

SRC Ordinary Meeting Agenda

26 February 2020 | Roosmaryn Building | 18:00

1. **Welcoming and Opening & Personal Items:**
	1. The SRC enjoyed a joined sitting with the Director of the Department of Student Affairs (hereafter DSA) and the Executive Team from Library Services immediately prior to the ordinary SRC meeting (17:00). The meeting commenced once quorum was met at 18:07.
2. **Attendance:** (Reflected in the Attendance Record and the Attendance Register)
	1. **Present:**
	2. **Absent with apology:**

* 1. **Absent without apology:**
1. **Acceptance of previous minutes and adoption of agenda:**
	1. Acceptance of previous Minutes
		1. The Academics 1 SRC Representative raised an objection to 5.5.1.5 – that it was not an offer of bribery but rather an ordinary gift.
		2. The Postgraduate International Affairs student objected to 5.4.1.4 – the Deputy President was not present during the meeting. Instead, it was the Deputy Secretary that made the said point.
		3. This SRC member also requested that the Attendance Section on the agenda be comprehensive.
	2. Adoption of agenda
2. **Other matters arising:**
	1. Residences 1
		1. ~~Residence Initiative~~
	2. Academics 2
		1. Academic Records Issued
			1. Unable to discuss this point (battery of device with necessary content died).
			2. The Academics Officer read out an email to the SRC (attached).

“Up until July 2017, Tuks allowed students to go to the CSC, pay R150, and then they would ‘clean’ your academic record. This meant removing deregistered modules, fails etc.

However, due to 1 student obtaining an administrator’s username and password, this student hacked the system and gave himself an 85% average or something of the like. That is why Tuks has removed this system.

Tuks must bring back this function. Many students have waited till the end of their degrees to clean their records but now cannot do so. The arguments are:

1.) It is administratively very unfair that some students were effectively allowed to clean their records, and are now working at top firms and companies, despite the fact that they failed modules, whilst many of their classmates are now unable to do so.

2.) All other South African Universities still offer this service to their students.

3.) It is very difficult to find employment with a record that has deregistered modules on it and so on, and Tuks always brags about how 80% of their graduates find work within 6 months of graduating - removing this system makes it much harder to find a job.”

