

## 1. Welcoming and Opening: President

The President opened the meeting at 17:41. Made a point that members need to respect the time meetings start.

2. Attendance: SG

### 2.1 Present:

Njabulo Sibeko – President (Pres)

Neville Mupita – Deputy President (DP)

Phenyo Matabane - Secretary (SG) (Late with Apology)

Christo Pretorius – Deputy Secretary (DSG)

Lauren Thabethe - Treasurer (TG)

Captain Shongwe - Facilities, Safety and Security (FSS)

Khanyi Mahlangu – Study Finance (SF)

Karabo Lefete – Day Student and External Campus Affairs (DSEC)

Francois du Plessis – Residences 2

Karabo Mogale - Societies

Sphesihle Makhanya – Transformation and Student Success (TSS)

Katlego Modise - Sport

Pule Nkadimeng - RAG

Zeenat Patel - Academics 1

Sandile Manoni – Academics 2

Vhutshilo Muambadzi – Residences 1

### 2.2 Absent with apology:

Thokozane Zwane – Media, Marketing and Communications (MMC)

Jaryd Grobler - Culture

## 2.3 Absent without apology:

None

### 3. Acceptance of previous minutes and adoption of agenda:

# 3.1 Acceptance of previous minutes

Treasurer, SF and DSG

3.2 Adoption of agenda



Agenda was adopted.

3.3 Noting of Matters Arising:

Academics 1: SAUJS

Academics 2: Jan 13 Statement

**Treasurer:** Cost-centres, food for student forum.

## 4. Feedback from Executive Meeting:

**President:** Mentioned that the executive had a meeting. Was regarding Provisionally funded students, they are being kicked out due to concessions expiring. DP created a form to get lists, the went to NSFAS with the list. More than 2000 responses in a short time.

**Deputy President:** (Regarding the NSFAS meeting) Mentioned that there was no update from the NSFAS portals, however we have a list of funded students. 85 were rejected but it still says provisionally funded on their portals. 289 possibly transferring students. Also, students who appeal. They might be funded. Issue now is Students don't know if they are funded. If they can apply for pay-outs, it means they are funded. NSFAS is trying to fix the problem.

Academics 2: Asked whether it was confirmed that if you have an offer that you are funded?

**Deputy President**: Responded by saying that there is a disconnect between the portal and if you are funded. Gugu has the names of funded students, so if you can claim, you are funded.

**Deputy Secretary**: Mentioned that they also discussed the possibility of renting a room for students from certain accommodations, especially for students who were still appealing."

**President**: Elaborated on the possibility of hiring rooms for students who are in the appeal process.

**Academics 2**: Mentioned that they have people rely on the provisionally funded status. The issue is that they need to change the name, because it means you are still funded but awaiting registration. It is problematic because it does not define that you are not funded. Noted that something must be done.

**Study Finance**: Noted that another issue is that students have NSFAS, but they have not filled in their details or submitted the relevant documents yet thus they cannot apply for payouts.

**Academics 1**: Mentioned that regarding the accommodation, we need to ensure what criteria is used. Students who are not funded can go to Snapp? (TG noted Snap has a waiting list)

**Transformation and Student Success**: Inquired if there are rooms within campus or rooms from accommodations.

**Treasurer**: Responded and said that there was an individual who wanted to get vouchers for students, we will be approaching the large shops to get vouchers for students who need food. The individual said that he wanted to start a vegetables garden, but the SRC needs to request to have the land.



**President**: To academics 2, said that it is NSFAS that we are dealing with. NSFAS people were allowed to upload their banking details etc. Since 2020, they would have your things on your portal. Provisionally funded, means that you can still lose your funded historically. The university used to go to NSFAS to make up for the difference. UP is not willing to open the tabs for everyone, because NSFAS always gives them trouble. We also wrote a letter to exec management to give them an indication of how many students are affected. Allow students to upload the things that worked in the past. Regarding the criteria for accommodation, its touch and go, it's more a suggestion that was on the floor.

