppositions” (Mbembe 2015: 6). Decolonisation of space is closely related to the *democratisation of access* to universities, and should not be confused with colonial notions of “tolerance” or “charity” (Mbembe 2015: 6). Moreover, decolonisation of space and access requires “Black students and staff [to invent] a set of creative practices that ultimately make it impossible for official structures to ignore them and not recognize them, to pretend that they are not there; to pretend that they do not see them; or to pretend that their voice does not count” (Mbembe 2015: 6).

Finally, another question that arises from calls for decolonisation of the curriculum is that of *who is taught*. In this context, decolonisation of pedagogical practice is closely connected to decolonisation of the curriculum. Instead of viewing students as passive recipients of knowledge, the relationship between teachers and students should be reconceptualised as a

situation that brings *co-learners* together (Mbembe 2015: 6). Freire echoes this reconceptualization of the teacher-student relationship:

“The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. In this process, arguments based on ‘authority’ are no longer valid; in order to function, authority must be *on the side of freedom*, not *against it*.” (Freire 1970, 2005: 80, original emphasis)

The entire academic practice should simultaneously be reimagined, and the commodification of education and “obsession” with measurement and quantification should be questioned (Mbembe 2015: 6-8). For Freire, authentic thinking that deals with reality can only take place through *communication* (Freire 1970, 2005: 77). A praxis of liberation as a process of humanisation entails that women and men reflect upon their world in order to transform it, and can be realised through *problem-posing education* (Freire 1970, 2005: 79). Problem-posing education is an active process that recognises the oppressed as beings in a process of becoming; beings in pursuit of full humanity (Freire 1970, 2005: 84-85). Importantly, problem-posing education is a revolutionary praxis, and should be *dialogic* from the outset. Any pedagogical practice that denies the input of the oppressed objectifies them, thus amounting to an act of violence (Freire 1970, 2005: 85-86).

The crucial importance of *meaningful engagement* with those who still suffer from colonial oppression, is therefore clear. Dialogue and shared meaning-making should steer any attempts to decolonise pedagogical practice, the curriculum and the university.

4 4 Challenges and criticism

Decolonisation of the curriculum, as a concept that can only be defined in dialogue, presents certain challenges. For example, in his inaugural lecture Prof Piet Naude observes that it is difficult – if not impossible – to define a single system of African knowledge (Naude 2017:3). Even where an African knowledge system can be identified, it may only be regarded as legitimate if explained according to established Western or Eurocentric paradigms (Naude 2017:4). Moreover, even *prima facie* African philosophies such as Ubuntu can also be discerned in Western philosophy (Naude 2017: 6). The search for localised, authentic African epistemologies will thus not be easily accomplished.

From a constitutional and human rights perspective, decolonisation of society is also a problematic discourse that influences debates regarding decolonisation of the curriculum. For example, in reducing social injustice to only race, other minority rights and interests can easily be overlooked. It is moreover not guaranteed that African philosophies like Ubuntu can guard against xenophobia, homophobia and similar prejudices that are not based on – but can intersect with – race. Finally, calls for decolonisation are not only reductionist in focusing exclusively on race, but also fails to pay sufficient attention to other constitutional and political complexities.

These challenges call for circumspection, but should not be relied upon to dismiss calls for decolonisation of the curriculum out of hand. The ultimate goal should be to create a socially just University and society.

References

- Dastile, N “Beyond Euro-Western dominance: An African-centred decolonial paradigm” (2013) 43 *Africanus* 93
- De Oliveira Andreotti, V “(Towards) decoloniality and diversity in global citizenship education” (2011) 9 *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 381
- Fanon, F *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961 transl 2004) New York: Grove Press
- Freire, P *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970, 2005 ed) New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc
- Higgs, P “African Philosophy and the Decolonisation of Education in Africa: Some critical reflections” (2011) *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 1
- Le Grange, L “Decolonising the university curriculum” (2016) *South African Journal of Higher Education* 1
- Madlingozi, T “Social justice in a time of neo-apartheid constitutionalism: Critiquing the anti-black economy of recognition, incorporation and distribution” (2017) *Stellenbosch Law Review* (forthcoming)
- Maldonado-Torres, N “On the Coloniality of Being” (2007) 21 *Cultural Studies* 240
- Maldonado-Torres, N “Outline of Ten Theses on Coloniality and Decoloniality” (2016) <http://frantzfanonfoundation-fondationfrantzfanon.com>
- Mbembe, A *On the Postcolony* (2001) London: University of California Press Ltd
- Mbembe, A “Decolonizing Knowledge and the Question of the Archive” (2015) *Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research* <http://wiser.wits.ac.za/system/files/Achille%20Mbembe%20-%20Decolonizing%20Knowledge%20and%20the%20Question%20of%20the%20Archive.pdf>
- Modiri, J “The crises of legal education” (2014) 46 *Acta Academia* 1
- Modiri, J “In the Fall: Decolonisation and the rejuvenation of the academic project in South Africa” (2016) *Daily Maverick*
- Naude, P “Decolonising Knowledge: In what sense is an ‘African’ ethic possible?” (2017) *Inaugural lecture*, Stellenbosch University
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S “Decoloniality as the Future of Africa” (2015) 13 *History Compass* 485
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S “Decolonizing the University and the Problematic Grammars of Change in South Africa” (2016) Keynote Address Delivered at the *5th Annual Students Conference on Decolonizing the Humanities and Social Sciences in South Africa/Africa*, University of KwaZulu-Natal, 6-7 October 2016

Price, M & Ally, R “The challenge of decolonisation: UCT's transformation journey” (2016)
<http://www.uct.ac.za/dailynews/?id=9659#.VwVwFliRp1k.email>

Quijano, A “Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality” (2007) 21 *Cultural Studies* 168

APPENDIX B: In support of Section 5 of the Task Team report: *Current processes at SU relating to Decolonisation of the Curriculum*

Keeping the home fires burning

**Summary of results of analysis of text captured at the closing session of the SOTL Conference,
October 2016**

Session facilitated by the Critical Citizen Group

The 2015 and 2016 student protests marked watershed moments in the history of South Africa's Higher Education landscape. This report summarises findings from a session facilitated by the Critical Citizenship group at the Stellenbosch University Conference on Teaching and Learning (SOTL), October 2016. It is based on an analysis of the text recorded in real time and simultaneously by scribes assigned to Faculty groups. Four questions were posed to the audience, and the discussion at each Faculty group facilitated by members of the CC group. The questions were as follows:

1. What is your reaction to the student protest page? (Participants were asked to respond to a photo prompt depicting SU student protest action in 2015).
2. How do you think the protests affected student lecturer interactions?
3. How do we decolonise HE structures?
4. How do we take the conversation further?

Responses to pictures of the 2015 photographs were overwhelmingly emotive. Feelings of anger, frustration, anxiety and chaos were expressed. However, members of staff also expressed conflicted feelings, mostly of simultaneous anger and sympathy. The general consensus was that, although there were even feelings of solidarity with the issues students were raising, violence associated with the protests was unacceptable. Despite the reported intensity of anger, chaos and hopelessness, statements of empathy and sympathy for students and their plight were most prevalent.

Some colleagues found associations between the 2015 protest, and past experiences, either at other universities (e.g. UWC), in other countries (e.g. Zimbabwe), or the historical national narrative (e.g. Mandela-led negotiations with the National Party.) Self-identified white colleagues, and white male colleagues in particular, expressed feelings of exclusion, wanting to respond in a way that was empathetic, but feeling disenfranchised from the populist discourse, and failing to find an acceptable response. The same cohort, it seems, also expressed fear, shame and guilt, hopelessness and powerlessness. Other responses included acts of distancing, an unwillingness to deal with the collective trauma, and surprise over the fact and the intensity of the students' anger. However, these responses of distancing were marginal.

