

SRC Ordinary Meeting Minutes

18 February 2020 | Roosmaryn Building 1-7 | 18:00

1. **Welcoming; Opening & Personal Items:**
   1. David welcomed everyone at the meeting and allowed the SRC Secretary to inform the Council of valid excuses of absence.
2. **Attendance:**
   1. **Present:**

Refer to the attendance register and the attendance record.

The Transformation Officer (late without excuse; 18:12)

* 1. **Absent with apology:**

* 1. **Absent without apology:**

1. **Acceptance of previous minutes and adoption of agenda:**
   1. Acceptance of previous Minutes
   2. Adoption of agenda
2. **Feedback from the Executive Committee:**
   1. N/A
3. **Portfolio-specific agenda points:**
   1. Secretary
      1. Consultation with Constitutional Tribunal
         1. The Secretary wanted to find out from the Council whether it saw it fit to reintroduce the amendment bill during the consultation process (from the Secretary Office).
         2. He reminded the Council to be prepared in terms of (1) understanding the amendment bill of the Constitutional Tribunal as well as (2) the CSG. Council has had adequate time to peruse the aforesaid documents.
         3. Council members (including the Student Sport, Academics 1, and Student Culture office bearers) were in favour of the bill, albeit to a certain extent.
         4. The SRC Secretary moved to vote on the reintroduction of his amendment bill.
         5. Six (6) SRC members were in favour of splitting the portfolio, six (6) were opposed and two (2) abstained. The President opposed the split (as a deciding vote).
         6. The amendment bill will not be reintroduced during the consultation with Tribunal.
   2. Marketing, Media & Communications
      1. **Merchandise**
         1. By end of May (latest) the SRC will be receiving their jackets.
         2. The design of the jackets ought to still be decided upon.
         3. The Postgraduate & International Student Affairs portfolio holder inquired about other designs of the ‘malpakke’.
         4. The MMC Office bearer mentioned that the SRC may elect between ‘malpakke’ and sweatpants.
         5. The Residences 2 portfolio inquired about when we will have the respective designs at our disposal. He furthermore asked for the particulars of the malpak design.
         6. The Deputy Secretary sought clarity on whether we are voting on designs or on the actual piece of clothing. The SRC President clarified that it would be the latter.
         7. The Transformation Officer believes that it is necessary to have the designs before us before voting on the issue.
         8. The MMC members undertook to have the designs ready by the next ordinary SRC meeting.
         9. The SRC President requested a backtrack to the previous agenda point (5.1.1).
         10. The Student Culture member interjected and mentioned that backtracking should be added as an additional matter arising (disciplinary committee).
         11. The SRC Secretary highlighted that the MMC office write a letter to the DSA, expressing concern with the manner in which merchandise has been administered, ultimately undermining the MMC portfolio. The fact that the SRC has received blazers at such a late stage is not attributable to negligence on behalf of the supplier, but rather to miscommunication from the DSA.
         12. The Student Culture Representative is of the view that Council will not pass the amendment of s36 (review board).
         13. The SRC Secretary emphasised the importance of not premising ones vote on a personal speculation of probability of the amendment being passed in Council.
         14. The Standing Committee agreed that the amendment bill concerning PDBY will be dealt with.
         15. The Residences 2 portfolio holder asked that members be protected during our sitting tomorrow.
         16. The President asked members to be direct and precise during the meeting.
         17. The Finance Officer suggested that we work through it amendment by amendment. This will be communicated with the Chief Justice.
      2. **Photoshoot**
         1. The Residences 2 portfolio suggested that the MMC officer presents SRC with concrete dates as to when the SRC should have the photoshoot.
         2. The Societies officer believes that this should not be a matter of debate.
         3. The SRC President clarified that the photographers (Gordon Harris Photography) will only be taking photos of the SRC once-off.
         4. The MMC Officer recommended taking two different pictures of the SRC, one in informal attire, and the other in formal SRC merchandise.
         5. The RAG SRC member mentioned that the photoshoot was very rushed. There was little room for taking photos with props. She opined that changing uniform would be impractical based on last year.
         6. The Student Culture member cannot (during any time this week) participate in the photoshoot.
         7. The Student Sport member is not available during next week.
         8. The Postgraduate & International Student Affairs is not available over weekends (not even 10 minutes as it will ‘mess up his schedule’).
         9. The SRC President looked up (on the internet) the business hours of the photographing company.
         10. The SRC President suggested that the SRC (for the purpose of brevity) avail themselves on the 6th of March.
         11. He recommended the 2nd of March. The SRC Residence portfolio holder highlighted that Institutional Forum will be taking place in this date.
         12. The SRC President ultimately recommended constructing (by MMC) a calendar invitation to serve as a reflection of the availability of SRC members.
         13. The MMC officer will be contacting the company to find out more about the possibility of accommodating the Council (in terms of more than one day for photoshoot).
         14. The SRC President referred back to 5.2.1.23.
   3. Study Finances
      1. **SRC Study Aid Fund**
