

**MINUTES OF THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH
HELD ON 7 AUGUST 2014
IN THE SRC BOARDROOM AT 21:00**

IN ATTENDANCE: MJ Dippenaar, Renita van Zyl, Tosca Ferndale, JC Rademeyer, Courtney Roots, Willem Steyn, Willie Ross, Altus Viljoen, Vera Leven, Sifiso Masuku, Josh Chigome, Marvin Shabalala, Janelle Havenga, Marius Louw, Wayde Groep

ABSENT WITH REASON: Michelle Bezuidenhout

ABSENT WITHOUT REASON: Samual Arendse

OTHER ATTENDANTS: Pieter Kloppers, JC Landman, JD Blanckenberg, Maxine Bezuidenhout, Gerriline Fouché (minute taker)

	DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION:	MOTIONS / ACTIONS
1.	<p>Opening:</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar opens the meeting at 21:07.</p>	None
2.	<p>Welcoming and Personalia:</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar welcomes all the members of the SRc as well as all non-SRc visitors.</p>	None
3.	<p>3. Approval of previous minutes:</p> <p>4 August 2014 (emergency meeting): Page 11: The paragraph that says that Mr. Dippenaar says that members should keep in mind to vote according to the constitution in order to prevent any miscommunication seems very misleading. Mr. Dippenaar suggests that it should say "Keep in mind</p>	None



	<p>that the SRc vote nullifies the PK amendment in the constitution in order to prevent any miscommunication outside”.</p> <p>Mrs. Ferndale says the name “Shuan” is misspelled. The correct spelling is “Sean”.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar says on the last page it says that Mr. Dippenaar wishes everyone a good evening and mentions that Mrs. Van Zyl will e-mail the constitution to all members. It should say the following: Mrs. Van Zyl will e-mail the constitutional amendments to all the members and not the constitution as a whole. Mr. Steyn and Ms. Leven (seconds) approve.</p> <p>24 July 2014: Ms. Goldbeck and Mr. Chigome (seconds) approve.</p> <p>4 August 2014 (Executive Committee Meeting) Amendments by Mr. Chigome on pages 1 and 2. Mr. Viljoen and Ms. Leven (seconds) approves.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Items from minutes:</p> <p>4 August 2014 (emergency meeting) There are no items from these minutes</p> <p>24 July 2014</p> <p>6.1: Mr. Dippenaar says that although it says “none” in the column to the right, it should be added that the interviews for the SSVO chairperson is finished and a new chairperson has been appointed.</p> <p>6.3. Mr. Dippenaar asks that it be minute that Mr. Steyn gives feedback to the SRc on this issue. Mr.</p>	

<p>Ross will be joining the meeting at a later stage and will then discuss item</p> <p>9.1. Mr. Dippenaar says that Mr. Ross will be joining the meeting at a later stage and will the discuss the new leadership/prim committee motion as an official agenda point. Mr. Dippenaar says that Mr. Ross said he is going to pass on the motion to the SRc in order to get ideas from the SRc for a week and a half and therefor this point will be discussed rather later as an agenda point if that is fine with everyone.</p> <p>9.2. Mr. Dippenaar says that once again it says “none” but would like to give feedback on the Research Information Liaison Portfolio that he has discussed with the SRc. He will be meeting with Prof Visser tomorrow at 11h00 and therefor will give feedback on this matter at the next SRc meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Groep points out that the recon has not been sent to the relevant SRc members on the 5th of August and that some form of action should be taken.</p> <p>Ms. Ferndale apologizes for not sending the recon to the relevant SRc members and will send it to Mr. Dippenaar and Ms. Van Zyl tomorrow.</p> <p>Executive Committee Meeting</p> <p>2.1. Mr. Dippenaar says the Societies Counsel and Ms. Van Zyl are to amend the constitution. Mr. Dippenaar says this is an agenda point and therefor will move on and discuss it later.</p>	<p>Mr. Dippenaar will meet with Prof Visser on the 8th of August at 11h00 concerning the Research Information Liaison Portfolio.</p> <p>Ms. Ferndale will send the recon to Mr. Dippenaar and Ms. Van Zyl on the 8th of August.</p>
---	---

	<p>3.1. Mr. Dippenaar says that Ms. Goldbeck should inform the SRc when the research development project event will take place.</p> <p>Ms. Goldbeck says there is not a set date for this project. There will be chalk boards all over campus and students will then have the opportunity to write their comments on these boards.</p> <p>Ms. Ferndale says on the point of the recons that according to the feedback from the Student Parliament they are requesting certain policy changes. Ms. Ferndale says she will forward the e-mail to Mr. Dippenaar as well as to all the relevant portfolios.</p> <p>5.1. Mr. Dippenaar says the big reveal bash that was talked about is being handled by Mr. Steyn and Mr. Arendse, the branding portfolio. Mr. Dippenaar says the big revealing of the new SRc will take place in the Neelsie and that it is a big night, especially for those candidates and requests that all SRc members make an effort to be there and enjoy the evening with the new SRc members.</p>	<p>Ms. Ferndale will forward the e-mail from the Student Parliament to Mr. Dippenaar as well as to all the relevant portfolios.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Setting of agenda:</p> <p>8.2. Student Representation on the Rector Nomination Committee (Mr. Dippenaar)</p> <p>10.3. Rector's awards 9Ms Goldbeck)</p> <p>10.4. SRc report new format & SRc report as a whole (Ms. Van Zyl)</p> <p>10.5. Funeral feedback (Mr. Kloppers)</p> <p>10.6. <i>In camera</i> moment: Professionalism.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Feedback:</p>	<p>Willem Steyn excuses</p>