Protests at the IHEs were generally seen to be misplaced. Arguments were made that the government was conveniently allowing universities to take the fall for its failures, and was not intervening as it should have. Views were expressed that issues raised by students indicated systemic disparities at the institution, that the complex nature of these issues and the emotions they evoked rendered them difficult to resolve, and that in many ways, they were intensified iterations of unresolved injustices at the institution, and in broader society. There was a sense that we had left the problem too long, and that we had missed opportunities for addressing them properly. By extension, failure to pay attention now would probably lead to further and more volatile disruptions in future.

Several ideas were exchanged about how to decolonise HE structures. Questions about whether to remove symbols of the University's oppressive past, whether to retain and re-interpret them, or whether to replace them with new artefacts (e.g. photographs) opened the discussion. The deficit of safe spaces, both in the physical and in the abstract sense, was a dominant theme. Points were raised about University architecture, and design and use of physical spaces on campus, and the latent messages that physical spaces hold for students and staff.

With regard to an abstract interpretation of “safe spaces”, participants felt that, while students had safe spaces to express themselves, staff did not. Safe spaces are compromised by an abiding sense of mistrust, amongst staff members, and between staff and faculty management. This is further exacerbated by silos in the university – clusters of people operating in closed systems by themselves, or entirely dissociated with others in the Faculty or Department. Feelings of mistrust and exclusion were linked to several requests for anonymous platforms of communication and expression for members of staff. Responsibility for the creation of safe spaces was frequently placed with Faculty and Faculty Management. Some called for a culture of debate at the level of Faculty, citing the lack of courageous conversations and the broaching of difficult topics as the very reasons for issues remaining unresolved.

In conversations about how to decolonise the classroom (the physical and abstract space), how to deal with “difficult topics” became a point of discussion. Some expressed a desire to talk about the difficult issues raised by the protests, but cited the following reasons for not doing so: not knowing how to broach the subject, felt inadequate to facilitate such a discussion, protest-induced time constraints and added pressure to cover prescribed content. Concern with being misunderstood, misjudged for their perceived loyalties, for being representatives of the elite/Afrikaans/bureaucratic establishment, was pervasive for a number of lecturers. Several other lecturers went ahead and set aside the course content in favour of these discussions, taking it as an opportunity to gain insight, and to also raise awareness with students about historical contexts of which they may not otherwise be aware.

At the level of Departments, the following suggestions were made: have a dedicated staff position for someone who could focus their research and inputs on decolonisation of the curriculum for that discipline, b) incentivise and acknowledge the contribution of those who do bring the skill and willingness to help raise broader societal issues with students and colleagues, and c) share research and literature with one another to help us understand decolonisation, what it means and how it is operationalised elsewhere. While there were those who called for a uniform definition of decolonisation, it was clear that reaching that kind of consensus would be difficult, and perhaps impractical. A call was also made for an authentic Africa-centric response to the decolonisation project in academia.

Ideas were exchanged about ways to bring about structural change by changes to curricula, course content, and degree structures. Cross-pollination of courses in the humanities to disciplines not usually associated with socio-political content (e.g. STEM subjects) was suggested. Next to what we teach, how we teach, emerged as a dominant theme. Fieldtrips, for instance, were suggested as a teaching medium through which students get exposed to the diverse lived experiences of other students who, like themselves, make up the citizenry of the country. There was also a suggestion that existing funding instruments (e.g. the NRF IKS funding call) be used to advance knowledge about indigenous knowledge systems to inform curriculum content, and epistemology.

Relationships between students and lecturers were reported to have changed in several ways. One interesting response was that lecturers/supervisors were shocked by the revelation of who their students “really” are, where they come from, their homes, their contexts, their realities. Some came to the realisation that we do not know the personal backgrounds of our students, and that it may be important to take this into account in how and what we teach. Few references were made to broken trust and feelings of betrayal, and there were even fewer remarks about relationships between students and lecturers remaining unchanged. For others the protests evoked feelings of sympathy and care, not only for staff towards students, but also of students toward staff. One lecturer gave an account of how their class had been disrupted by protestors, and how students rallied round in a bid to protect them. Another mentioned feeling helpless, but still feeling compelled to protect their students in the classroom during class disruptions.

The diversity of people groupings mentioned during the session is noteworthy. These include: students who stayed in the classrooms, students who were protesting, black students, white students, foreign students, lecturers with “protest experience”, lecturers for whom this was new, students in jail, female vs male students. These statements were often made dualistically – one vs the other. It also speaks to representivity: who feels themselves represented, and how, in this necessarily disruptive process.

An enduring theme throughout the hour-long session, was the need for different members of the university campus community to talk. Calls for “debate”, “dialogue”, “engagement”, discussion of “difficult topics” and “conversation” were repeatedly made. However, barriers to effective communication were described as follows:

- a) Lack of common understanding and common language (e.g. definitions) of Decolonisation
- b) A lack of awareness (on the part of students and staff) on where different parties are coming from
- c) A lack of will, but mostly, a lack of skill, to facilitate difficult discussions with students and other members of staff
- d) A trust deficit that leads to feelings of exclusion or threat
- e) Not enough time, not the right space, not the right context for courageous conversations
- f) Not the right skills to bring up these important topics, and then hold them in a way that expresses empathy and safety

These are major themes captured in the analysis carried out in April 2017. It would be useful to keep in mind that, although the frequency of coded items attract attention, expressions of dissidence, avoidance, exclusion and depression may be infrequent, but are perhaps especially important to note.

Chilisa (2012) describes 6 stages of decolonisation, viz., rediscovery, recovery, mourning, dreaming, commitment and action. Interestingly, the results of the analysis could be matched very closely with this framework. It should be recognised that, for this diverse group of staff members, individuals may be at different stages of this cycle, both personally and professionally, and at different times, or simultaneously. Findings, taken together with discussion of the topic by Le Grange (2016), offer clear, inspirational and useful direction to colleagues in decision-making roles.

It must be noted that, to date, this concluding session at the SOTL conference has been the only university-wide event that has had as its focus, discussion amongst SU staff about the national student crisis. Members of staff offered many useful and practical ideas for change – from the epistemic to the every-day practice in the classroom. There were also strong expressions of commitment, personal reflection, empathy and agency amongst the group. These are the elements that offer rich opportunity for the systemic transformation at Stellenbosch University so vehemently called for by communities on and off campus. In seeking appropriate responses to student and societal claims on academia, we would do well to listen equally to those who keep the home fires burning.

Rhoda Malgas (rmalgas@sun.ac.za)

References:

Chilisa, B. (2012) Indigenous research methodologies. Los Angeles: Sage publications.

Le Grange, L. (2016) Decolonising the university curriculum. South African Journal of Higher Education 302(2): 1-12.

**APPENDIX C: In support of Section 6 of the Task Team report:
*Facilitating partnerships between the student community, academics,
support staff and management***

Report: Decolonising the Curriculum Workshop

1. Brief description of workshop proceedings

On the 12th of April 2017, the group under the leadership of Tonia Overmeyer organised a workshop attended by student leaders and representatives from different student organisations, societies, faculties, residences and PSOs to gain insight into students' understandings and perspectives of certain aspects surrounding the decolonisation of the curriculum at Stellenbosch University.

