



## MINUTES OF THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

### OF STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY HELD ON 4 APRIL 2016

#### IN THE SRC BOARDROOM AT 20:00

#### IN ATTENDANCE

Axolile Qina, James de Villiers, Lianda du Plessis, Marc Rudolph, Lethiwe Mbatha, Lwazi Phakade, Wim Steyn, Inge Barac, Kara Meiring, Reane Olivier, Tino Muzofa, Nonkululeko Radebe, Carmen Kennedy (Vice chair of Tygerberg, on behalf of Nicholas Wayne), Farai Mubaiwa, Brandon Frolick

**ABSENT WITH REASON** Tumelo Motse

#### ABSENT WITHOUT REASON

**OTHER ATTENDEES** Judy Lombard (minute taker)

	<b>AGENDA</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
1	<b>OPENING</b>  Mr Qina calls the meeting to order at 20:00. This is the start of the second half of their term.	
2	<b>WELCOMING AND PERSONALIA</b>  Mr Qina welcomes the members in attendance.	



3	<p><b>APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES</b></p> <p>Previous meeting was not finished.</p>	
4	<p><b>ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES</b></p> <p>None</p>	
5	<p><b>SETTING OF THE AGENDA</b></p> <p>The following points was added:</p> <p>6.8 #EndRapeCulture – F Mubaiwa</p> <p>6.8.1 #EndRapeCulture statement – J De Villiers</p> <p>6.9 Language L Mbataha</p> <p>7.4 Disciplinary committee – J De Villiers</p> <p>7.5 Equality office – J De Villiers</p> <p>7.6 Communication policy - J De Villiers</p> <p>7.7Matie diary and election convener</p> <p>7.8 SAUS Feedback – L Pakade</p> <p>Agenda was set</p>	
6	<p><b>DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS</b></p> <p>6.1. Reserve fund policy task team - L du Plessis</p>	

<p>The reserve fund that is carried over needs to be stipulated how it is used. Task team is drafted for the policy committee consisting of B. Como, L. du Plessis, M. Rudolph, Tulia George. L. Phakade - What would be the power to disregard the policy? M. Rudolph – in the policy it will state regarding amending the policy. It will be binding and the policy cannot be disregarded, and cannot be amended if policy is not followed. All motions are binding on the next SRc and they have to decide by a vote to amend it. Next SRc must be more informed on previous motions. M. Rudolph – this is only binding from this SRc onwards and not motions from previous years. A. Qina will look at S. Laing’s report and see if there are any motions. The idea is for continuity so that the next SRc does not have to start from scratch. L. du Plessis - The funds left from previous years goes into the reserve fund. T. George knows exactly what the balance sheet is and the reserve fund. Voting on task team as a whole. Task team is mandated and voted in. Votes: 10 yes, 1 abstain. Deadline for policy is 29 April.</p> <p>6.2. New Appointments - A Qina</p> <p>Two positions need to be filled in the SRc – security and branding and relations. A. Qina is interim but cannot oversee security. Two options – appoint new member in a by-election – vote in a new SRc member or open up position as a managerial position. Can appoint up unto 10 managers. Or the option is there to keep it as is and distribute responsibility amongst the SRc.</p> <p>J. de Villiers does not propose a by election – will take up to 4 weeks and the person will only start in fourth term. An appointment also takes 3 weeks. Carina Stapelberg has completed most of her responsibilities and is overseeing the new hope summit. W. Steyn</p>	<p>Deadline for reserve fund policy task team - 29 April.</p>
---	---

<p>support that they do not do a by election. M. Rudolph – M. Kruger had a sub-committee and they acting under A. Qina's authority. At the moment it is a free floating committee. There also needs to be a plan set up for when another SRc visit Stellenbosch. B. Frolick will organise it and then someone just have to help. T. Muzofu – it is redundant to elect someone if there is a committee. In the third term SRc members do not work except if they have an event. He suggests appointing one person already leading most of the work and allowing them to give feedback to SRc. M. Rudolph – it creates responsibility and obligation by appointing someone and holding them accountable. J. de Villiers – original plan was a task team, but authority and accountably is needed. T. Muzofu – is it not possible to appoint from the current subcommittee. L. Phakade - it would be ignorant not to open it up to all students as the responsibility is important. It needs to be equal for everyone to apply. A. Qina - everyone agrees to not have a by-election. This will have to be communicated to the broader student community. J. de Villiers - It is an interim procedure that has already been communicated to campus. W. Steyn – this committee is very big – all the safety HC members. The third task team is under the discretion of the SRc. They also need to have an executive committee. J. de Villiers - there needs to be a task team on how to appoint the new position. This needs to be voted on at this meeting that the SRc executive committee (EC) can take it further.</p> <p>Voting – we are opening up a managerial position for security</p> <p>A task team does not to be voted in.</p> <p>K. Meiring disagrees that the EC can vote in a manager. M. Rudolph - we cannot give the EC complete authority. We can have a task team and decide who is in it later. N. Radebe – feels it is acceptable</p>	
--	--