<p>6.1. Institutional Forum (Mr. Chigome)</p> <p>The first point of discussion at the meeting was the appointment of a new rector. The appointment will take place no later than September. Thuther more it was also discussed that two new members of the Institutional Forum were appointed. A big topic of discussion was the revision of the Language Policy of the university. In the past there was a hierarchy if Afrikaans, but now they are trying to bring in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa. It was discussed that there should be less of an emphasis on the T-option and that all faculties should have Afrikaans and English translating services seeing that this would help with the inclusivity of the university.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar: I would just like to add that it is very important for us to give and listen to feedback so that we as the SRc can answer any questions from the student population. Are there any questions concerning the IF feedback?</p> <p>Mr. Groep: I would just like to discuss the US Language Policy. I would just like to know what the role of the SRc is in the investment in Language Services.</p> <p>Mr. Chigome: Prof Skoonwinkel has emphasized that he has the final say in this matter and that has been doing this for many years.</p> <p>Mr. Rademeyer: I think a week grace period for such a huge document is irrelevant. Prof Skoonwinkel comes from a Engineering background and therefor I do not feel that he can have the final say. I feel that a week is</p>	<p>himself at 21:33.</p>
--	--------------------------

totally unacceptable to give feedback about the multilingualism constitution. It is impossible to get feedback from such a large amount of students within a weeks' time.

Mr. Chigome: To defend Prof Skoonwinkel I think that it was not just a proses of one week. He has been working with students for many years and therefor he is well aware of what the students input is in general. Would Maxine like to add something?

Mr. Bezuidenhoud: On that point it is also important that at this meeting prof Skoonwinkel emphasized that what is being discussed is the "taalplan" and not the "taalbeleid". The policy itself was not discussed.

Mr. Rademeyer: But that is not very clear in the email that prof Skoonwinkel sent out.

Mr. Chigome: As the IF we do not have a final say in this matter. All we do at the end of the day is given our recommendations.

Mr. Groep: What was the context of the final recommendation about the "Taalplan"?

Maxine: The secretary will send out an e-mail with the compiled feedback on that point, seeing as every person present there has different feedback.

Mr. Dippenaar asks that Joshua forward the feedback email to him as soon as he receives it.

Mr. Rademeyer: On what research is this new

document based on? Did they get any student input concerning the translating services or language use in the classrooms?

Mr. Chigome: There is a “Taakspan” for that particular job. These issues were discussed and one example that was used concerning the translation services was that the message actually gets very watered down. For example: The lecturer would make a joke in Afrikaans and then the English people would have no clue what everyone is laughing about.

Mr. Louw: We had a transformation workshop last year concerning this topic where lecturers and class representatives gave their input on the matter and I do believe that the job is being done thoroughly.

Mr. Dippenaar: I just want to respond to JC’s question by saying that the “taalplan” is nothing new to us. It has been going on for five years. There is transparent research being used to deal with these issues.

Ms. Bezuidenhout: Just to answer JC’s question, the students that do serve on the IF did however give feedback with regards to especially the T-option. There were a few of us that did not agree with the T-option but the majority felt that the T-option is something that we appreciate and would like to keep alive in our classrooms.

Mr. Dippenaar: We will have to extend the time if we want to continue discussing this point. I suggest that anyone who has any further questions on remarks on

this point should talk to Joshua. Does Mr Kloppers have any final remark?

Mr. Kloppers: If there are students who do have something to add, nothing stops them from sending comments on this issue even after the deadline.

Mr. Dippenaar: I consider this point handled and would like to continue with the agenda.

6.2. AKSS (Mr Rademeyer)

An AKSS meeting was held last week. There were various discussion points. I would just like to summarize what happened there. There was a man that talked about self-defense classes. This motion has been sent out to the vice-prim. There is also a GPS system that was tried out by JC Landman and it was quite nice to get feedback about that. The information regarding the system has been communicated to students and it is basically just to keep students safe and also a way for parents to track the students. There was also a discussion regarding the safety competition. There will also be a meeting with the sponsors next week. I asked them every time if there are any problems and there were a few very small issues but in general it seems that there are no serious problems. The biggest problem was with the new safety bars at the resses that needs work. Wilgenhof has a problem with students using their gate as a short-cut, but the gate cannot be locked because then their own students will not have access to their grounds. The biggest problem at the moment is homeless people sleeping on campus areas. This

has a negative effect on student, not only emotionally but also in other areas. The main focus of the meeting was a motion that I received with regards to a student neighborhood watch. The motion was not received from a student but from an outside structure. The students are in general not very happy about this motion. There was a vote on this motion and all the students on the AKSS voted against the motion. The reasons were as follows:

- It is dangerous for students.
- Students feel that it is not their responsibility.
- Students do not have time for that.
- Who will be responsible for the costs?

The Eikestad news asked me about the motion and I told them the truth. I also added that the SRc will make a final decision concerning the motion. I therefore ask Mr. Dippenaar that we please make a decision whether we are for or against this motion. I would also like to add that if we make a decision in this regard that it should come from the students' side and not facilities management seeing as they cannot be held responsible for any actions. If we do work through facilities management it can cause a number of complications, for example that students who want to take part in the watch would have to be 21 years old, wear a uniform and go through a training process. Facilities management can help with the execution of the motion but cannot make a decision on this point.

Mr. Dippenaar: I have already discussed this matter with JC and have nothing to add. Is there anyone that would like to comment on this matter?