These aspects under discussion at the workshop centred on what decolonising the curriculum should look like outside of the classroom, how other students could be drawn into the conversation of decolonisation, and how the university should be held accountable in such discussions.

Before these matters were attended to, the participants of the workshop convened to attend a presentation on what it could mean to decolonise the curriculum. Thereafter, the participants were divided into three groups that each engaged with the matters mentioned in the previous paragraph. The workshop concluded with a plenary session, which prompted further general discussions of the issues at hand. The discussions held in the group and plenary sessions raised many understandings, perspectives, concerns and suggestions addressing what a decolonised curriculum would look like at Stellenbosch University, as reviewed in more detail below.

2. Feedback from students on:

2.1 Decolonising the curriculum beyond/outside of the classroom

This topic spoke to how students would describe a decolonised university, what decolonising the curriculum would necessitate for students at the university, and what types of co-curricular activities would help decolonise the university.

The perspectives, observations and concerns of – as well as suggestions on addressing – these points of conversation came to light and can be summarised as follows:

History, experience and reality

- A decolonised university “benefits us all”. It is an inclusive space, “it includes all of us without sacrificing/excluding/erasing other cultures”.
- A decolonised university can be described as a “place of equality where it is a safe mix of students, where all sides of history is taken into account and incorporated into what we are learning”. It has to “take everyone’s perspectives into account to get closer to the truth”. This includes the “need to rewrite history from everyone’s perspective to get the ‘right’ history.”
- Should take African perspective and African history into account. Prioritise historical and cultural importance of collectivism over European ideal of individualism.
- We (university included) have a tendency to romanticise history when it is, in fact, complex. History is often one-sided.
- Current realities also often one-sided. We need to spend more time researching the South African reality ourselves in our own way, instead of relying on textbooks following Eurocentric assumptions, positions and models.
- The university should speak from and speak for our own histories and experiences.

Institution, education and curriculum

- University should stop looking at Europe as an example of what universities should look like.
- A decolonised university “provides excellent tertiary education” that is primarily Afrocentric and focuses on “African excellence”, thereby “promoting African education as excellent.”
- Historically, African innovation and scholars have been/are erased from narrative. Should be reversed. The idea is not to erase European history, but to acknowledge and honour African scholars’ contribution to academics.
- Emphasis should be on both old and new contributions from/within Africa, not just contributions from Europe. Focus should be on internal (African) contributions.
- Examples of a decolonised curriculum (in class): legal studies should value customary law, as it is a form of “logic” of Africa that is “undermined”; legal studies should

address the exploitation of local environment; engineering should include a focus on humanity; economics and mathematics are largely based on the Western world and implementation not necessarily beneficial to South Africans within South African context, as South Africa is a unique space that needs its own, possibly new, models applicable to its people and settings.

- University is a research-centred institution. Must invest in and produce research that uplifts the continent.
- Philosophy department used as an example of what hinders decolonisation. The student remarked that the department has more females than males, but the *logic and reason* module was taught by a male lecturer. Calls for decolonisation of gender in a sense. Also example of in student's final year where the *African philosophy* module was presented by a white male, and the student assistant was also white male. At the same time, these modules would have black guest lecturers. The department, therefore, has female and African lecturers that are equipped to present the modules, but they keep to the status quo that privileges white males. Such variety of contradictions hinders decolonisation.
- University is too concerned with building ties and partnerships with European universities, should prioritise building "strong institutional ties" and partnerships with other universities in Africa. Decolonisation cannot happen if issues such as this are not given attention.

Representation, transformation and equality

- The university has to move away from a colonial/European/Eurocentric mind-set. If university is primarily European, it is exclusionary, as representation matters.
- A decolonised university would have a representative demographic in relation to the academic staff.
- A decolonised university would humanise all persons involved in the education system (historically, certain groups of people have been dehumanised).
- Representation matters. Question of whether everyone (both students and staff) who occupies the space at university is really being acknowledged and represented?
- Some (black) students do not see themselves in the curriculum.
- Statistically, white students outnumber black students, and white members of academic staff largely outnumber black members of academic.

- Also begs the question: who will be represented by the decolonised curriculum, and who will the decolonised curriculum serve?
- “Who do we give the task to implement and design a decolonised curriculum?” Looking at statistics for academic staff, there are less black members than white members of staff. “If we design the decolonised curriculum, who will be implementing it if there hasn’t been transformation with regards to the staff in universities?”
- Also introduces question of transformation, or rather, “what does decolonisation look like in terms of transformation?”
- Are *transformation* and *decolonisation* linked? Are they separate? If separate, which should be implemented first?
- Example of position of the “need to transform first before decolonising”. Following this position, transformation would involve increasing the physical representation of black/African academics, as these academics would be better able to contribute to the decolonisation of the curriculum. Need for representation emphasised, “can’t have decolonized education if the people it is supposed to serve are not in the space”.
- Also question of whether equality needs to be achieved and what this entails, or “how are we going to achieve this equality?”

University space, structure, institutional culture and climate

- University space “must be made accessible, that it is not only privileged students that can make it to these spaces”.
- Stellenbosch University needs to be made “comfortable for people of colour”. SU has a negative “image”; is perceived as being exclusively Afrikaans; only concerned with own “traditions” and not willing to “learn from other cultures”. The space is not comfortable for black people and therefore needs to be more welcoming to black people. The university’s image or perception of university needs to be changed so that people of all backgrounds are willing to “come here”.
- Needs to ask “what is it about the university that discourages especially black people to come to the university?” Also, “why is it difficult for the university to transform?”
- African students are “challenged by the culture”. The male-only and female-only residences are problematic spaces. “You find that in single sex residences there is less progression compared to mix-gendered residences”. These spaces reinforce

“Afrikaner” culture and tradition and do not accommodate and are not willing to learn from other cultures.

- Language policy identified as problematic. The use of Afrikaans itself is not a problem; it is when it is used as a tool/method of exclusion is when it is a problem.
- The system also enforces inequality in terms of finances, “because to reserve residence-accommodation, there must be a certain fee paid which many black households cannot afford”.
- Residence culture identified as problematic. Students feel like they have to change who they are to fit in with residence and feel forced to follow residence traditions.
- Residences create “othering” and alienate students.
- Residences need to be decolonised, new traditions have to be created to accommodate everyone and erase “othering”.

Co-curricular activities

- *Vensters* as example. The themes and stories depicted in *Vensters* performances echo Western stories. African stories and realities are rarely, if ever, portrayed.

2.2 How to draw other students into the conversation on decolonisation

These discussions centred on questions of how to enable students to have conversations about decolonisation, the roles of leadership structures in residences and staff/management in this conversation, and how students have experienced having these conversations on campus.

- *Vensters* can be used as a platform to tell African stories. Should have African themes and be African based.
- Residence culture needs to be decolonised. Meetings should be held with people from different “spheres/cultures” in order determine what is exclusionary within residences and reverse this.
- HKs are called to do more groundwork in their residences. This will enable them to really understand the community within their residence.
- HKs need subgroups or subcommittees that are concerned with making residence space inclusive to all of its residents. Responsibility should go beyond HK within residences, also because HKs are often not representative of its residents.