**Residences 1**: Mentioned that if students are rejected and do not have the right criteria's, why are they surprised.

**President**: Responded and said that there are exceptions, for example of death or taxes etc.

**Transformation**: Inquired on how we are going to accommodate students who will be rejected who have signed leases.

**President**: Said that they will not kick out students as funded, but as self-funded students. Buildings allow students in good faith. Then the situation arises, that they get rejected. The idea was to write to accommodations, but there are 85 students. Please allow them to leave without the debt. Unfortunate they are already signed the leases and they agreed to let the students go in with debt. We will need to then negotiate with them about what we can do, even possible AOD.

**Residences 1**: Mentioned that they went to speak with Respublica, and we convinced her to give grace to students are funded. She said any student who gets rejected. They are financially obligated to pay the amounts due for their stay there. But they can negotiate payment deals. This might be the case for all accommodations.

**Societies**: Said that Respublica requires 50% first, and inquired if this will be paying that too.

**Residences 1**: Responded and said that it was not a matter discussed.

**Transformation**: Said that an idea is to engage with the accommodations on the matter. We can negotiate for them to leave without paying cancelations.

Day Students: Inquired if they were cancelling their leases, or if they will be kicked out.

**President**: Responded and said that we can argue that they do get kicked out, and then they don't pay those fees.

**Academics 2**: Mentioned that we explore all other options before the kick out option. If it comes to a point for them to be evicted, they cannot be held accountable. They both are in the same issue because both parties knew what they were doing. Students will have debt or have legal issues. Look at the long-term implications.

**President**: Mentioned that people will have to be either have financial arrangements or get evicted.

**Academics 2**: Insisted that they knew the possibility of them getting rejected, why is the student liable and not the residences. Allow them to leave without paying anything.



**Sport**: Said that it is best if the student goes to their residences first, then go to the SRC. It's possible that they have bursaries.

**Residences 1**: Explained that we keep speaking of 85 people, but there is more that we do not know of. Secondly, emphasised what president said on the good faith agreement between students and private accommodations. Thirdly, can we write to accommodations to all the stakeholders, and then we can maybe waiver it. I don't think private accommodations have bursaries. Lastly, they need to use emergency funds to accommodate the rejected students.

**Deputy President**: Inquired about where they are going after a solution is found for them to be kicked out.

**Study Finance**: Responded and said that financial aid will not accommodate these students; it relies on donors.

**Day Students and External Campuses:** Inquired if the rejected students, are they TuksRes or Private, secondly, why are they rejected?

**President**: We don't know what the spread is. We also don't know why or that they are rejected. They need to be given an appeal opportunity. Perhaps a google doc can help us identify the difference.

**Residences 2**: Inquired for clarity on what the rejection means. Members of the Council explained.

**Transformation**: Inquired about where we are taking them. Are we going to look at solutions for the academic debts as well. It's going to be a ripple effect. May I propose, we need to go meet management. They have not said anything. We need to meet with them. We will try and meet them.

Academics 2: Mentioned that we need to recommend a system which will allow for helping students in these scenarios like the study aid fund. Let us explore options that ensure that our students don't have debt.

**President**: Mentioned that money needs to be raised and the Finance task team will be at the head of it.

**Academics 1**: Suggested that we need to divide the problems; we won't have a solution if we complicate the two issues into one issue. We have 3 problems, they can't pay, they need to leave, and they have the tuition problem. Tuition needs to wait, lets solve the first two.

**President**: Agreed with Academics 1.

**Transformation**: Raise a concern about one more problem, students who did senate review and they appeals were rejected. They also signed leases, and they were now rejected.

**President**: Responded and said that there should be a blanket request to accommodations, but I don't know how successful that would be. We should do an individual approach. We just need to know who stays where?



**TG:** Suggested asking management for sports houses to be used as emergency accommodation.

**Societies:** Supported TG's ID, also place students to squad there like in a hall, they have no choice. That would give extra motivation to finish their studies.

**Residence1:** Mentioned that they feel like this topic needs its own meeting, and she noted that we will not get withe efficient solutions.

**Residences 2:** Mentioned in the beginning of the year people who came in the beginning of the year, noted the DIA to be used.

**DP:** Noted about sports houses that there are expenses like water and Wi-Fi, and also with Societies mentioned about dignity, that we Vann allow inhumane conditions. And also, we are spending much time on this agenda point a time is moving.