* + - 1. The Facilities Officer said that there is a period for deregistration without it reflecting in one’s academic record.
			2. The Deputy Secretary concurred with this anonymous person.
			3. The SRC President said it is important to follow up on the security threat; where the decision was taken; whether it is codified or not.
			4. The Academics 1 Officer asked a question assuming no codification i.e. how the SRC will go about in addressing this issue.
			5. The President responded that it be tabled and forwarded to the relevant persons.
			6. The Academics 1 Officer asked about our stance. The SRC President stated that the SRC is not informed enough on this issue.
	1. Marketing, Media & Communications
		1. SRC Photoshoot
			1. MMC Officer needs to inquire about availability of SRC members for the photoshoot.
			2. The photographer is available from 08:00 until 17:00 on the dates.
			3. The Residences 1 portfolio highlighted that the shoot is a speedy process which would not take longer than one hour.
			4. The Societies Representative believes it is redundant to dwell on this point – SRC members have forwarded their timetables (Academic) to the Secretaries who should, in collaboration with MMC, contemplate a date for the photoshoot.
			5. The Residences 2 portfolio said that the Secretaries should sit and narrow down a list of possible of times.
			6. The Residences 1 portfolio cautioned against increasing the workload of the Secretaries and the MMC unnecessarily.
			7. The Day Student Officer said that there is already a timetable and that the workload will not be unnecessarily increased.
	2. Deputy Secretary
		1. Student Forum
			1. Provisional date is the **18th of March**.
			2. All SRC members must start drafting reports (provisional due date for submission is **6 March 2020**). Constitutionally speaking, reports have to be submitted two weeks in advance (prior to the forum).
			3. Academics 1 asked for a crash course in preparation of student forum. She also inquired about details on what a report is.
			4. The Deputy President asked whether the POA has been published.
			5. The SRC President responded that it is currently with the Executive but that he is not sure whether it has been published.
			6. The Deputy Secretary responded to 4.4.1.3 that it is a platform for SRC’s to account. The progress on POA’s should form the substance of the report.
			7. The Residences 2 officer asked for a report template.
			8. The Deputy Secretary will be forwarding the template, as well as procedure.
			9. The Facilities member asked if it would be an issue if what you have done does not correspond with your POA.
			10. The Deputy Secretary responded to 4.4.1.9 in the negative.
			11. The Transformation Officer inquired about what she should do if she has planned an event after 6 March but before 18 March.
			12. The Deputy Secretary says that it should be included if it takes place before 18 March.
			13. The Student Culture representative asked whether reports of last year can be forwarded to the current SRC. She undertook to do so.
			14. The Secretary highlighted that SRC members should not account for something that has not happened yet. Rather state that you are planning an event than stating that it has occurred when in actual fact it has not.
			15. The Deputy Secretary will be giving a briefing prior to Student Forum.
	3. President
		1. Institutional Culture Survey
			1. The President read out a report explaining the composition of the survey, the funding thereof, the date etc.
			2. The survey will be taking place from 04-06 March 2020.
			3. The Postgraduate Officer elucidated the case from Institutional Forum (voting will be taking place on 02 March 2020).
			4. The following SRC members were nominated:
				1. **SRC President (accepted)**
				2. SRC Residences 1 (declined)
				3. SRC Transformation Officer (declined)
				4. **SRC Treasurer (accepted)**
			5. The SRC President’s election was objected to (due to his workload) after which the Facilities member volunteered to partake in his place.
	4. Student Culture
		1. Student Culture Quota Policy
			1. The reason why ‘Blossoms Delight’ was allowed to participate in InSync in spite of not meeting the quota was due to a decision made by the Director of Student Affairs based on the fact that a lot of residences did not meet this requirement.
			2. This quota rule will be implemented and enforced more strictly (i.e. 60/40 in residences; 70/30 under limited circumstances in societies).
			3. There is an external group. If you are found to participate in matters related to this group, you will be disqualified.
	5. SRC Transformation Officer
		1. Budget
			1. The Finance Officer is not happy with the DSA’s feedback and overall correspondence in terms of the ‘Project Pool Funds’.
			2. The Treasurer explained the current situation with the budgets. 20% of cost centres were used for the SRC Study Aid Fund. An additional R100 000 came from the SRC Budget and the students were able to register (contingency fund).
			3. The Deputy Secretary inquired about individual cost centres – the Treasurer referred to 4.7.2.
1. **Feedback from the Executive Committee:**
	1. N/A
2. **Portfolio-specific agenda points:**
	1. President
		1. Library Services Engagement
			1. This point was substantially covered during the meeting with Library Services (see above).
			2. The MMC Representative holds the view that library hours should be extended during the examination period.
			3. The Academics 1 Officer believes that the Library Homepage is difficult to navigate.
			4. The Deputy President spoke about a proposal formulated to extend library hours and inquired whether the SRC would support this petition. He added that SRC members are not obligated to support this initiative.
			5. The Student Culture member highlighted that the Library does have training sessions (in response to 6.1.1.2) where students can be trained on the website.
			6. The SRC President asked that this information be made available through ClickUP.
			7. The Transformation Officer is of the view that the more interaction with the Library pages would ease navigation. She said that students should be encouraged to use these services.
			8. The Treasurer added that an AIM test is written on the utilization of the Libraries.