- Importance of need for safe spaces to enable conversations about decolonisation and decolonising the curriculum is emphasised.
- Start by giving decolonisation a “proper meaning”, as it has negative and erroneous connotations that makes it difficult for conversation to happen.
- Student leaders are expected to interact with students on these matters.
- Students should be encouraged to not only have these conversations with each other, but to also bring these discussions back to home, to have these conversations “beyond the university.”
- Since these issues under discussion are social issues, we have to acknowledge that it affects people in ways that may elicit an emotional response (feel hurt, angry). The emotional and psychological implications also need to be addressed before we can move forward.
- Acknowledges that the university creates spaces for critical thoughts and discussions. Problem identified lies with HKs in certain residences who refuse to utilise the residence space as platforms for critical discussions. HKs need to facilitate conversations about decolonisation in their residences.
- Suggested that residences should organise more informal social gatherings where discussions about decolonisation are held (not just more “formal” critical engagement platforms), especially in residences/spaces that privilege white, Afrikaner students where there often is a resistance to such topics. The meaning of decolonisation should also be made clear in these social gatherings before informal conversations commence.
- The onus should also be on students to educate themselves on the matter, as opposed to resisting the topic.
- Students should also inform students around them about these matters without alienating them.
- The role of HKs and other student leadership on campus should be redefined. Often good at planning socials but not that good at participating in these critical discussions events.
- Acknowledges Metanoia and Huis Russel Botman as spaces where these conversations usually take place and asks what role these residences can play to ensure that these conversations start taking place elsewhere on campus. Other spaces need to aspire to be like these residences. Also emphasises making use of spaces that are already there and incorporate the issues that needs to be addressed.

- It is important for leaders on campus to keep encouraging people to be part of conversations held on campus.
- There is a divide between students and staff, and students and management. Students feel access to management and staff is difficult to the point where students cannot express themselves to these structures. Students feel like we do not have enough access to the people who can help us, and asks “who these people are”.
- Support staff and academic staff members need to engage with students and “walk the path with them”.
- Students’ experiences of having critical discussions on campus have rarely been peaceful and have mostly been “aggressive”. These discussions tend to dismantle after a while, because of such unsettling experiences.
- Discussions sometimes turn “violent” in cases where these matters as communicated by students often do not reach or are not responded to by management. When communication “is cut out, violence is inevitable”.

2.3 How the university should be held accountable with reference to decolonisation

- Management needs to be more open to and effective in listening to students. Frustration around not feeling heard.
- Management is “not connected to students and campus-life”. Management needs to “be brought down to student level”.
- The university accommodates white people and thereby preserves the white culture. There is a refusal to acknowledge that the university does not accommodate everyone. The onus is often unfairly on black people to create these spaces for themselves.
- There is a resistance and unwillingness to engage with the truth and addressing privilege of certain students and academics on campus. These privileges and disregard thereof hinder the progress of equality, transformation and decolonisation.
- The university needs to be held accountable by acknowledging its historical role, by “unwrapping” and acknowledging its endorsement of and contributions to injustices in the past.

3. Summary

Moving beyond the classroom, a decolonised university would be an inclusive and welcoming space that accommodates all of its students and staff without ignoring and erasing any person or group of people's culture, actuality and history. It would be a fair, just impartial, non-discriminatory and safe place for all of its students and staff. It would be a place that prioritises African history, contributions and realities, and that incorporates these into what we are learning and what we are exposed to on campus.

On the topic of history, the university should strive to discontinue one-sided, partisan accounts of history and instead develop even-handed narratives that reflect and take multiple perspectives of history into account. Such even-handed narratives would be a more "trustworthy" representation of our African history and its implications for our current contexts and realities.

On the topic of a need for a focus on African contributions, this involves the need to acknowledge and honour African actors' contributions to academia. It also includes the responsibility of the university to produce academics, scholars, scholarship and research that reflects and speaks to African needs and conditions of reality, and on the whole uplifts the African continent. Additionally, there is a need to prioritise African knowledge systems and incorporate this into what we are exposed to and learned at the university.

The university's tendency to strive to be like European universities and to attain European ideals hinders the possibility of the decolonisation of the university. Instead, the university needs to start thinking and positioning itself as an African university. Another hindrance in the pursuit towards decolonisation is the university's preoccupation with building strong institutional ties and partnerships with European universities and neglecting the need to build ties with other African universities. In other words, the university should start fostering strong institutional ties and partnerships with other African universities instead.

This Eurocentric mind-set that the university has should be dismantled for reasons other than those outlined above. Besides creating an exclusionary space, this mind-set obstructs equality, transformation and representation. Acknowledged as necessary yet complex and often contested principles, students are aware that these issues require further deliberation, especially within the context of decolonisation. At present, the fact that the majority of students and staff are white was raised as a concern. This included observations that academic staff positions,

especially those that are seen as more prestigious, are usually reserved for white male lecturers and professors. This then begs the question of who would be responsible for developing a decolonised curriculum, as it would be more fitting for black African members of the academic staff to develop such a curriculum. This also pointed to the need for more black African academics to be appointed by the university. On the other hand, with the majority of students at the university being white, it also points to the need of an increase in the number of black students at the university. The university space has to be decolonised for this to be achieved, and suggestions on what this entails will be discussed momentarily. Closer to the issue of representation, this then begs the question of who the decolonised curriculum would speak to and serve if the majority of the student population is white.

A decolonised university space must be perceived as accessible to prospective students, and moreover be accessible to its students irrespective of their background – and everything that this might entail. As previously stated, the university has to be “comfortable for people of colour”, and this is made difficult by the university’s image, structures, institutional culture and climate that makes it clear that the space primarily accommodates and privileges white – and especially white Afrikaner – students.

Campus residences – more so single-sex residences to be precise – have especially been identified as examples of spaces that are not welcoming to black students. As residences that historically exclusively accommodated white Afrikaner students, the white Afrikaner culture and its traditions have become hegemonic in these residential contexts – although this hegemonic culture is reflected throughout the entire campus as well. The result of this is that these residences currently impose traditions associated with the white Afrikaner culture on its black residents, expecting them to celebrate this one culture without incorporating the cultures of all of its residents. Additionally, whenever students resist this imposition, they become marginalised. These spaces, in other words, exclude black students and are therefore not welcoming and friendly to all of the students.

Residences can therefore be viewed as an example of the institutional culture and climate of the entire university campus that is characteristically Eurocentric, privileges white students and staff, and therefore excludes, marginalises, and alienates black students. This also creates further divide between students and leads to “othering”, again emphasising the need for the development and honouring of Afrocentric narratives. Besides possibly facilitating this in ways already previously discussed, another suggestion was that *Vensters* performances should move

away from reflecting Western stories and storylines, and rather portray African cultures, stories and realities as a way of promoting Afrocentric narratives instead.

Another factor in the pursuit to decolonise residences – by extension, also the rest of the campus – is to organise more and frequent critical engagement platforms that facilitate discussions around decolonisation. It was suggested that more and frequent informal social gatherings should also be organised where students are encouraged to have such conversations in less official settings. These are to be organised and facilitated by HKs and other student leaders, and they are therefore expected to bring the conversation to students who usually may not engage with such matters. It was remarked that some HK members have to be held accountable in this regard, as they often resist such necessary expectations, even if these expectations are articulated to them by management. At the same time, it was remarked that the onus should also be on students to educate themselves on these and relevant matters. Students should also be encouraged and expected to have conversations about decolonisation with each other and even with people outside of the university context without that does not lead to further alienation.

These abovementioned suggestions consider ways of drawing other students into the conversations about decolonisation and the decolonisation of the curriculum. It was mentioned that in drawing students in and having such discussions, we should be aware that it may hit close to home and could evoke emotionally charged responses, and that such reactions should be respected.