**SF:** Mentioned that there are students who needs who need funding and are not qualifying should be covered as SG mentioned earlier for the SRC

**President:** Responded that we do not have the time. Noted that in the SRC have people who know and other who do not know about what is happening, so that why it was broad. Noted about the time constraint, and he felt we needed to have this talk at this point and bring solutions. DIA money is used for all operations within the institution they can help us in our plans to go outside to ask for money.

Academics 1: Agreed with the President that the university is not going to allow that, we can put down what we have discussed and have some time to think and research on these points. So, we are well informed in terms on what's faceable or not.

**SG:** Inquired the President suggest, Municipality buildings to be used for accommodation.

**President:** Can we meet on Monday online and said we will resume this agenda. We should sleep on these and will see each other on Tuesday.

Academic debt, where do they go, food issue.

### 5. Portfolio-specific agenda points:

5.1 Customer Experience Project (Academics 1)

**Academics 1:** Mentioned that facilities attended a project on how UP improve its customer service. The registrar said the student input is quite important. What suggestion do we have as Council and let's not lose the opportunity to fully represent the students.

- 5.2 Recently Readmitted Student (Academics 1)
  Gave a brief updated to the readmitted students.
- 5.3 Institutional Forum Feedback (Day Students)



**Day Students:** Noted that they received the new transformation plan where the due date is 19th of April.

**DP:** Suggested in the sense of that members know what is in that document. We need to find ways.

SG:

**Societies:** Explained that the transformation plan is to help us and guide us on how to deal with issues addressed on the plan, hence we must read the document and know it. There are a lot of students that deal with issues addressed on that document so must read it and make necessary amendments. It addresses a lot of issues such as Gender based violence which is a serious issue, misgendering and so forth.

**Day Students:** Stated that It is the new plan for the next 5 years, so please can we take it seriously.

5.4 Mentors (Deputy Secretary-General)

**DSG:** Mentioned that members should as their mentor to be your mentors. And it can be everyone.

**Academics 2:** Mentioned that if that fails, we can identify those ones, to request. **Pres:** Inquired if they can make a request for us.

5.5 Update from the Secretariat (Deputy Secretary-General)

DSG: Mentioned that POAs update from the HOD. There has been a request from DSG on the individual reports by the 17th of April, as they need to justify why you were paid, otherwise deductions will follow.

**DSG:** Mentioned that the President must lead us in what to report, and where we have reports from the heads. Then we go to Questions without notice and with notice.

**DP:** Stated that there is a possibility of someone reporting to a question and putting another member on the bus. You might be answering and putting each other under the bus. We need to be a team as much as differences to opinions.

**Pres:** Mentioned that different Task team headband we will get out thing. If they ask a question about it.

**Pres:** Mentioned that everyone should know what's happening in a task team. We are not going to have one member answering all the accommodations. Task Team should speak in their what's app group and communicate when answering the questions. Members should request assistance from each other, so we do not look like

**Residences1:** Mentioned that we need to look into each other's strengths and weaknesses, do not answer were.



**Academics 1**: Mentioned that she agrees to discuss a few things on to our task teams as well, also to reply and engage. Familiarise ourselves with the student forum rules. Questions without notice, for without very good reasons.

**Pres:** Mentioned that we should try the very best to not give negative answers.

**DSG:** Regarding the sub-councils.

Societies, for not now, and Day house Chairpersons.

Jarad or Pule. Pule for marketing.

**SG:** Inquired about himself being included in answering the questions and presenting the reports as per the constitution.

**DSG:** Responded and said that he will inquire with the Chief Justice.

**TG**: Mentioned that food for the members will be from Atlas, the problem is that the cost centre money, has already been planned for in advance.

TG: Mentioned about the cost centres, that there is challenge is with regards to what we have.

Academics 2: Complained about the statement on the general update, on SAUS, where to engage on that. The labels and the terminologies used in our statements. Understand our constituency, who we are engaging as well. We want to be relevant. Lingo on the statement should be in Cape Town of places as well. We acknowledge the visitation of the interim solutions, we

**Academics 1:** What happens to execute meetings, and when I try to ask from who, and I don't think want happens on Executive I'd the same thing.