<p>Ms. Havenga: I agree with JC. I, as a woman, will not drive alone in my car as part of such a watch. This is not a practical or smart solution. There may be other ways to it like doing it in groups.</p> <p>Ms. Ferndale: Even doing it in group form can be a problem seeing as even a group of people need training of some sort. I think there are a lot of liability and training issues. If there is a uprising from the students themselves, the motion can be re-evaluated, but I personally do not think it will work.</p> <p>Mr. Kloppers: The students themselves will not organize it, but maybe people in the neighborhood will be willing to organize such a watch.</p> <p>Mr. Groep: I agree with Mr. Kloppers and Ms. Ferndale. We as the SRc need to send out a stronger message and we must respond to the memo sent out at the end of last term concerning the student protest on the Rooiplein. Students still feel unsafe and feel that the SRc has grown silent on this topic.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar: The memorandum has already been discussed and the respond from management on the memorandum has been put on the website. JC and I went to the safety meeting with facilities management and risk management and we discussed that safety will be an issue again and there will be an uprising again. We want to have a plan in order to have a better stance. We discussed how we would then respond to the issue and there are many new ideas in the pipeline as well. I was supposed to meet with Ms</p>	<p>Mr. Dippenaar will be meeting with Ms. Gava in connection with the follow-up protest in the week of 11 August.</p> <p>Mr. Ross joins meeting at 21:43.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar has extended this agenda point.</p>
---	--

<p>Gava tomorrow on the follow-up protest, but I already have a meeting scheduled for then. We therefore have a meeting on Monday.</p> <p>Mr. Louw: Who can students call if they see a homeless person sleeping on private property on campus?</p> <p>Mr. Rademeyer: At this stage students mostly call campus security. It is illegal for homeless people to sleep on private property. There are for example complaints of homeless people that are sleeping at the Wilgenhof cricket nets. This is a very uncomfortable situation to the students and they feel that it is not their responsibility to sort it out. The motion itself is more focused on the emotional side of the situation. Facilities management is in the process of drafting a document containing information about new safety mechanism on campus such as the cameras that will be placed on campus. I suggest that there be a timeline be put together just to make clear what will happen when and so that we as the SRc can hold facilities management responsible for the execution of certain set ideas.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar: It is also important to remember mandate as the SRc as well as the liability that we have when it comes to the motion of a neighborhood watch. At the end of the day the SRc is responsible for campus safety and the safety portfolio is accountable for people who are part of a neighborhood watch. It is a very difficult ground to walk on. We can also make this a wide spread social media campaign in order to</p>	<p>Informal vote on neighborhood Watch Motion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For: 0
---	---

<p>communicate our stance and initiatives in an innovative manner. We can even launch a 'student vigilance project' and maybe even make it a student safety competition.</p> <p>Mr. Rademeyer: There is a Twitter handle, @safematies as well as a facebook page. We also want to start sending out e-mails to all students in which we summarize all the decisions and initiatives made by the safety portfolio as well as facilities management.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar: Can we then minute that Mr. Rademeyer will discuss the above mentioned suggestions with Me Ferndale and I at a later stage. I believe we should go over to an informal vote for or against the neighborhood watch motion.</p> <p>6.3. Library Committee (Samuel)</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar says that Mr. Arendse is absent tonight and that if anyone has any questions regarding this agenda point, that it be directed toward himself or Mr. Arendse. He will not be extending this point to the next meeting.</p> <p>6.4. Student Fees</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar refers to the meeting that he and Mr. Viljoen attended on the 4th of August 2014.</p> <p>Mr. Viljoen: The student fees of the US were compared to the student fees of the other universities in the country, especially UCT. UCT has much higher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against: 10 • Abstain: Mr Willie Ross <p>Ms. Ferdale excuses herself at 21:48.</p>
---	---

student fees and the US has quite average student fees. The annual increase in student fees will be 8%, the same as previous years and in accordance with inflation. The residence fees will also increase with 8 %. With regards to the first payments of 2015 – there is a chance that the payments will be made in four different payments instead of three in order to lower debts. There will also be a limit on internet cap of R1 200 per year per student. From December the student fees has to be paid in cash in order to make it easier for students who are getting their degree. If a student uses more than R1 200 internet cap, he/she will have to pay the rest of the amount in cash.

Mr. Dippenaar thanks Mr. Viljoen and asks the members whether they have any questions.

Mr. Chigome: What is the rationale behind the increase in residence fees?

Mr. Dippenaar: It is pretty much the same as the student fees. The increase is determined with inflation. There are specific percentages for growth and then there is also amounts of bad debt that have to be covered somehow. The plan behind the increases is well-structured.

Ms. Ferndale asks when these increases are going to be communicated to the students as well as who will be communicating it.

Mr. Viljoen says that it will come directly from the student fees committee.

Ms. Ferndale says that it could be a good idea to host a meeting where all students are welcome in which the budget will be communicated.

Mr. Dippenaar says that they can work with the student parliament to execute such an idea.

Mr. Rademeyer asks whether internet services fees will decrease as well as if students can get special permission to use more than R1 200 of internet cap.

Mr. Dippenaar says that the question has already been answered and that students may use more than R1 200 of internet cap by paying cash for it.

Mr. Groep asks whether the 8% increase is applicable to all students housing on campus.

Mr. Dippenaar says yes, but he is not certain about LLL fees.

Mr. Kloppers asks whether internet costs have decreased and whether you will get much more cap for the R100 a month.

Mr. Dippenaar says that the IT Forum meetings next sitting is in the week of the 11th of August. He also ads that the US has the cheapest internet in the country at the moment and that a new optic cable for data has been laid. The idea is to standardize the costs of internet.

Mr. Blackenberg suggests that the internet cost changed be communicated to *Matieland* and that students should have the opportunity to comment on this matter. He also asks why there is a R1 200 cut off if the university has the resources for students to use more internet than that.

Mr. Kloppers says that, because we have the cheapest internet in the country, it is obvious that a student who uses more than the R1 200 cap per year is misusing the internet.

Mr. Dippenaar says that if a student has a limit on the amount of cap that he/she is allowed to use, it will be the students' instinct to rather use the available cap for academic reasons. It also decreases unpaid debt in student fees.