<p>for the EC to make these decisions because they are there for exactly this purpose in a crisis. L. Phakade – this is not a motion that has to be handed over, it deals with the situation we are in, it is not binding and can work for the EC to have voting rights on this case. This will also be the most effective way of letting the EC be in control. K. Meiring still thinks that the EC should not vote for managers in future. Romek Swadowski is to mandate security committee as a task team until the position has been filled. Voting on if EC can handle the election of the manager. Votes: 9 yes, 2 abstain. The EC can handle the situation to deal with the election of manager for safety and security. This needs to be communicated to the student community. I. Barac says that it must be clear who are taking responsibility for C Stapelberg's portfolio otherwise it is always the same people doing the work. The EC needs to keep each other accountable. If for instance UFS is coming it must be clear who is taking responsibility for it. When someone requests to see the SRc, it must be brought back to the SRc and they decide together if they are allowed to come. With regards to branding someone can be hired. R. Olivier suggests Quan Piers to be elected to do the work. M. Rudolph suggests he be paid for his work because there is money left. He worked for C. Stapelberg before and knows the work. F. Mubaiwa suggests he must be paid first for previous work. T. Muzofu reminds them that someone cannot just be chosen they have to vote on it. L. du Plessis – they can send an invoice to T. George. M. Rudolph – to hire someone as an assistant or ad hoc person they have the authority to employ someone without voting. T. Muzofu clarifies that he was under the impression they still wanted to elect someone in C. Stapelberg's position.</p> <p>6.3. Office - A Qina</p> <p>J. de Villiers and others worked on an office procedure. Only two</p>	
---	--



<p>people made comments but it needs to be voted in. Everyone has read the document. F. Mubaiwa – it must be stricter to regards with who gains access to the SRc office, because there is not always space for everyone. N. Radebe -What provision is made for Ex officio members? J. de Villiers - All sub committees have access during office hours. If someone is not part of a subcommittee only 2 people per SRc member may be there during office hours. After office hours there may be as many people as you want. L. Phakade – it will be difficult to regulate. The SRc office is a student space and constricting students in coming to the office is problematic. Each person must supervise who they allow to the office. A. Qina - this document is not for us to play cop it is for us to have guidelines on how we can share the office. R. Olivier - the policy is in relation to consistency. Once off is not a problem, but the committee members using computers for social activities when SRc members needs to use it. M. Rudolph changed a lot on the document because it was very strict. Many things still need to change. It does not bind Sharine Dowries and Tulia George. They do not work well with some SRc members because of their work ethic. M. Rudolph feels they also need to be binding to this policy. N. Radebe - What is the difference between a policy and a procedure. Does it state anything about occupation of the SRc office by students? J. de Villiers - this document is to deal with some of the ambiguity about how the SRc office is managed. Policy – contains procedure and how it is the managed – the practical implementation of it. T. Muzofu – if it is not a cop situation why is there a document and why does it need to be voted in. There is also a lot of bureaucracy at the moment and this document will create more friction. A. Qina – the document is there for us to hold each other accountable. A meeting with J. de Villiers, T. George and S. Dowries was held in order to decide how to better work in this space after which the document was drafted. F. Mubaiwa</p>	
--	--