			9. The Academics 2 asked that not only the Merensky Library Hours are extended but that the hours of other libraries are also extended to perhaps 00:00.
			10. The Facilities Member stated that libraries accommodate the needs in terms of the use thereof. She used Groenkloof as an example.
			11. The Academics 2 Officer stated that some books are only found in e.g. the Law Library – it is imperative that the library hours of the Law Library at least are extended. It has been proposed since 2015.
			12. The Deputy President mentioned that the proposal (mentioned earlier) is focused on one thing at a time (e.g. the shortfall of computer resources).
			13. The Deputy President reiterated his earlier point i.e. to find out which SRC members would be willing to volunteer in terms of library services (support from the SRC).
			14. The Facilities member said that they are merely submitting a fair request and are not making any drastic recommendations.
			15. The Transformation Officer said that (concurrent with the abovementioned proposal) recommendations should be made to IT as well who also has facilities. She stated that students should not be standing while typing out assignments.
			16. The Facilities members and SRC President stated that their respective schedules (for different reasons) would not accommodate this initiative.
			17. The Deputy Secretary suggested standard operational procedure and that SRC members do not all give reasons as to why they are unwilling or unable to volunteer.
			18. The Deputy President said that this initiative does not pertain to the policing of people but that it is a hands-on representation and facilitation of an accessible environement.
			19. The Student Culture Representative recommended that any and all students should be able to volunteer.
			20. The SRC President believes that the last suggestion is plausible but that the majority of SRC members will not be able to fit this into their individual schedules.
		2. Botswana Benchmarking
			1. An SRC from Botswana will be visiting Hatfield and would like to know whether the SRC would be available during the recess period when they are visiting (albeit assuming the contrary).
			2. They wanted to meet specifically with the NAS Faculty and the SRC.
			3. The SRC President stated that this will be taking place during the March Recess. He added that it will entail a campus tour etc.
			4. The MMC Officer asked about specifics (date, place etc.).
			5. The Academics 1 SRC Officer asked whether it would be possible to have SRC members there that are available.
			6. The Residences 2 Officer asked whether they are able to come outside recess. He also requested that it take place on a Friday. He asked whether our SRC will ever be going on benchmarking trips.
			7. The SRC President responded that we give them the 22nd of March (first Monday of recess). If they are not able, the visit will be subject to SRC availability.
			8. He also stated that the SRC due to obligatory (office hours) and budgetary constraints the SRC will not be able to partake in a benchmarking trip.
			9. The Transformation Officer asked that the SRC has a standard PowerPoint presentation for any future similar events.
		3. Update on Tribunal Exco Meeting
			1. The SRC Deputy President and the President met with UP Executive and Tribunal members (including the Chief Justice and the Registrar).
			2. The Executive Management stressed that the Tribunal is subordinate to the SRC and that they should not participate in direct communication with UP Management.
			3. The Executive highlighted that they want to preserve a healthy relationship with students.
			4. Lastly there was a concern raised by the CJ on the review committee – he believed that the amendment passed by the SRC concerning the review committee should be rescinded.
			5. The Academics 1 Officer questioned what the lines of communication are between the SRC and the UP Executive.
			6. The SRC President asked that he together with any other Executive member be notified when communication is forwarded to UP Executive.
			7. The SRC Secretary also asked that SRC members consult one another before corresponding with UP Executive – the matter might fall within their portfolio and they might already be in communication with Management. The SRC President added that keeping everyone in the loop is not necessarily always practical.
			8. The Facilities members highlighted that there is a manner to go about when consulting one another.
			9. The SRC President spoke about a novel Student Life Policy at UP (the commencement date should be communicated by Senate). Prior to communication of enactment of policy, previous policy will apply.
	2. Study Finances
		1. NSFAS
			1. If one has outstanding fees in 2020, one can receive funding through UP Loans and Bursaries in terms of historic debt provided the NSFAS requirements are met.
			2. Funds depleted – the Study Finance Officer confirmed this with staff at the Administration Building.
			3. The budget was apparently cut significantly (in relation to last year).
			4. It was confirmed that student will be assisted with historic debt through the office of Study Finance.
			5. The Deputy Secretary asked whether the amount was increased.
			6. The Finance Department at the Administration Building excluded the rest of the SRC in its correspondence with the Study Finance Officer.
			7. The Secretary asked for feedback on an NSFAS meeting with the UP Executive today. She was not made aware of the meeting.
			8. The Deputy President asked for feedback on the SAUS meeting with NSFAS last week.
			9. The Secretary responded that the content of the meeting was contained in a PowerPoint presentation which was forwarded to SRC members on the WhatsApp group on the day of the meeting.
			10. The SRC President added that the meeting’s relevance to UP context was insignificant and for that reason it was not necessary to add comprehensive feedback during the ordinary SRC meeting.
3. **Time and date of next meeting:**
	1. N/A
4. **Closing:**
	1. The meeting was adjourned at 19:58.

**I, David Kabwa and Ryan Haines, hereby declare that these minutes serve as a true reflection of what transpired during this particular SRC meeting.**