:

6.5. Veelsydigheids taakspan (Mr. Ross)

Mr. Steyn says that the "taakspan" consists of himself, Me Van Zyl, Mr. Rademeyer, Prof Skoonwinkel, Mr. Jannie vd Westhuizen (rector of Paul Roos) and Mr. Kloppers. The main question is if versatility should form a separate criterion in placements. The Tygerberg system was used as an example and it was concluded that the administrative burden of adding Tygerberg as an influence on main campus is just too high. There was a specific focus on candidates that fall directly under the academic boarder, for example for cut off for girls last year was 79%. We are there for looking at the versatility of students who fall just below that mark, in other words 75-79% in comparison to those who did make it. The one argument is that

	<p>students who do excel in different areas at the same rate are likely to excel academically as well. There are arguments for both sides of the matter, but it was concluded that each individual's versatility be assessed and on that grounds be placed or not.</p> <p>6.6. SR(UK) and RBS:</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar says that the main point of discussion was the increase in LLL fees. There was specifically talked about the LLL contract price and the actual price at the moment. We are still waiting for feedback in this regard. Furthermore the safety plan was also discussed, just to remind them that we have not given up on this matter. The “taalbenadering” was also discussed and it came to 100% English and Afrikaans. We do not want to influence any student in a negative way in this regard. We also want to put the “taalbenadering” on the website so that students can read through it.</p> <p>Mr. Kloppers says that it is already on the website.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar says that the rector's election process was also put on the agenda as well as the issue concerning the Halaal kitchen in the Neelsie. We were assured that if any shop space in the Neelsie opens up that a Halaal supplier will get first choice to open a Halaal kitchen in that space.</p> <p>Mr. Kloppers confirms that the deli in the new generation hub is Halaal.</p>	
<p>7.</p>	<p>Statutory bodies and portfolios</p>	

<p>8.</p>	<p>Items for decision</p> <p>8.1. Rector's Award Nomination:</p> <p>Me Goldbeck: I hope everyone received my e-mails these last two weeks in this regard. This event is a very important one that takes place every year and it still is a honorable award that comes from the SRC's side. Tonight we have to vote on four candidates. The ABR, PK and Societies Council had the opportunity to nominate certain people for this award. The SRC still has to vote on these candidates. Each person will have the opportunity to give a motivation for why the nominee should win the award and thereafter we will vote. Members from the alumni are invited to the event that is nominated for the alumni award. This person will also be the guest speaker for the evening and the SRC has to vote for this person as well. We can start with Mr. Ross' candidate and motivation.</p> <p>Mr. Ross: The candidate is Mr. Brian van Vuuren. He was chosen as candidate by the prim committee and also received the most nominations by far. The SRC already have the motivations and reasons for this nomination. I fully support Brian's nomination. This is the PK's nomination for Achievement in Student Leadership.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar will be leading the vote.</p> <p>Ms. Robbertse: The candidate for the Rector's Award for leadership is Jaco Botha as nominated by the ABR. I have known Jaco since December 2012 where he was voted as a member of Theology Student Council. He served two terms on the ABR with me and</p>	<p>Vote for PK's nomination for Rector's Award for Student Leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favour: 10 • Opposed: 0 • Abstain: 0
------------------	--	--

<p>was chosen as the chair of the Theology Student Council last year. He contributed to the ABR on different levels. He was very focused on the wellbeing of the students and, together with the HK of Sonop, gave suggestions as to how to evaluate mentors and mentees. Jaco has been on many outreach programs in Africa and is generally just a very good person. He is also a great supporter of the FVZS Institute for Leadership Development.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar leading the vote.</p> <p>Ms. Leven: The ASK nominee is Ms. Lize-Marié Vermeulen. Lize has been very active as the chair of the Pulp Film Society. She performs above and beyond her duties and had had a remarkable influence on students' lives. She has been a part of the society for many years and has a passion and drive for her work. She has been a loyal servant to societies and has shown what a great impact societies can have on students. She is a very passionate individual and always takes initiative when an opportunity or obstacle presents itself. She has very good interaction with students and has proven to be a great leader in effecting change. She always stands up for what she believes in even when she is in the minority. She has given significant support to the Societies Chair. She is very worthy of recognition.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar leads the vote.</p> <p>Mr. Groep asks what the point of the voting is if these people have already been voted in by ex officio</p>	<p>Vote for ABR's nomination for Rector's Award for Student Leadership: In favor of: 10 Apposed: 0 Abstain: 0</p> <p>Vote for Societies Council's nomination for Rector's Award for Student Leadership: All in favor: 10 Apposed: 0 Abstain: 0</p>
--	--

bodies.

Mr. Dippenaar says that he sees Mr. Groep's point, but that the SRc is still the only body that can vote for these candidates.

Ms. Goldbeck says that the reason for the SRc's vote is because the awards are originally the Src's awards and has only been named the Rector's award for the last five years.

Ms. Goldbeck: Lastly we need to vote for the Outstanding Alumni. I have sent the motivations for each nominee to all the members of the SRc. Each member of the SRc has one vote per nominee. The candidates are as follows:

- Riaan Cruywagen = 1 vote
- Judge Cameron = 7 votes
- Fanie vd Merwe = 1 vote
- Alex Fourie = 2 votes
- Prof Sonja Human = no votes

Judge Cameron wins the award for Outstanding Alumni.

Ms. Goldbeck says that the applications will open on 25th of August and will be available at the SRc office as well as on the website.

Ms. Ferndale asks that Ms. Goldbeck sends the application to her.

Ms. Goldbeck ads that certain structures automatically

gets an award and all the other winners are determined by a panel of 15 members.

8.2. Student Representation on the Rector

Appointment Committee:

Mr. Dippenaar: The regulations require that two SRC members be elected as representatives on the appointment committee. These two students have to be appointed by the SRC. The committee has to be chosen before the 29th of September. The meetings are on the 8th of September and the 10th of November and before the 28th of November there will be a joined meeting with the senate where there will be a final short-list of candidates and a discussion of who the best candidate will be in accordance to the vision we have for the university. The floor is open for any of you to stand for this position or make suggestions, but I nominate myself and Ms. Van Zyl as the two candidates for this position. The two of us have a lot of personal experience with the council and understand the context of the SRC as a whole and of the management of the university. I therefore nominate myself as well as Ms. Van Zyl.

Mr. Ross seconds the nomination.

Mr. Dippenaar asks whether there are any other nominations or people who want to nominate themselves.

Mr. Rademeyer nominates Ms. Robbertse and Mr. Groep seconds.