Students' past experiences with having these conversations have been described as having been hostile. This can be traced back to the divide and gaps in communication between students and staff, and students and management. In wanting to enable this conversation on decolonisation, students have found it difficult to find staff members that are easily approachable and open to engage in such conversations. With regards to management, students have repeatedly found that when management does not promptly respond to students' concerns regarding such conversations, students become frustrated and this has hostile or "violent" results. This hostile experience often eventually leads to the end of such conversations.

On the part of the university in this regards, the university should be more open to and effective in listening to students. In future then, when students want to engage with management on conversations about decolonisation, the necessary steps have to be taken to ensure that the channels of communication operate effectively. The university staff is also advised to engage

and “walk the path with students”. The divide between students and staff, and management and staff should therefore be bridged by having management and staff “come down to students’ level”. In the pursuit of decolonisation, the university has to acknowledge that it creates and perpetuates a space that is not accommodating to all of its students and staff, identify how this is enacted, and moreover have to find effective ways to rectify this. This is related to the need for the university to acknowledge that it privileges white people, promotes Eurocentric approaches, celebrates a detrimental one-sided history, and perpetuates hegemonic white Afrikaner culture and traditions at the expense of people of colour, Afrocentric approaches and African knowledge systems, an even-handed account of history and other African cultures. Finally, the university has to hold itself accountable for its historical role in endorsing, contributing to and implementing injustices of the past that also shaped the current realities of inequality and injustice that we are faced with.



**STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY
TRANSFORMATION PLAN (TP)**

March 2017

This document is forthcoming from the Institutional Transformation Committee. It had been amended and approved by the Rector's Management Team and Senate after campus wide consultation.

The English version of the Transformation Plan is the source document.

Submitted by:

Prof Nico Koopman

(Vice-Rector Social Impact, Transformation and Personnel)

Ms Monica du Toit

(Head Transformation Office)

Table of contents

1. Introduction and background
2. Objectives of the TP
3. Core definition of transformation
4. Themes for organising transformation objectives and outcomes
 - 4.1 Place
 - 4.2 Programmes
 - 4.3 People
5. Transformation Policies
6. Key Transformation Performance Areas
7. Institutional structures for transformation
8. Addendum

1. Introduction and background

This Transformation Plan (TP) aims to advance the implementation and operationalisation of the Institutional Intent and Strategy (IIS) of Stellenbosch University (SU). The IIS explicitly anticipates and mandates the development of a TP to promote its own implementation. The TP also aligns with the transformation imperatives of the Institutional Plan (IP) of the University, which stipulates the strategic management indicators and key performance areas with regard to transformation, as well as with the transformation parameters of the business plans of faculties and the professional academic support services environments. The TP is guided by the values of SU, namely excellence, shared accountability, empathy, innovation and leadership in service of others.

The TP draws upon various external documents, which include:

- the 1996 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, with its Bill of Rights;
- the White Paper on Education and Training (1995);
- the subsequent Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education: Education White Paper 3 (1997);
- the Higher Education Act of 1997;
- the Soudien Report of 2008 (Report of the Ministerial Committee on Transformation and Social Cohesion and the Elimination of Discrimination in Public Higher Education Institutions);
- the draft Transformation Barometer, which is currently being developed under the auspices of the Department of Higher Education and Training;
- the 2015 Durban Statement on Transformation in Higher Education (DHET 2nd Higher Education Summit Oct 2015); and
- the HSRC Report on Transformation in Higher Education 2017

The TP is developed in a context of accelerated and deepening transformation. The higher education sector in South Africa including SU, have experienced a period of unprecedented turmoil and change over the past few years. This period of instability, accompanied by the significant growth that SU has experienced over the past decade, has given rise to new challenges and opportunities. With its future-oriented focus, as outlined in the IIS 2013–2018, SU is well positioned to maximise its impact and to fulfil its commitment to create inclusive and diverse experiences for its students and staff members in order to unleash their full potential. The TP serves as one of the vehicles for achieving this goal.

Through its TP, SU commits itself to co-creating A New African University where its students and staff work, live, listen and learn, deliberating on the relevance of our knowledge and producing new knowledge to move our society from an exclusive past to a socially just, sustainable, thriving, democratic future. The need for comprehensive transformation at university level is widely acknowledged and has become ever more urgent.

2. Objectives of the TP

The objectives of the TP are to:

- 2.1 coordinate, facilitate and advance transformation as an embedded, systemic, inclusive and integrated process and practice at SU;
- 2.2 create synergy in our institutional understanding of a working definition of transformation for SU;
- 2.3 offer a historic and national context for transformation in higher education and its alignment with national aspirations;
- 2.4 establish guidelines, principles and parameters for university-wide transformation actions;
- 2.5 establish a reporting, monitoring and evaluation framework aligned with the IIS to track transformation actions and progress; and
- 2.6 initiate and guide the development of TP's in the various university environments.

3. Core definition of transformation

3.1 In this TP transformation is defined as follows:

Transformation at SU is an intentional and structured process of profound change of the University's places, people and programmes, with the following three major aims:

Firstly, **to advance the strategic principles of the IIS**, namely

- excellence through diversity;
- access with success;
- inclusivity and co-ownership;
- future orientation and innovation.

Secondly, **to promote the realisation of the 7 overarching strategic priorities stated in the 2017-2022 IP**, namely

1. Broadening access
2. Maintaining Momentum of Excellence
3. Enhance Social Impact
4. Expanding Internationalisation
5. Advancing Systemic Transformation
6. Enhancing Systemic Sustainability
7. Executing the Campus Renewal Project

Thirdly, **to contribute** – through its people, programmes and all its activities – **to the change and renewal of society**, so that society *r e f l e c t s* **the central values of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, namely

- human dignity;
- the healing of the wounds of the nation;
- social justice;
- freedom; and
- equality.

3.2 Transformation at SU is viewed as **systemic transformation**. This implies that all dimensions of university life are involved in the transformation and renewal process. Systemic transformation also implies that all dimensions of university life contribute to the transformation of society. Transformation is therefore described as transformation of the University and transformation through the University.

- 3.3 Transformation at SU will be directed and assessed in both quantitative and qualitative ways. Although these two dimensions of transformation are distinguishable from one another, they are also interdependent and interwoven.
- 3.3.1 **Quantitative transformation** refers to those dimensions of transformation that can be clearly measured. Quantitative indicators in this TP are referred to as performance targets and include indicators that, for instance, describe the statistical diversity of the staff corps and student body, student success rates, the number of publications dealing with transformation themes, and the number of courses that build transformation competencies among students and staff.
- 3.3.2 **Qualitative transformation** refers to those dimensions of transformation that have to do with presuppositions, prejudices, attitudes, behaviours and intellectual frameworks that determine institutional processes and practices. These subconscious beliefs and attitudes often advance discrimination in terms of race, socio-economic standing, gender, sexual orientation, levels of disability, age, nationality and so forth and form part of the institutional culture. The profound change and renewal of institutional culture is at the heart of qualitative transformation. Qualitative indicators in this TP are captured as intentional transformation processes and practices.
- 3.4 **Institutional culture** refers to the subtle and subconscious pictures, expectations, perceptions, perspectives, prejudices, attitudes and intellectual frameworks with which people live and which determine the visions, values, ideals, communal identity and collective character of an institution.
- 3.5 SU, by referring to racial classification in the Admissions Policy (2017) and in this TP, does not, in any manner, condone or seek to perpetuate the effects of racial classification. In referring to race, the University recognises that past racial discrimination in South Africa (through legislative means) translates into continuing disadvantage in the present. It therefore does not attempt to determine the racial classification of students and staff but instead relies on a system of self-classification. For these purposes, all applicants are invited to indicate the racial group with which they most closely relate. Options include those adopted by the apartheid regime, namely “Black African”, “White”, “Coloured” and “Indian” but include “Asian”, “I’d prefer not to say”. These options serve as the basis for demographic reporting.
- 3.6 The transformation journey of SU is guided by the values of the IIS, namely empathy, co-accountability, servant leadership, excellence and innovation.
- 3.7 The transformation process at SU takes cognisance of the four drivers for systemic, inclusive, integrated transformation, namely: expertise, student success, diversity and systemic sustainability.