## 6. Other matters arising:

#### 6.1 Academics 1: SAUJS

**Pres:** Noted about the protest the SRC on the 15th of March. They said we must revise this the memorandum said to vote against, and it is a binding decision, where.

**Academics 1**: Noted to revote again as there is new information that must be considered.

**Academics 2:** Noted That when they decide to discuss, say that minutes were released, and it is not necessary to vote again. Also, it is what we agreed upon as the SRC.

**TG:** Mentioned not to vote again.

Rag: Supported the TG in not voting again.



**DP:** Claimed that we are setting a wrong precedent of re-voting, members to take a decision to protest the decision, which is wrong as a Council. Are we saying that that we are not supposed to vote, and minority must organize people who are outside to protest the vote. Are we saying a vote can be protested.

**DSG:** In support of a re-vote, explained that he did not have the opportunity to vote the first time.

**Residences 1:** Inquired, on the new information that should be disclosed, asked the reason why we cannot allow on this new information to be disclosed, in support of we might not agree on what majority has said, as the SRC we should stand on one front. **SG:** Mentioned that we should take responsibility to support protection of freedom of speech for members of the council and student population.

**DP:** Noted the new information.

**Academics 1**: Mentioned an incident where SAUJS contradicts what they said in the meeting, and second to that, the moral stands on what the organization states. Defamation of character has occurred, which is a very serious accusation. Further to that, what they see fit to do is further concerning, they brought up a matter of assisting students to when they initially wanted to host a freshers, if a society engages in this way, there are serious concerns, are we true to continue working to them.

**Transformation:** Mentioned, I understand that there is a great need for us to show a united front, we took an oath without fear, favour, or prejudice. Rights of free speech must not be infringed, or we are a circular institution, and if we are entering into the concession there should be respect for that.

**TG:** The reason they change is that it is too late, and we proposed different ideas on how to everything came about.

**DP:** Responded and said, Zeenat mentioned that articles that have been released, would we care to give us such articles, let us not use hearsay, he does understand what Transformation mentioned, what is the stance on campus, they have been cases of violence from the Palestinian Students against the Jewish students. Are we to say we should choose which violence is better than the other?

**Academics 1:** Responded and said that she can provide articles, the actions of the PSC has nothing to do with Jewish students. They make it a point. They clarified that it is not against Jewish students. There is an assumption on what have been said. We remain able to express in our individual capacity.

**SF:** Mentioned that the refreshers was an initiative to assist students, and we as The SRC do not have any.

**DP:** Mentioned that for him, he still stands on the point that until proof have been provided. I still stand and push forward the idea until proof can be provided, we cannot revote.

**Sports:** Mentioned that we spoke about this, and we cannot revote, the meeting is becoming personal now, how did the student get to that point from the first go. Let us not make the meeting like what we discussed before.

**TG:** Noted that we can open the floor, to vote and who is comfortable with not voting. **SG:** Requested for respect.

**Academics 2:** Mentioned that members in the SRC are being questioned personally out of the SRC on their stands onto this.



**SG:** Noted a point of order off the record and on the record, it would be limiting the capacity of the SRC on institutional intelligence.

**Residences 1:** Inquired if we should revote or not revote. Mentioned that, if what Zeenat is saying is true, that would be a different story. This conversation is not being spoken forth, where someone was up to something, where people are now pushing personal mandates.

**Pres:** Mentioned that sometimes you cannot separate yourself from the SRC. Made an example that he can go to a society like women in law and there he says otherwise and the majorly decides otherwise. He mentioned that he is the most neutral person. That action would be delegitimizing every decision that was made by the SRC. There is no personal capacity, every member is still an SRC member no matter where they are. Even working on weekends, we are still SRC in private and in uniform.

**TG:** Mentioned that we will come again to revote. exempted.

## Voting

5 yes

8 no Revote.

7. Time and date of next meeting:

Tuesday during recess for a special meeting.

8. Closing:

The President closed the meeting at 9H40pm.

I, "President and SG", hereby declare that these minutes serve as a true reflection of what transpired during this particular SRC meeting.