Ms. Robbertse revokes her nomination because of her

<p>position on the senate.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl nominates Mr. Groep and Ms. Ferndale seconds.</p> <p>Ms. Bezuidenhout says that the people who are nominated for the council have to attend all the meetings and therefor suggests that two people be voted in and a third candidate be held as an alternate.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar says that the person who is not voted in now will serve as the alternate.</p> <p>Ms. Robbertse suggests that there be made used of a negative vote system for this vote.</p> <p>Ms. Bezuidenhout suggests that this is a closed ballade vote. Ms. Bezuidenhout goes to fetch ballades in the SRc office.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar says that Me Ferndale has Ms. M Bezuidenhout's proxy and that he himself has the proxy of the Milac captain.</p> <p>Ms. Bezuidenhout asks that there first be voted for the candidate that the members do not want to serve on the committee and thereafter will be voted again for the alternate.</p> <p>Ms. Bezuidenhout makes the results known. The person that has dropped out is Mr. Dippenaar and therefor the two students who will serve on the committee are Ms. Van Zyl and Mr Groep. Mr.</p>	
---	--

	<p>Dippenaar is the alternate according to the results of the vote of confidence.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Items for acknowledgement and discussion</p> <p>9.1. Student Constitution Amendments:</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: Everyone has the list of proposed constitutional amendments in front of them. There has already voted on PK the other day. I did not send it to the Societies Council, but I did go through it because their constitution is not quite op to scratch. I got feedback from Milac, the Student Court, from the election conveners od ABR. I did not get any feedback from the TSR but I believe we are only voting on one change in the TSR constitution. The Student Parliament also did not get back to me but I do not believe that we have any conflict there either.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl continues by reading sections 96-98 of the constitution with regards to the process of amending fundamental provisions. Ms. Van Zyl ads that the referendum will be held in the week of 11 August during the election of the new SRc.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: We have a special amendment process not withstanding section 96 (Ms. Van Zyl reads section 96 and also reads section 98, the Referendum.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: Firstly we are going to handle the referendum section, the fundamental sections and chapters.</p> <p>Mr. Blanckenberg asks if there will be a discussion on each amendment or if the voting will take place</p>	

<p>immediately.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that some of the amendments are only language and grammar changes for reading improvement, but if it is a fundamental change to an article there will be time for discussion.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl:</p> <p>Amendment 1 (Page 1): With regards to the top part of page one of the Constitution – the Afrikaans version of the constitution is not up to date and a lot of past amendments were not added to the Afrikaans version. The English version is there for the most updated version and I therefor recommend that page one says that “The English version of this document will take precedence in case of interpretation disputes”. This is then the first amendment that we need to vote on. The managers do not have voting rights but you are welcome to give your input on the matter.</p> <p>Amendment 2 (Chapter 2, section 11): Nothing is changing about this article, but the wording was not correct. (See the corrections of section 11(1) and (2) in the Proposed Constitutional Amendments).</p> <p>Amendment 3 (Article 41: Transparency): This is a fundamental change. This section has never been complied with and therefor it is a section that has not been in use. It is a fundamental section and I do not prefer that we lose all transparency, but there is no</p>	<p><u>Vote on amendment: Page 1 of the Constitution</u></p> <p>All in favour:12 Against: 0 Abstain: 0</p> <p><u>Vote on amendment: Chapter 2. Section 11(1) and (2)</u></p> <p>All in favor: 12 Against: 0 Abstain: 0</p>
---	---

way of communicating to all the students without wasting our mail with each agenda point. I would suggest that we remove this article and that instead we have a code of conduct in which we agree to always advertise meetings of the SRc and ad the article that says that one must RSVP 24 hours beforehand if you want to say something in the meeting.

Mr. Blackenberg says that this section has always been in practice but has lapsed in the past four years. It is not clear in the constitution weather there is an onus on the SRc to (1) make students aware of the fact that we are making such a change and (2) that there are no mechanisms in place as to what steps the SRc has to take in this regard.

Mr. Chigome says that the SRc is elected to represent the students and make these amendments to the Student Constitution to positively influence the students. It will be impractical to ask every single student for an input with regards to amendments and it is therefore in the SRc's right to vote on these matters.

Ms. Van Zyl adds that she invites a lot of people to each meeting and also sends out invitations to all the prims and PK and it always results in a poor turnout. If this section has been in practice for the last couple of years I have not seen it. We do not have to take it away but I am presenting all the amendments to you that has come to mind.

Mr Ross says that the fact that a section has not been used does not mean it can just be taken away. I do

<p>support most of Ms. Van Zyl's suggestions but I also think that it is practically impossible to send out the agenda 48 hours before the meeting seeing that we as the SRc only receive the agenda 24 hours before the meeting. I support changing the time frame but I do not support taking the article away.</p> <p>Me Leven suggests that the article be changed to one university day beforehand and also that the agenda be made available at the office and website and not necessarily have to personally e-mail it to every single student.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar says that the agenda has always been made available on request and that there is a secretary for that exact reason.</p> <p>Me Ferndale says that it is possible to make the agenda available on the website and that there has be structures put in to place to make sure that the agenda is made available. I therefor do not think we should take the article away because it is possible to apply the article in practice.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that the article will no longer be removed and also asks if anyone is in favor of an amendment stating that the agenda be made available one day before a meeting. (No positive responses for the amendment)</p> <p>Mr. Chigome says that it is important to make the agenda available just to protect themselves as the SRc.</p>	<p><u>Vote on changing the wording from two days to one day</u></p> <p>In favor: 0 Against: 12 Abstain: 0</p>
---	---