<p>- With the meeting held is it not possible for them to undergo sensitivity training? Playing gospel music out load when Muslim and students from other beliefs are at the office is not creating an open space. Enquires if the meeting was advertised on the SRc facebook page as there is no one else present. J. de Villiers confirms that it was advertised. J. de Villiers - this complaint does not come only from T. George and S. Dowries but also from many of the SRc members.</p> <p>Voted: 8 yes, 1 no, 3 abstain. The office procedure policy is approved.</p> <p>6.4. #EndRapeCulture - Point of Order - N Radebe</p> <p>This is on the point of the meeting held on the Rooiplein. She is concerned about the bullying and blind siding of the SRc structure. She recalls that F. Mubaiwa stated on group that the meeting will be cancelled if the majority of the SRc members are not there. That does not make sense if the meeting is for everyone on campus. Ten SRc members were there but still we are questioned on unity. Are we mandated to attend all events? It seemed by the threatening message that they did not do their job. Why was the chair person called up at the meeting? Hence the blind siding part – he was clearly not aware that he was going to be called up. The EC was also called up - what communication happened between womxn empowerment and the EC? F. Mubaiwa – the SRc needs to be there according to policy for the event to be legal. The university staff cannot attend an illegal gathering. The SRc needs to be marshals. At SRc events the SRc always needs to be marshals at the meetings on the Rooiplein. She needed to rely to management that the meeting will be legal. Rape Culture is not the mandate of the Transformation portfolio etc. It should be the mandate of each SRc</p>	
--	--

<p>member. This portfolio was thrown on them even though it was not in their stipulation. This was a social issue that needed to be addressed. They started off by chalking campus. This situation was thrown to her and she was expected as a woman to fight for this. This is everyone's issue. F. Mubaiwa, R. Olivier, K. Meiring met with the SSVO and also security personnel. As to why the SRc chair was called up, she was not handling the meeting. And then they called up Munita Dunn (SSVO) and Louis Vlok (Crisis centre), but F. Mubaiwa was not chairing the meeting. The students wanted to know what the chair is doing to end rape culture, and that is why he was called up. The chair then said the EC is fully committed to the campaign. But F. Mubaiwa feels that only one person from the EC helped her – M. Rudolph. She sees that it is discussed in the EC meetings, but feel that they should not be approaching the EC about this, they need to be part of it. Because of F. Mubaiwa's relationship with management they contacted the Rectors Management Team (RMT). Rape culture on this campus is a thing and it is concerning if there is still members of the SRc that is not aware of the fact. It is almost inhumane to force people to care for something that is inhumane. If the students have to hold us accountable, with what information do they go about doing it? There is a difference in leading as a facade and truly leading students.</p> <p>R. Olivier speaks from her experience. She left the whatsapp group because they continually spoke about #EndRapeCulture on the group and no one responds. Everyone does not have to attend all events but it is different when the situation is one of social justice. She does not understand why this need to be minuted as N. Radebe could have spoken to them directly. They only received the minutes of the EC meeting very late – this could be the responsibility of the RMT. The EC cannot say one thing and do another. We only hear of</p>	
--	--



<p>what the EC does and do not see the results. K. Meiring - it is impossible to attend all events but F. Muraiwa informed them one and a half months ago. There is then enough time to inform F. Mubaiwa if you can attend or not and to plan to attend. Just because the SRc made a portfolio about Womxn empowerment does not mean we are championing the needs of womxn in general, the actions still need to follow. L. Phakade – within the SRc there is a lack of support and attending others events. There is a general lack of response in the whatsapp group. It would have been better to inform the chairperson beforehand that he is going to be called up, because it felt like an attack on the SRc structure in general. With regards to RMT meetings there is probably a lack of communication back to the SRc. Suggests other SRc members also be invited to support EC at the RMT meetings. It is problematic that there is few woman part of these meetings. T. Muzofu – the SRc as a structure is under threat. Everyone is busy with their own events in their own portfolios. When campaigning something we cannot rely on others who are already very busy. But we can ask for help and support. We need to handle our own portfolios. We must be careful on how we approach people and respond in a public space i.e. Twitter. As a structure we need to submit to the authority of the chairperson. At the campaign a negative image was created of the SRc. L. Mbatha – our students respond to the SRc in general, not to individuals. We must not forget about our reputation, it cannot only be about what we want but we need to be careful on how we react. If we do not understand our own significance as a member. We cannot feel hurt when people do not respond on the whatsapp group. She feels that F. Mubaiwa is respected and people jump in response to her – not everyone is that privileged. F. Mubaiwa – states again that it was not planned to call up the chairperson. F. Mubaiwa constantly asks when there is an RMT meeting and never gets a response.</p>	
--	--