4. Themes for organising transformation objectives and outcomes

In this TP, the strategic transformation objectives and outcomes are categorised into three broad themes:

- Place
- Programmes
- People

The theme of “**place**” refers to social inclusion and changes in both the physical spaces and the foundational institutional culture that facilitate a sense of belonging among students and staff. The theme includes visual redress, welcoming culture interventions and the design and organisation of spaces that enable access to students and staff living with a range of disabilities. The focus on “place” also includes the way in which the visual identity and celebrations of SU are expressed as an institution rooted in Africa.

“**Programmes**” refers to core University programmes as well as specific transformation competencies, support and communication programmes that engage teaching, learning, innovation, research, communication and training tools to enable systemic transformation.

The theme of “**people**” includes all strategies that ensure that student, staff numbers reflect the diversity of the broader South African and African society, and that stakeholders can participate with ease in the governance structures of SU. This theme also includes strategic and institutional partnerships and stakeholders represented in alumni, service delivery and external communities.

THEMES	INDICATOR		
PLACE	Process	Practices	Performance indicators/Targets
PROGRAMMES	Process	Practices	Performance indicators/Targets
PEOPLE	Process	Practices	Performance indicators/Targets

4.1 Place: Social inclusion that facilitates belonging and that is rooted in Africa

- 4.1.1 Prioritise and expand social inclusion interventions that enable a welcoming institutional culture, greater access, facilities that validate diverse identities and needs and a visual redress strategy that is aligned with a new African university.
- 4.1.2 Advance a welcoming and enabling culture for staff, stakeholders and external partners.
- 4.1.3 Continuously renew the student welcoming programme of SU to facilitate a welcoming culture of inclusivity and co-ownership in the first and the subsequent years of study.
- 4.1.4 Renew the public semiotics, i.e. the public meaning and symbolism of the physical infrastructure of SU (buildings, signage, statues, pictures etc) in a resolute, intentional, coordinated way.
- 4.1.5 Realign and implement turn-around strategies to achieve the transformation directives of SU and the South African Constitution.
- 4.1.6 Advance gender justice and renew universal access amenities, such as bathrooms.
- 4.1.7 Alter buildings to ensure universal access to and justice for people with disabilities.

4.2 Transformation programmes

The transformation programmes of SU include expanding and developing existing core institutional programmes, as well as developing and mainstreaming new programmes aligned to the IIS. This includes learning and teaching, research and innovation, and social impact programmes, programmes aimed at building transformation competencies in students and staff, support programmes aimed at student and staff success, communication and engagement programmes, and social inclusion programmes.

4.2.1 Transformation competencies programmes

These programmes aim to advance institutional training, engagement and leadership development that prioritise key transformation and change management competencies in students and staff and include

- 4.2.1.1 the advancement, development and strengthening of the transformation competencies of staff through relevant courses for staff members; and
- 4.2.1.2 the advancement, development and strengthening of the transformation competencies of students through a coordinated core academic and co-curricular programme informally referred to as the central “Maties 101” graduate attributes, leadership and transformation course.

4.2.2 **Transformative learning and teaching programmes**

These curricular and co-curricular programmes aim to prioritise, evaluate, assess, expand and develop curriculum renewal and teaching methodologies to ensure the relevance of teaching and learning programmes for societal transformation needs in the contexts of Africanisation, decolonisation, disability, “information age” and global competitiveness.

4.2.3 **Transformative research and innovation programmes**

These programmes aim to

4.2.3.1 prioritise and deepen research outputs and themes that address the transformation needs of local and broader African societies;

4.2.3.2 strengthen existing and develop new initiatives and strategies to enlarge and diversify the pool of expertise and researchers; and

4.2.3.3 develop assessment criteria to direct, incentivise and measure synergy between research themes and research outputs and the transformation themes of the IIS and the Constitution.

4.2.4 **Transformative social impact programmes**

These programmes aim to

4.2.4.1 assist with the assessment and guidance of learning and teaching programmes and research and innovation programmes in order to advance the transformative impact of these programmes on society; and

4.2.4.2 facilitate reciprocal interaction and partnerships between university divisions and societal institutions, thereby advancing the impact of societal needs, experiences and knowledge on the programmes of SU and simultaneously enriching the transformative impact of the University on society.

4.2.5 **Transformation support programmes aimed at student and staff success**

A major imperative of so-called qualitative transformation is to address the renewal of the institutional culture of SU to ensure that it is free of all forms of overt and, especially, covert discrimination, including (but not limited to) racism, classism, sexism, patriarchy, misogyny, homophobia, heteronormativity, ableism and ageism.

The transformation of the institutional culture entails progress in overcoming prejudices being monitored in creative ways, including climate and culture surveys and narrative discourses.

The creation of a culture of open dialogue in safe spaces is essential for the creation of an institutional culture of dignity, healing, justice, freedom and equality.

These supportive strategies include:

4.2.5.1 Prioritising and expanding transformation support programmes that enable student and staff success by focusing on wellness; academic support; mentoring; psychological support; bereavement support; and preventing and reporting disciplinary breaches, sexual harassment and various forms of discrimination.

4.2.5.2 Strengthening and expanding initiatives to admit a diverse student body and to address the growing need for adequate socio-economic support and alternative funding models for students.

4.2.5.3 Ensuring justice and equity with regard to staff compensation and talent management as well as removing all inequality and discriminatory compensation and talent management practices, including those relating to women, gender non-conforming staff and people living with disabilities.

4.2.6 Transformative communication and engagement programmes

Communication and engagement programmes that institutionalise critical dialogue, facilitate transparency, and model social inclusion, the IIS values and a culture of listening will be developed and expanded. These communication and engagement include:

4.2.6.1 regular transformation campus-media articles, information and opinion pieces;

4.2.6.2 a transformation website; and

4.2.6.3 critical dialogue and engagement programmes aligned with important religious and cultural days, national and global transformation engagements and debates.

4.3 People and associated transformation processes, practices and performance targets

4.3.1 The people of the University include its staff, students, alumni, institutional partners, relevant stakeholders and role-players.

4.3.2 The transformation of the people of the University will entail:

4.3.2.1 Diversifying the staff corps by setting clear, appropriate, and challenging yet achievable targets, and implementing the directives of the Employment Equity Policy and Plan of SU.