<p>Mr. Dippenaar suggest that there be voted on the change.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: I will not be taking any further questions on this matter. Ms. Van Zyl reads from section 14 of the constitution. If the members feel that I am not complying to section 14, please come and speak to me afterward. There will now be two votes: Firstly there will be voted weather the time frame should change from two days to one day and secondly there will be voted on accepting or deleting the amendment.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar: I suggest that we make a change in the constitution that if there are changes made to the agenda or anything added to agenda after it has been made available to the student, that we are not allowed to discuss that agenda point.</p> <p>Mr. Kloppers suggest that if an agenda point is added after the agenda was made public, that the SRc members can vote for the approval and discussion of that agenda point in the meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that they have suggested changing it to one day seeing that any agenda point that was late and has to be voted on will lead to an invalid agenda point on which the SRc cannot vote in that meeting.</p> <p>Ms. Bezuidenhout suggests that for the purposes of voting that the SRc members only vote for the deleting or keeping of the section at this stage.</p>	<p><u>Vote on deleting section 41</u></p> <p>In favor: 0 Against: 0 Abstain: 0</p> <p><u>Vote on changing the wording from two days to one day</u></p> <p>In favor: 9 The amendment was not accepted.</p>
--	---

<p>Ms. Van Zyl says that the amendment of the wording was not accepted so it stays the same that the agenda must be made available two university days before the meeting.</p> <p>Amendment 3 (Part 3.5, sections 44 and 45) See the amendments on the document with the Proposed Constitutional Amendments.</p> <p>Mr. Kloppers says that it should be changed to “Senior derikteur of sy/haar benoemde”. The translation will come from the Writing Lab.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl requests that there be voted on the Afrikaans amendment and that they will get the English translation from the Writing Lab for the referendum.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: Just for clarity I would like to ad that when it comes to amending fundamental parts of the constitution, there are 10 votes from the SRc needed to accept such an amendment.</p> <p>Amendment 4 (Chapter 5: The Student Court and the Appeal Court).</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: There are a few changes in section 56</p>	<p><u>Vote on changing the wording in sections 44 and 45</u></p> <p>In favor: 12 Against: 0 Abstain: 0</p> <p><u>Vote on changing the wording in section 56</u></p> <p>In favor: 12 Against: 0 Abstain: 0</p>
---	---

(1) and (2), as well as the adding of subsection (3) and therefor changing subsection (3) to subsection (4).

Ms. Van Zyl: Section 57 remains the same. They just added a new subsection (3).

Mr. Dippenaar asks in which instances a member would be removed from the Student court.

Ms. Van Zyl: A person would be removed if he/she goes overseas for an exchange program and also in the instance of disciplinary measures.

Mr. Dippenaar says that such an amendment leaves a gap in the position and takes away the integrity of the position.

Mr. Chigome agrees with Mr. Dippenaar and says that when you apply for a position like that you make a commitment for a year and that you should not apply for such a commitment when you also want to do exchange.

Mr. Dippenaar says that he understands that if a person wants to leave, that he or she will do so regardless of any constitutional obligation. He also adds that he believes such a person should then be removed forcefully and their integrity should be questioned.

Mr. Kloppers says that he can understand that the Law Faculty would want a person in this instance to

<p>resign or be removed seeing that such a person would not be able to perform their duties when they are, for example, overseas for an exchange program.</p> <p>Mr. Blackenberg says that the Law Faculty should have some form of a code of conduct in this regard so that they can organize a situation like this by themselves. It can also help to organize any conflict of interests.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that she does not believe that commitment is a problem in the student court, because the members have a large amount of admin to do and have to read through a lot of society council constitutions. They always write interpretation notes.</p> <p>Mr. Jaftha: The Student Court constitution does not really set out any grounds for removal. The only reason for removal that is given is that the person did not perform the duties on two occasions. The reason given for the chair to be removed does not correspond with this.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that the exchange program was not given as the official reason for the removal of the chair. It is why they are making provisions for resignation.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl moves to a vote for the revision of subsection three as well as adding section 58 removal.</p>	<p><u>Vote for the revision of subsection 3</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favour: 12 • Against: 0 • Abstain: 0 <p><u>Vote for adding section 58 removal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favour: 12 • Against: 0 • Abstain: 0 <p><u>Vote for adding section 59 to the constitution of the</u></p>
--	--

<p>Ms. Van Zyl: Then they want to add section 59: Appointment of a new member (Ms. Van Zyl reads from section 59).</p> <p>Ms. Bezuidenhout asks why the faculty board can decide who can serve on the student court, but only the dean can remove a person from the Student Court.</p> <p>Mr. Kloppers says that a lot of problems can arise if you want to involve the faculty board in this issue. A faculty board meeting only happens four times a year and for them to be convened under a request of the student resignation will get one in so much trouble. I would be very weary of that. It is already problematic to think about this because you would be forcing a meeting on them. It would be bad politics to force a meeting on them.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that what is written in section 59 is already being practiced in the faculty. This is not something new and has been approved by the faculty board. Ms. Van Zyl goes over into a vote for adding section 59. She adds that all the section numbers will now change from article 60 to 71, but she will add it in the referendum.</p> <p>Amendment 5: Section 90 (SRc general election) Ms. Van Zyl: (Reads from proposed amendment). The week that the voting stations for the SRc, no other elections are allowed to take place. This is open for discussion because it is quite a large change.</p>	<p><u>student court</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favour: 12 • Against: 0 • Abstain: 0
---	---

Ms. Leven says that this amendment would make the re-registration process for the societies very difficult. This is because the elections for societies councils takes place in exactly the time frame in which the SRc elections take place.

Mr. Chigome says that the SRc must take in consideration the limited amount of candidates that stand for the SRc .

Mr. Kloppers says that, unless the SRc elections are postponed, it will always clash with the training programs of the HK's. To make the election earlier would lead to losing a week test period.

Mr.. Dippenaar says that the SRc election period starts on the first day of the term and can therefore not be made earlier.

Mr. Ross says that he supports the amendment and also suggests that the SRc election period be shorter so that it can be more concentrated.

Ms. Van Zyl says that the date for the election is determined by the election convener and that they always try to make it as early as possible. The nomination period has been shortened from 10 calendar days to 10 consecutive days so that the election itself can be earlier.

Mr. Groep asks how long the nomination period should be.

Ms. Van Zyl: Ten calendar days.

