**MINUTES OF THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL**

**OF STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY HELD ON 14 September 2015**

**IN THE SRC BOARDROOM AT 21:00**

**IN ATTENDANCE** James de Villiers, Lianda du Plessis, Carina Stapelberg, Lethiwe Mbatha, Bradley Frolick, Mynhardt Kruger, Axolile Qina, Marc Rudolph, Lwazi Phakade, Kara Meiring, Natasha Woudberg, Wim Steyn, Inge Barac, Nick Wayne, Danielle Bezuidenhoud.

**ABSENT WITH REASON** Tumelo Motse

**ABSENT WITHOUT REASON**

**OTHER ATTENDEES** Brandon Como, Mothlebane Koloi, Farai Mabaiwa, Victoria Thomas (Minute taker), Derick Truscott

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AGENDA** | ACTION |
| 1 | **CALL TO ORDER**  Mr Qina calls the meeting to order at 21:03. | None |
| 2 | **WELCOMING AND PERSONALIA**  Mr Qina welcomes the room to first Student Representative Council meeting of the 2015/2016 SRC term. | None |
| 3 | **APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES** | None |
| 4 | **SETTING OF AGENDA**  5.5 MAD2/MGD  5.6 Critical Engagement  5.6 ‘Maties’ Identity  5.7 PGIO  5.8 Office Conduct  5.9 #iamstellenbosch | None |
| 5 | **DISCUSSION AND FEEDBACK**  **5.1 Election of Policy Officer**  Mr Qina informs SRC members and room of regulations regarding the election of the policy officer for the 2015/2016 SRC term.  Mr Rudolph avails himself for the position of Policy Officer. Mr Rudolph addresses the room and answers questions.  With thirteen ‘Yes’ votes and one ‘Abstaining’ vote, Mr Rudolph is elected as the policy officer for the 2015/2016 SRC term.  **5.2 Election of Communication Officer**  Mr Qina informs SRC members and room of regulations regarding the election of the Communication Officer for the 2015/2016 SRC term.  Mr De Villiers avails himself for the position of Communication Officer. Mr De Villiers addresses the room and answers questions.  With fourteen ‘Yes’ votes, Mr De Villiers is elected as the COMMUNICATION officer for the 2015/2016 SRC term.  **5.3 Amendment of Student Constitution and Voting**  Mr Qina reads through the motion for the Amendment of Student Constitution.  Mr Wayne questions the issue of dividing the honoraria to compensate for the additional executive members and the affect on the SRC. Mr Frolick mentions that the honorarium will not affect the SRC budget.  Mr Steyn comments that important decisions will be addressed by the entire SRC; however, the executive committee can be more effective as a smaller group for more pressing matters.  Ms Meiring mentions that the executive committee should be increased in size for a better representation of students, as well as for meeting *quorum*.  Mr de Villiers questions the affect that this motion will have on future SRC committees.  Mr Qina mentions the change in the size of the executive committee through recent years. Mr Qina mentions that the SRC has already shown transparency and the ability to unite campus that that aligns with the SRC vision. Mr Qina mentions that decisions affecting campus should not be made by only the executive committee, but rather the entire SRC.  With eight ‘No’ votes, two ‘Abstaining’ votes and four ‘Yes’ votes, the motion for the Amendment of the Student Constitution is not passed.  **5.4 Task Team for Welcoming Period**  Mr de Villiers suggests establishing a task team for welcoming week to address the concerns of the SRC.  Ms Barac mentions that the task team can work towards bridging the gap between the SRC and students.  Mr Pakade questions the role of the task team. Mr de Villiers: the task team will bring recommendations to the SRC which then can be voted in; however, the recommendations will not be binding.  Mr Pakade mentions that the role of the task team overlaps with that of the portfolio of Student Success and NSFAS. Mr Pakade suggests that the task team for welcoming week falls in line with the portfolio of student success.  Ms Barac recommends that the role of the SRC within welcoming week should be addressed.  Mr Qina suggests that the task team should be further discussed when relevant parties understand what it will actually do as it is a problem we need to address, further he asks that this be addressed in the next meeting as an agenda point.  **5.5 MAD2/MGD**  Ms Bezuidenhoud gives feedback on the recent Social Impact (Previously known as MGD) meeting which took place to define the roles of the MAD2 and Social Impact.  Ms Bezuidenhoud explains that the portfolios of Social Impact and MAD2 will fall under a single SRC portfolio. The new portfolio structure will consist of one chairperson (Who is a SRC member), two vice-chairpersons (One for Social impact and one for MAD2) and two separate committees for Social impact and MAD2. The two committees will work separately, but will be aligned. The MAD2 committee and Social Impact committee may collaborate on projects throughout the year.  Ms Bezuidenhoud explains that the position of vice-chair of Social Impact has yet to be appointed and will be done by means of an application process, which will be advertised by the SRC. The honorarium for the vice-chair of Social Impact will fall under the MAD2 and Social Impact portfolio budget.  Mr Qina explains the umbrella affect of mad2 and social impact to prolong mad2 throughout the year.  The Social Impact committee is yet to be appointed and will be done so accordingly.  The proposed motion is that MAD2 and Social impact will fall within the same SRC portfolio.  With fourteen ‘Yes’ votes, the motion passed.  **5.6 Critical Engagement**  Mr Frolick mentions a document formulated by Miss Farai Mubaiwa to address critical engagement on the University Campus. Mr Frolick and Miss Farai Mubaiwa suggest three critical engagement portfolios: Women empowerment, Consciousness and Gender identity & Sexuality.  Mr Frolick mentions the discussions with the Transformation office to increase the funding of the critical engagement portfolio.  Ms Barac questions the difference between having only one critical engagement manager or three critical engagement managers for each of the proposed topics. Ms Barac questions whether other topics would be addressed.  Miss Mabaiwa addresses the room and clarifies that all critical engagement falls under consciousness. Miss Mubaiwa addresses the three suggested engagement topics and stresses the importance of having a critical engagement manager for each of the proposed topics.  Mr Qina suggests that the LLL philosophy and initiative should be considered for increased critical engagement. Mr Qina suggests that the LLL houses be connected with the university residences.  Ms Meiring stresses that the funding of the three manager portfolios should not affect the decision to pass the motion.  The first proposed motion is that three managerial critical engagement portfolios be established, while the second motion is that one managerial portfolio is established with three sub-portfolios for the critical engagement topics.  By the voting of hands, the first motion passed.  **5.6 Maties Identity**  Ms Stapelberg suggests that the portfolio of Maties Identity should be changed from a SRC portfolio to a managerial position.  The motion is that the Matie Identity position is consolidated with the Inclusivity portfolio and becomes a managerial portfolio and no longer falls under Ms Stapelberg’s SRC portfolio.  By the voting of hands with the count of seven to six, the motion is passed that the Matie Identity portfolio becomes a managerial position.  **5.7 Post Graduate International Office (PGIO)**  Mr de Villiers suggests that the PGIO portfolio be moved to Ms Stapelberg and fall under her own SRC portfolio.  Mr Qina informs attendees of the concept behind PGIO. The aim of the portfolio is that there is a representative for the voice of the post-graduate and international students.  Mr Koloi (student attending the meeting) suggesting that the portfolio still needs to be well developed and SRC should give it a chance to ensure it does what it should, which is represent Post graduate students effectively. Mo further indicates that Tino tried but he couldn't do it effectively due to being too busy with his other portfolio.  Also how Mr Wayne indicates how at Tygerberg they have ensured that this portfolio exists at Tygerberg, is effective and represents the needs of post-graduate students.  The first proposed motion is that PGIO becomes a managerial portfolio within SRC and the second is that PGIO becomes a Managerial Position.  By the voting of hands, the motion is passed that the PGIO portfolio becomes a managerial position.  **5.8 Office Conduct**  Mr de Villiers mentions that the SRC Code of Conduct will be put under review. The adapted document presented at the following SRC meeting.  Mr de Villiers suggests a motion that the SRC office be established as a professional environment during the office hours between 8am until 5pm.  By the voting of hands, the motion is passed.  **5.9 #iamstellenbosch**  Mr Mothlebane Koloi and Mr Derick Truscott address the room regarding the #iamstellenbosch campaign.  Mr Koloi reads the mission statement and vision of #iamstellenbosch.  Mr Rudolph raises the point that the SRC should only vote on endorsement at this stage and not any budgetary implications.  Mr de Villiers raises this campaign to the SRC to vote in the SRC’s support and endorsement for the campaign.  Mr Koloi mentions that part of #iamstellenbosch is to establish a Matie identity.  The proposed motion is that the SRC will support the #iamstellenbosch campaign with no budgetary implications for the SRc.  By voting of hands, the motion is passed. One member abstained. | Mr Rudolph is elected as the policy officer for the 2015/2016 SRC term.  Mr de Villiers is elected as the policy officer for the 2015/2016 SRC term.  The motion for the Amendment of the Student Constitution is not passed.  The motion to make MAD2 and Social Impact one portfolio is passed.  The motion for three managerial critical engagement portfolios is passed.  The motion for the Matie Identity portfolio to become a managerial position is passed.  The motion that the PGIO portfolio becomes a managerial position is passed.  The motion to establish a professional working environment in the SRC offices during working hours is passed.  The motion for the SRC support of the #iamstellenbosch campaign is passed. |
| 7 | **QUESTIONS AND VARIA**  Miss Barac invites the SRC members to the PK meeting that will take place at 8pm on the 22nd of September 2015 at Irene Residence. This meeting will address the SRC guardians.  Ms Stapelberg invites the SRC members to contribute to the SRC mission statement via email.  Mr Frolick requests that the executive committee give a public response regarding Mr Piet le Roux and his resistance to transformation.  Mr Wayne requests that Tygerberg Campus have a permanent point on the SRC meeting agenda. |  |
| 8 | **NEXT MEETING**  The next meeting is to take place on 28 September 2015 at 21:00 in the SRc Boardroom. |  |
| 10 | **ADJOURNMENT**  Mr Qina adjourns the meeting at 12:08. |  |