- 4.3.2.2 Diversifying the student body by setting clear, appropriate, and challenging yet achievable targets.
- 4.3.2.3 Diversifying key institutional governance structures.
- 4.3.2.4 Enabling greater participation through intentional processes and practices to ensure that institutional diversity coincides with greater agency in the people of the University, since advancing institutional participation will enable student and staff experiences to inform institutional decisions and strategies. This includes the assessment of decision-making processes and decision-making structures to adhere to the directives and the values of the IIS.
- 4.3.2.5 Undertaking a process of monitoring and analysing longitudinal diversity trends within institutional governance structures, these including but not limited to the Students' Representative Council, house committees and private student organisations, the Institutional Forum, Senate, Council and the various subcommittees of Senate and Council, Convocation and other leadership structures. Ultimately the data should inform future strategies and interventions.
- 4.3.2.6 Developing institutional partnerships with alumni, stakeholders and role-players that adhere to the strategic priorities and values of the University.
- 4.3.2.7 Developing service delivery and sourcing procedures, practices and partnerships that adhere to the values and transformation priorities of the University.

5. Transformation Policies

All policies, plans, procedures and protocols of SU should adhere to the transformation parameters of the IIS and the Constitution. Some policies advance the transformation priorities of SU more explicitly and it is important that the processes and practices identified in transformation programmes continuously inform policies. Some of the policies, plans and codes that have a key transformation function include the:

- Employment Equity Policy
- Employment Equity Plan
- Discrimination and Harassment Policy
- Language Policy
- Admissions Policy

- Residence Placement Policy
- Transformative Student Funding Model
- Social Impact Policy
- Social Impact Plan
- Teaching and Learning Policy
- Research Policy
- Human Resources Policies
- Procurement Policies and Procedures
- Code for Student Discipline
- Statute of the University
- Code of Conduct for Staff
- Code of Conduct for Members of Council
- Protocol for Dialogue on Campus
- Protocol for Constructive Protest
- Institutional HIV Policy
- Policy regarding Students with Special Learning Needs or Disabilities

6. Transformation Key Performance Areas and Indicators ¹

TRANSFORMATION THEMES AND SUBTHEMES	STRATEGIC PRIORITY AND OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS RELATED TO PROCESSES	INDICATORS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
<p>6.1.PLACE</p> <p>6.1.1 Social inclusion programmes</p>	<p>6.1.1.1 Prioritise and expand social inclusion programmes that enable a welcoming institutional culture, greater access, facilities that validate diverse identities and needs, and a visual redress strategy that is aligned with a new African university.</p>	<p>6.1.1.1.1 Expand and develop a visual redress, renewal and renaming strategy that contextualises historical symbols, reintroduces silenced historical narratives and aligns symbols and building names with the IIS.</p> <p>6.1.1.1.2 Expand facility audits on universal design and social inclusion, including gender-neutral bathrooms and accessible building designs.</p> <p>6.1.1.1.3 Conduct signage audits to inform a coherent signage approach that adheres to universal design principles.</p> <p>6.1.1.1.4 Explore methodologies to conduct audits of the calendar and communication documents to identify existing unconscious bias and micro-aggressions and to determine the accessibility of information.</p> <p>6.1.1.1.5 Support cross-disciplinary social inclusion programmes through colloquiums, faculty-based think tanks and student campaigns.</p> <p>6.1.1.1.6 Institutionalise regular student and staff climate and culture surveys to review lived experiences and challenges with regard to inclusion</p>	<p>Develop best practices for signage on campus and make recommendations regarding redress and renaming.</p> <p>Review and strengthen best practice guidelines for a welcoming culture in student communities.</p> <p>Develop good practice guideline documents for inclusive institutional events, including recommendations for catering, entertainment and disability friendliness.</p> <p>Develop inclusive religious and commemorative calendars and institutional practices to sensitise the Campus community.</p> <p>Develop an institutional event protocol with guidelines on inclusive catering, event procedures, intercultural sensitivity and diversity with regard to both panellists and participants.</p>

1. ¹ Note that all indicators related to institutional targets are indicated in the Institutional Plan

6.2.PROGRAMMES	6.2.1.1 Identify and build key transformation and change management competencies in	6.2.1.1.1 Advance institutional training, engagement and leadership development that prioritise key transformation	Advance performance management mechanism that recognises
-----------------------	---	--	--

TRANSFORMATION THEMES AND SUBTHEMES	STRATEGIC PRIORITY AND OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS RELATED TO PROCESSES	INDICATORS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
6.2.1 Transformation competencies and skills	students and staff.	<p>competencies.</p> <p>6.2.1.1.2 Monitor, evaluate and expand the transformation training programme for staff.</p> <p>6.2.1.1.3 Develop an institutional transformation glossary of terms, concepts and reading lists.</p> <p>6.2.1.1.4 Evaluate, track, develop and expand transformation leadership co-curricular courses and workshops for students in collaboration with the Frederick van Zyl Slabbert Leadership Institute.</p> <p>6.2.1.1.5 Develop a formalised, accredited baseline institutional transformation curriculum for students across faculties with transformation content, amongst others by way of specific modules, and develop well- rounded students to become engaged citizens in society.</p>	<p>transformation competencies as a compulsory and priority skill for students and staff.</p> <p>Integrate transformation competencies in existing student and staff leadership programmes.</p>
6.2.2 Transformative learning and teaching programmes	6.2.2.1 Prioritise, expand and develop curriculum renewal and teaching methodologies to ensure the relevance of teaching and learning programmes to the societal transformation needs in the contexts of Africanisation, decolonisation and global relevance.	<p>6.2.2.1.1 Track and report on faculty-based curriculum renewal activities that include both content renewal and teaching and learning methodologies to align with societal transformation needs.</p> <p>6.2.2.1.2 Continue and expand institutional teaching and learning colloquiums, conferences and regional think tanks on curriculum renewal and emerging models.</p>	Implement critical pedagogy and academic transformation leadership awards.
6.2.3 Transformative research and innovation programmes	6.2.3.1 Prioritise and deepen research outputs and themes that address the transformation needs of local	6.2.3.1.1 Introduce annual info-graphs and intervention and recommendation reports on the demographic profile of the research cohort at SU.	Introduce annual research colloquiums that disseminate research outputs on societal impact and institutional

TRANSFORMATION THEMES AND SUBTHEMES	STRATEGIC PRIORITY AND OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS RELATED TO PROCESSES	INDICATORS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
	<p>and broader African societies.</p> <p>Develop an African footprint.</p> <p>Recognise study credits within the African context.</p>	<p>6.2.3.1.2 Monitor, expand and report on research outputs on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Themes that relate to IIS and institutional transformation needs. • Internationally recognised and local research on race, gender, disability and social justice and inclusion. • The percentage of research funding available for transformation studies. • The total number and value of grants. • The percentage and value of funding support and development initiatives. • The number of research clusters. • The number of scholarly outputs. <p>6.2.3.1.3 Establish research entities that focus on the development and implementation of the National Development Plan and the achievement of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.</p>	<p>transformation.</p> <p>Assess the role of procedural systems in research outputs and identify perceived barriers.</p> <p>Transform research awards and recognition.</p> <p>Create an institutional database of opportunities for funded research, scholarship and creative activities that address transformation and diversity issues.</p>
<p>6.2.4 Transformative Social impact programmes</p>	<p>6.2.4.1 Prioritise social impact programmes that facilitate interaction and partnerships that advance societal needs and reciprocally impact knowledge creation.</p>	<p>6.2.4.1.1 Advance and monitor the Social Impact Strategic plan.</p>	<p>Introduce best practice guidelines for social impact initiatives.</p> <p>Identify service delivery practices that prioritise social impact and BBBEE (Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment) principles and optimal working conditions and labour practices, combat discrimination and adhere to a code of conduct.</p>