Ms. Robberste suggests that the caucus should be shortened to a period of one week.

Ms. Van Zyl says it is one week of caucus without voting and one week with voting.

Ms. Robberste suggests that nominations should be ten days, thereafter caucus for three days without voting and then with voting.

Mr. Ross says that a ten day period for nominations is not sensible seeing that person who decides to stand for SRc hopefully makes that decision early in the year.

Ms. Besuidenhout says that the nomination period has to be this long because there are not that many SRc applications. If there are not enough applications within ten days the election conveners also have the power to extend the nomination period.

Mr. Rademeyer says that he agrees with Mr. Ross. He adds that the advertising for SRc nomination should start much earlier and should open on the first day of the third term.

Mr. Groep asks if the nominations and voting can take place within a period of three weeks so that the new SRc can be announced on the Friday of the third week. This way HK's can start their voting processes in the fourth week of the term.

<p>Ms. Van Zyl says that there is a problem with the election period being dragged out to long at the moment and that they are trying to solve this problem. We want one SRc month as a whole in which there will not be any HK processes started yet in order to shift the focus to the SRc.</p>	<p><u>Vote for the amendment to the amendment</u> In favor: 12 Against: 0 Abstain: 0</p>
<p>Ms. Leven says that she is all for a SRc election taking place before the other elections on campus, but if it happens to late it will be impossible for the societies, because the societies need to work with both the SRc, HK and finances department timeline. There are certain deadlines that have to be met as well as the applications for leadership bursaries that close at a certain date.</p>	
<p>Ms. Van Zyl asks Me Leven when they usually start with their process.</p>	<p><u>Vote for changing subsection 4 and adding subsection 5</u> In favor: 12 Against:0 Abstain: 0</p>
<p>Me Leven: It starts in this time of the year and has already started so technically we would not be able to do it at all now.</p>	
<p>Ms. Van Zyl: There are now two extra proposed amendments that have not been added in my document. The one is the shortening of the nomination period and the other is the change from March to February. It is not necessary however to deal with these to changes now, because they are not fundamental. I would also suggest that we remove societies from the list in the amendment seeing that it could cause a lot of problems. The amendment would stay the same. Subsection 4 would not be changed,</p>	<p><u>Vote on amending section 25</u> In favor: 12 Against:0 Abstain: 0</p>
	<p><u>Vote on amending section 74</u> In favor: 12 Against: 0 Abstain: 0</p>

<p>but we would remove “Societies Committee” from subsection 5. We now move to voting on the amendment to the amendment.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar asks if it would be possible to make the advertising for the Societies Committees elections more effective and therefor start earlier with the advertising.</p> <p>Ms. Leven says that at the moment there are more than 50 societies, each with their own committee and therefor the admin in such a matter would be extremely time-consuming.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: We have now amended the possible amendment. We now vote for changing subsection 4 and adding subsection 5.</p> <p>Amendments 6 & 7 (Sections 25 & 74)</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: This is now the end of the fundamental amendments. The next couple amendments are not as grueling, but we still have to vote them in with ten SRc members. I am now just going to read through them and thereafter we will vote.</p> <p>Amendment 8 (Schedule 1)</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: (Reads from the proposed amendments) I would just like for Ms. Bezuidenhout to explain why we are adding to subsection 3 of section 1.</p> <p>Ms. Bezuidenhout: Currently there are students that are excluded in this regard, like Elsenburg, the Business School, Worcester and the post-grad</p>	<p><u>Vote on amending item 7</u></p> <p>In favor: 12</p> <p>Against:0</p> <p>Abstain: 0</p>
--	--

<p>students above masters-level.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that this is already in practice and that they just want to add transparency to it in the constitution. Because of time limitations and the need for discussion on this matter we will not be voting for this amendment tonight and I ask that we move on.</p> <p>Amendment 9 (Item 7)</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: As you remember we had a problem with this in one of our previous SRc meetings because the Tygerberg executive committee has always appointed their own convener (Ms. Van Zyl reads from the proposed amendment).</p> <p>Ms. Bezuidenhout: Can I propose that we change “end of May” to an earlier month because the TSR elections have to coincide with the elections of the SRc that we have here. They have also in the past had problems with there not being enough candidates. I therefor propose that it is at least in March.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: Thus the amendment to the amendment is “to the end of March”. We can now move to a vote.</p> <p>Amendment 10 (Item 12)</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: (Reads from the proposed amendment) This is something that was proposed in the PK motion.</p> <p>Mr. Blackenberg says that it is not a challenge to get 200 signatures if you live in residence and therefor it would not be a fair amendment to people who are not in a residence.</p>	<p><u>Vote on amending item 12</u></p> <p>In favor: 12 Against:0 Abstain: 0</p> <p><u>Vote on amending item 23</u></p> <p>In favor: 11 Against:0 Abstain: 1</p>
--	---

Mr. Chigome says that if you cannot even get 200 signatures then you will definitely not get elected as a member of the SRc.

Mr. Dippenaar asks if 5 days will be enough to get 200 signatures.

Mr. Ross says there is enough time to get 200 signatures in five days and that it should not be a problem.

Ms. Ferndale suggests that the nomination forms should be made available earlier in order for candidates to start getting signatures earlier.

Ms. Van Zyl says that it is something that can be considered, but there is not enough time to discuss it now. I now want to move to a vote.

Ms. Van Zyl says that there already has been a vote on the section 13 amendment.

Amendment 11 (Item 23: Presentation Meetings)

Ms. Van Zyl: (Ms. Van Zyl reads from the proposed amendment). There must be a minimum of five caucus on each campus, including at Milac. We now move to a vote.

Amendment 12 (Item 25: Role of the Dean of Students)

Ms. Van Zyl says that there has already been a vote

on this matter.

9.2. SRc Evaluation

Mr. Groep: I ask that we try to finish the SRc evaluation process as quickly as possible. We do not want to sit with the same situation as last year where there was no SRc evaluation.