<p>#EndRapeCulture is not her portfolio, only the campaign was. But the campaign itself should not be her portfolio. This should be the SRc's responsibility in general. She responded to help because she is a woman and cares about social justice. It is a problem if she does not have a support network from the committees and groups she forms part of. It is problematic for her to get people to care about social injustice. To date 5 rapes took place on campus this year. As a SRc why are we not doing more about the situation? Commends A. Qina for apologising on the email that the EC did not do more. How many rapes will it take for the SRc to wake up? M. Rudolph – we have an extra responsibility to touch base. As an EC we need to make an effort to be informed. We have no excuse if we know what is on the agenda of an RMT meeting. We cannot deal with topics if we have not been diligent in getting the correct information. Our decisions have been labelled as authoritarian and we have increased the gap between us and other leaders that we are working with. As an EC they have not been doing enough. The EC needs to be informed of situations. A. Qina – we are not communicating effectively. We need to define what the purpose of the whatsapp group and emails is. We cannot expect administration to be handled on a whatsapp group but on an email. The focus cannot be on the EC but on the SRc as a whole. We all have our individual portfolios but there are some things that we need to champion together. That means we need to support each other. We need to honour each other. We are too critical and too negative. Respond if you cannot attend an event. Never again shall we offend one another as a body in public. We deal with it together but not in public. It is not just about the EC but about every SRc member. We will do more; we will meet with the Critical Engagement portfolio members. B. Frolick feels this discussion should be held in camera. We need to be serious and commit.</p>	
--	--

<p>6.5. Ex Officio:</p> <p>6.5.1. AAC - N Radebe</p> <p>6.5.1.1. Recruitment – embarking on an outreach to a school in Kayalitsha. They are going on Thursday with a representative from each faculty informing them about applications. The recruitment office will help with fees.</p> <p>6.5.1.2. AAC day – All the faculties will be on the Rooiplein together between 10:00 and 13:00 on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April. The deans have been invited, but not all can attend. They have permission to be on the Rooiplein. Please try to attend. J. de Villiers – please send an invite to everyone on email. A. Qina – all events needs to be communicated via email to go on their calendars.</p> <p>6.5.1.3. Class Representative training launch – irrelevant and did not discuss.</p> <p>6.5.2. PC - I Barac and W Steyn</p> <p>Dr Antoinette van Der Merwe came to speak to them on the language policy.</p> <p>There were many task team feedbacks.</p> <p>Spoke about safety on campus. They had the initiative of having a neighbourhood watch. Meeting with Viljoen van der Walt and all the security personnel of the campus to give feedback this Thursday.</p> <p>6.5.3. SC - K Meiring</p> <p>Not everyone replied to give feedback on the language policy.</p>	
---	--

<p>Issue with societies not having the correct amount of money in their accounts – admin problem that will be sorted out. SC training has not happened because only 15 members respond. The training is now incorporated into the meetings. They may not miss more than two meetings.</p> <p>A woman approached her about a charity called beauty life. Giving training to homeless and helping them to get a job. They need volunteers to help them maintain the website etc. They also want endorsement from the university. Suggest students from social work to help, also Danny Bezuidenhout and N. Radebe to attend meeting.</p> <p>6.6. Protest Policy Task Team dissolution - M Rudolph</p> <p>The task team was advertised numerous times but no one committed to join. He proposes to draft a policy based on research he has done and then give to the SRc to comment. W. Steyn suggests other student bodies are also asked to comment for instance the PC. M. Rudolph will submit it to all the different structures. And by the next RMT meeting it must be finished (21 April).</p> <p>6.7. Sustainability &amp; Nuclear Power - L Mbatha</p> <p>With her sustainability portfolio there was a reconstructing of the Vensters and Green cup portfolio. Everything was considered – from noise levels to paint.</p> <p>A few students have been given land to have their own gardens. A social innovation project is being run at Kayamandi.</p> <p>An informal settlement development is busy taking place where they are involved.</p>	<p>M. Rudolph finish protest policy – 21 April</p>
--	--