TRANSFORMATION THEMES AND SUBTHEMES	STRATEGIC PRIORITY AND OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS RELATED TO PROCESSES	INDICATORS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
<p>6.2.5 Transformation support programmes aimed at student and staff success</p>	<p>6.2.5.1 Prioritise and expand transformation support programmes that enable student and staff success by focusing on wellness, academic support, mentoring, psychological support, bereavement support, and preventing and reporting disciplinary breaches, sexual harassment and discrimination.</p>	<p>6.2.5.1.1 Use annual feedback mechanisms (surveys) to gather student and staff feedback on support programmes.</p> <p>6.2.5.1.2 Implement the discrimination and sexual harassment policy and institutionalise quarterly feedback and analysis on the number and patterns of disciplinary, harassment and discrimination cases.</p> <p>6.2.5.1.3 Align IIS and transformation goals with the following implementation plans, interventions and strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Student Disciplinary Code and student services • The Staff Wellness Strategy and Plan • The Student Wellness Strategy • The Financial Support Plan for Students • Academic support and mentoring <p>2.5.1.4 Implementing a multilingual programme offering as outlined in the Language Policy.</p> <p>2.5.1.5 Student recruitment and admissions: Recruit and admit a diverse student body with the potential to succeed and to maintain and promote academic excellence through diversity.</p> <p>2.5.1.6 Student financial support.</p> <p>2.5.1.7 Residence placement: Accommodate diverse student communities within the institutional residences, with an emphasis on the placement of most vulnerable students in order to enhance their chances of success.</p>	<p>Develop and implement non- discriminatory standards and practices for research, teaching, human resource performance management and examinations.</p> <p>Advance security and law enforcement practices and responses to protest and other forms of disturbance that adhere to human rights, dignity and safety.</p> <p>Provide cost-effective student support to improve module and graduation success rates.</p>

<p>6.2.6 Transformation communication and engagement programmes</p>	<p>6.2.6.1 Develop and expand communication and engagement programmes that institutionalise critical dialogues, facilitate transparency and model social inclusion, the IIS values and a culture of listening.</p>	<p>6.2.6.1.1 Develop visual and written communication content and channels that are informative, communicate progress, articulate challenges and invite input and participation from students and staff.</p> <p>6.2.6.1.2 Design, expand and coordinate a transformation campus engagement programme and calendar in collaboration with various institutional partners, including national days and relevant national and international topics.</p>	<p>Advance communication practices that are transparent and aimed at providing students and staff with relevant knowledge about institutional structures, data and participation procedures.</p> <p>Develop survey and audit tools to standardise review</p>
--	--	---	--

TRANSFORMATION THEMES AND SUBTHEMES	STRATEGIC PRIORITY AND OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS RELATED TO PROCESSES	INDICATORS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
		<p>6.2.6.1.3 Develop an interactive and institutional transformation website and increase student and staff opinion pieces and articles on transformation issues and debates.</p> <p>6.2.6.1.4 Establish and coordinate an active institutional transformation committee and support the development of faculty and environment-based transformation committees.</p> <p>6.2.6.1.5 Advance a transformation and institutional culture of communication, engagement, visual branding and marketing strategy.</p>	<p>methodologies and identify practices that perpetuate exclusion and othering in university documentation, including the calendar and university websites.</p>
<p>6.3. PEOPLE</p> <p>6.3.1 Diversity of people</p>	<p>6.3.1.1 Increase student and staff diversity with specific focus on the increase of the percentage of black, coloured and Indian students and staff.</p> <p>6.3.1.1 Create a shared institutional responsibility for reaching the targets.</p>	<p>6.3.1.1.1 Introduce the annual monitoring, analysis and communication of progress in collaboration with stakeholder bodies and faculties with regard to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student enrolments (under and postgraduate). • Staff diversity on all post levels. • Student throughput rates. • Residential and private student organisation placements. <p>6.3.1.1.2 Advance wide engagement with the Employment Equity Report and recommendations.</p> <p>6.3.1.1.3 Advance annual engagement with faculties, departments and units with regard to targets that include equity figures and substantive initiatives to advance inclusion.</p>	<p>Advance staff recruitment practices that support diversity targets.</p> <p>Advance student recruitment, funding, placement and support practices that are fully aligned with strategic targets.</p>
<p>6.3.2 Systemic transformation</p>	<p>6.3.2.1 Governance Increase the diversity of students and</p>	<p>6.3.2.1.1 Monitor, report, analyse and communicate longitudinal diversity trends within institutional governance structures through info-graphs and other reporting tools</p>	<p>Develop institutional recommendations and best practice guidelines on election</p>

TRANSFORMATION THEMES AND SUBTHEMES	STRATEGIC PRIORITY AND OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS RELATED TO PROCESSES	INDICATORS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
	<p>staff and of women and persons living with disabilities in institutional governance structures.</p>	<p>with specific reference to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Students' Representative Council. • House committees and societies. • The Institutional Forum. • The Senate and its subcommittees. • The Council and its subcommittees. • Convocation <p>6.3.2.1.2 Develop standardised tools to report on election and voting trends to monitor the levels of participation in Council and in Students' Representative Council voting activities.</p> <p>Mandate all governance structures to formulate an annual strategy to increase diversity as part of their core responsibilities.</p> <p>6.3.2.1.3 Review the transformative impact of the current Statute and its ability to facilitate Vision 2030.</p>	<p>and nomination practices and co- option options for student and staff governance structures.</p> <p>Outline co-option strategies in case of inadequate diversity in governance structures.</p> <p>Pilot induction and training practices for governance structures to empower new members to participate fully.</p> <p>Develop mechanisms to review meeting practices and procedures with regard to inclusion and creating a democratic experience.</p>
<p>6.3.3 Participation</p>	<p>6.3.3.1 Enable greater institutional participation to channel student and staff experiences and insights fully into governance structures, including minority voices, e.g. the disability sector.</p>	<p>6.3.3.1.1 Advance, expand and support enabling platforms for affinity organisations and staff stakeholder forums, e.g. the Women's Forum, the Maties Staff Forum, LBGTQI, religious and cultural societies, the disability sector, staff and worker unions and partners.</p> <p>6.3.3.1.2 Develop an annual institutional stakeholder engagement and consultation strategy and institutionalise feedback mechanisms.</p>	<p>Develop and update an institutional annual stakeholder list.</p>

TRANSFORMATION THEMES AND SUBTHEMES	STRATEGIC PRIORITY AND OBJECTIVE	INDICATORS RELATED TO PROCESSES	INDICATORS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
6.3.4 Strategic partnerships	6.3.4.1 Develop institutional partnerships with alumni, external and internal community stakeholders, funders and higher education institutions to strengthen transformation in the higher education sector.	<p>6.3.4.1.1 Advance, and support cross-disciplinary higher education transformation networks that advise, support and share tools to strengthen transformation work.</p> <p>6.3.4.1.2 Broaden community engagement networks and forums like the Rector-Mayor forum to address transformation issues in the greater Stellenbosch and South Africa.</p>	

7. Institutional Structures for Transformation

To enhance systemic transformation at SU specific structures are established. These include:

7.1 A Vice-rector for Transformation

7.2 A Senior Director for Social Impact and Transformation

7.3 A Head for the Transformation Office

7.4 A Transformation Office

7.5 An Institutional Transformation Committee (ITC) that reports to the Rector's Management Team (RMT) – (see addendum for terms of reference of the ITC).

7.6 Transformation Committees in faculties and Professional Academic Support Services (PASS) Divisions

7.7 These structures function in close collaboration with various university structures.

8. Addendum

Terms of reference of the Institutional Transformation Committee.