Ms. Van Zyl: I did send you all an e-mail today with the template of the final report. That is because I had a meeting with Brandon and we are very clear about the evaluation panel. This is why the date of the final report is very early. If you still have projects taking place after the date of the final report you can just add in your report “see addendum E”.

Mr. Groep asks if the evaluation makes provision for SRc members or managers that do not adhere to the handover period specifications.

Ms. Van Zyl says that she will mention it to Brandon and also ads that the evaluation takes place one week before the holiday and in the week during the holiday.

Ms. George and Mr. Como are working on a very extensive handover period in the office. You have to be here on the first day of the 4th term to spend one-on-one time with your new SRc candidate. The evaluation panel will then finish their report on the Friday and then also take that in account.

Ms. Robberste asks if there is any way of quality checking the evaluation forms of the SRc.

	<p>Ms. Van Zyl says that she will make a note of the request and do so.</p> <p>Mrs Groep asks when the nomination of the two students of that the SRc appoints will be finalized.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: They will probably vote the in on the 25th of August. Ms. Van Zyl also says that the reason why the reports have to be done at that stage is because there will be a symbolic handover function of your entire years' work at the announcement of the new SRc. The submission date is the 15th so that I have time to quality check each report. Please do make sure that there are no spelling errors in your report. On the 21st you will be handing over everything except for your final addendum.</p> <p>9.3. Election Conveners Evaluation</p> <p>Ms. Robberste: I just want to know what the official process is going to be concerning the election conveners evaluation. I also want to know when it is going to happen.</p> <p>Mr. Chigome asks that Ms. Van Zyl and Mr. Dippenaar discuss this point with Mr. Como and send the members an e-mail in this regard seeing that it is getting very late and it is an issue that the members do need to think about.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar agrees with Mr. Chigome.</p>	
<p>10. General</p>	<p>10.1 Student Assault Incident:</p> <p>Mr. Groep: I was contacted and told that the media is going to run an inside story about this incident and</p>	

<p>they are doing a major story in this regard. They are going to ask the SRc what our position is in this regard. I have not been contacted by the media but I do feel that we should have some sort of press release ready for when they do contact us.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar asks why the student did not make a complaint to the SRc.</p> <p>Ms. Ferndale: Because of certain legal claims they are not allowed to talk about the incident. No-one except the student's friends really know what actually happened. E-news will not ask any detail because they know that the SRc does not know any detail about the incident. They will however ask the SRc how we are planning to deal with this incident.</p> <p>Mr. Kloppers says that he will send a media report to Mr. Dippenaar and will decide thereafter what comments should be made in this regard.</p> <p>Mr. Chigome says that a statement has to be made in this regard so that student can see that they can talk to the SRc about these issues.</p> <p>Mr Kloppers says that there is a overtone of racism that is making this a difficult situation.</p> <p>Ms. Ferndale says that the SRc must be a contact person for these issues.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar says that the SRc should take a general stance in this matter.</p>	<p>Ms. Havenga excuses herself at 00:13.</p>
--	--

10.2. Matie Life:

Ms. Havenga: I just want to thank everyone who helped out during Matie week. There were no big issues during Matie week. ABSA is very happy with the SRc and enjoyed the week. I will be sending my final feedback to ABSA on Monday. I just want to talk about “Matie Life” as a word. What do who have to do to change the name of the portfolio in the future seeing that the word “Matie” is causing a lot of problems. By naming something Matie life I have gotten in to a great deal of trouble with the university. We did get “Matie Week” sorted out, but the word “Matie Life” is still illegal. I think it should be changed to something like “Student Week” or something that does not contain the word “Matie”.

Mr. Dippenaar: The name of the portfolio was actually chosen by the SRc in the first weekend of year planning and I think the reasoning behind it was that the word “Matie” has a sense of identity to it. I realize that there are issues around this word concerning intellectual property but if we feel very strongly about the word we need to find a way to give the SRc the permission to use the word in certain relevant contexts.

Ms. Havenga says that the problem comes in when another word is linked with the word “Matie”.

Mr .Kloppers says that he supports the suggestion to get special permission for the SRc to use the word.

	<p>Mr. Dippenaar asks that Me Havenga includes this issue in her report so that it can be looked into. Mr. Dippenaar also thanks Ms. Hanvenga and says that Matie Week was exceptional.</p> <p>10.3. Funeral Feedback</p> <p>Mr. Kloppers: I did attend the funeral and this is a very sad situation. I was also there on Saturday evening when the bodies were received. This incident really showed that when an incident like this occurs on campus, students do support and represent each other. I thank the SRc see for it leadership. I do however feel that the SRc should take a stance regarding the railway crossing and should also write a letter to the parents for support.</p> <p>10.4. <i>In camera</i> moment:</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl: I just have a complaint regarding the start of the evening and the way the members communicate with each other. We are losing focus and we need to check each other in this regard. We should not be losing steam right now and it is not effective to get angry at each other.</p> <p>Mr. Dippenaar: I agree with Ms. Van Zyl. The fact that Me Ferndale has not yet received everyone's reports is unacceptable. Communication and the attendance of meetings will be discussed during the evaluation. I ask that we do not start slacking just because our term is coming to an end. Thank you all for your time.</p>	
11.	<p>Questions and Varia</p> <p>Mr. Louw: I am starting a new community interaction</p>	

	<p>project about how to communicate and engage in an honest way etc.</p> <p>Mr. Groep says that the Student parliament should give a motivation for their changes.</p> <p>Me Ferndale says that a SRc members should be at the student parliament meetings at all times.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that the personal shadow day will start at 09:00 on the 11th of September.</p> <p>Mr. Groep asks that everyone should remember about the SRc photo that will be taken on the 18th of August and says that ex officio members do not have to be there.</p> <p>Ms. Van Zyl says that the third new SRc member has been chosen, namely Albert Coetzee and that the new student captain is Matea Dleza.</p>	
12.	<p>Next Meeting: 21 August 2014</p>	
13.	<p>Closing</p>	