<p>A renewable energy program is also going to start - #NuclearPowerMustFall and renewables must rise. This campaign will be run and supported by them. Students will be informed on how they impact energy, nuclear power and renewable energy. L. Mbatha will update the SRc after the 15<sup>th</sup> of April. You can decide to support. R. Olivier thanks L. Mbatha for creating awareness. She suggests working with the PC and having a workshop regarding #NuclearMustFall. M. Rudolph asks that L. Mbatha send him the information and send it to the other SRc members so that everyone is sufficiently informed. A. Qina asks that all members keep the SRc updated on portfolios and give feedback on events.</p> <p>6.8 #EndRapeCulture – F Muraiwa</p> <p>Tomorrow is a rape culture consciousness workshop with Prof Amanda Gouws.</p> <p>There are a lot more call outs from residences.</p> <p>HeForShe, Sasco and other societies are also joining them on the #EndRapeCulture.</p> <p>The assault task team is now established consisting of a diverse group of people. They are having their second meeting next week.</p> <p>Some improvements have been seen after the petition has been handed over. There are more G4S vans and two securities at each post. The SSVO is receiving sensitivity training.</p> <p>R. Olivier – this month is sexual assault month and asks that a statement is made on behalf of the SRc. Friday the 15<sup>th</sup> of April is day of Silence for all that have been sexually assaulted. She suggests a men only workshop where men are facilitating a discussion. B. Frolick is concerned that there was no security on</p>	<p>Update from L Mbatha after 15<sup>th</sup> April on #NuclearPower MustFall</p> <p>A. Qina discuss workshop with R. Olivier and</p>
---	---



<p>a dance competition like the ser. Appreciation for everyone judging at the English debating. Nationals meeting went well in Pretoria. Theatre festival is from the 18<sup>th</sup> of April. The final is the 28th of April.</p> <p>7.2. Tygerberg - N Wayne</p> <p>C. Kennedy - At the last TSR they voted in the TAAC constitution as default. The postgraduate constitution is also voted in. Changes have to be made to the TSR constitution. They had their first Student Parliament last week. Last month they had Straat fees and discussions on #EndRape Culture. Their term reports are due at the end of the week.</p> <p>7.3. MILAC T Motse</p> <p>7.4 Disciplinary committee – J De Villiers</p> <p>Busy with the redrafting of the code of conduct of the SRc members.</p> <p>7.5 Equality office – J De Villiers</p> <p>Two task teams were initiated. R. Olivier is a representative of the task team but suggests Bandile Mndebele to be added as well. R Olivier still wants to know who nominated her as she was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>7.6 Communication policy - J De Villiers</p> <p>Section on social media will be added.</p> <p>7.7Matie diary and election convener</p> <p>Applications will be sent out ASAP. Suggests a task team be set up from SRc to appoint the members</p>	
---	--

	<p>7.8 SAUS Feedback – L Phakade</p> <p>Attended SAUS (SA Unit for Students) with B. Frolick over the weekend. L. Phakade will have an event on mental health awareness and student success.</p>	
<p>8</p>	<p>QUESTIONS AND VARIA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A. Qina – thinking about a fencing project where the residences are fenced (as we cannot fence Stellenbosch) and only students are allowed to access with student cards.</li> <li>• A. Qina - suggests we go to classes and see first-hand what are the situations regarding the language policy.</li> <li>• A. Qina – want to improve communication by the weekly emails. Please respond.</li> <li>• A. Qina – term reports must be finished by the end of the month.</li> <li>• J. de Villiers – language policy has been sent out to the different structures.</li> <li>• J. de Villiers – office duty list has been emailed. Please remove your name if you do not want to do duty at the specific time. Please inform him if you do not want to be on the list.</li> <li>• R. Olivier – Constitutionally she was under the impression that they have to do office duty. Asks that the EC minutes be out on time.</li> <li>• R. Olivier – Question on internal moderations and when they are going to receive it.</li> <li>• F. Mubaiwa - asks that everyone do something on #EndRapeCulture in their different portfolio.</li> <li>• B. Frolick – suggests looking into bench marking with other</li> </ul>	





	<p>university.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B. Frolick – suggests having a student leader social hosted by the SRc.</li> <li>• M. Rudolph – asks that they reply on feedback regarding the EC minutes.</li> <li>• M. Rudolph – check who is cc'ed in emails sent and make sure that the relevant persons are informed.</li> <li>• M. Rudolph – Please send all emails in English. Please do not reply thank you when an email is sent.</li> <li>• K Meiring and A Qina will be going to Belgium until the 18<sup>th</sup> of April.</li> </ul>	
9	<p><b>NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Monday, 18 April 2016, TBC</p>	
10	<p><b>CLOSING</b></p> <p>Mr Qina adjourns the meeting at 23:20</p>	