         1. The Finance Officer provided the SRC with a point of information regarding the current status of the fund and the sources thereof.
         2. The Finance Officer asked the Council to inform students that the Fund is closed, but asked that students are however referred to her office for the purpose of negotiation.
      2. **Fundraising**
         1. The Finance Officer will be setting up a workshop for the entire Council for the purpose of being trained on raising funds.
         2. She will be in communication with the DUR (Hernen Finkel) in relation to the said workshop.
         3. The Finance Officer asked that members start contemplating possible fundraising events.
         4. The Deputy Secretary asked that the SRC don’t allow time constraints to prevent the Council from hosting events.
   4. Postgraduate & International Student Affairs
      1. **Office Hours on External Campuses**
         1. The Officer would like clarity on the arrangements surrounding this issue.
         2. The Deputy Secretary believes that this should be compulsory and not optional that there is a particular number of hours a week to visit external campuses.
         3. The MMC Officer concurred with the point raised in 5.4.1.2.
         4. The Deputy President highlighted that these hours should not be added to our current office hours but that our current office hours should make provision for external campuses.
         5. The RAG Officer believes it is a great, but rather impractical suggestion. Realistically speaking, SRC members will not be willing to commit to this initiative.
         6. The Facilities Officer stated that she is willing to do office hours on Groenkloof campus. She believes that SRC members should alternate to do office hours.
         7. The Finance Officer asked where we would have these office spaces.
         8. The SRC Secretary stated that (in the past) the SRC was allocated office space on external campuses. In theory, this is a great initiative but in practice, members would most likely not fulfil their duties to do these office hours.
         9. The Facilities officer stated that the list (for monitoring office hours) has not yet been put up and that SRC members are currently doing office hours out of good conscience.
         10. The Residences 2 portfolio holder believes that the 2020 SRC should at least attempt this initiative and not disregard this matter due to the past.
         11. The SRC President explained the difference between ‘visibility’ and ‘presence’. He is of the opinion that deeming such an initiative mandatory would result in ineffective execution. He acknowledged the logistical issues surrounding the issue (transport, office space etc.).
         12. He ultimately suggested keeping it voluntary.
         13. The Day Student & External Campus Affairs officer mentioned that she and the Deputy President will be visiting external campuses (per their agreement). She will still be meeting with Dr Wilken on this issue.
         14. The SRC President asked for feedback on the logistical parameters of this arrangement by the ordinary SRC meeting on the 4th of March 2020.
         15. The Finance Officer does not she how it would be reasonably possible for her to commit to external campus visits due to the nature of her current office hours that are more often than not outside of her control.
      2. **AOW Residence Fees and Facilities**
         1. The Postgraduate & International Student Affairs portfolio mentioned that the accommodation is aware of the amount received by NSFAS for accommodation. The fees are too high.
         2. He also believes that the facilities of these accommodations are exorbitant (he referred to laundry).
         3. The RAG Officer reiterated this point.
         4. The Postgraduate Officer mentioned a few expensive items (including washing of bedding etc.). He sees it as problematic that students are not made aware of these prices until they receive the bill, leaving them financially excluded.
         5. The Facilities Officer inquired why AOW (as a university accredited traditional accommodation) is subjecting their tenants to private accommodation prices.
         6. The Residences 2 portfolio holder believes that accommodation fees cannot be negotiated as it is essentially on equal footing with traditional residence prices. He does however feel that the additional (unreasonable costs) could and should be challenged.
         7. The Student Culture portfolio holder highlighted that prices of different traditional residences vary (depending on renovation etc.).
         8. The SRC President stated that NSFAS students within the capped cohort (and not uncapped students) will be affected by this issue.
         9. The SRC President will be setting up a meeting with Professor Mosia to discuss this matter, together with directors within TuksRes.
      3. ~~UPI Email~~

5.4.3.1 The office holder moved for the deletion of this agenda point.

* 1. Academics (1)
     1. **NSFAS Telecommunications Company Pitch**
        1. The Officer, SRC President and Deputy Secretary met with this company.
        2. The organisation proposed a warranted laptop, dongle etc. to NSFAS students who wish to not utilise their book allowances.
        3. This would be a voluntary initiative – students will not be compelled.
        4. The company approached the Academics 1 Officer with this proposal. The organisation has highlighted that this proposition is operational in other universities across the country.
        5. The company was willing to offer a gift for the acceptance of this proposal.
        6. The SRC Secretary emphasised that book allowances were allocated for no purpose other than that of buying books. He added that gifts for the acceptance of the proposal will essentially constitute fraud and is something to be weary of.
        7. He stated that the company should forward the SRC a comprehensive business proposal.
        8. The SRC President elucidated on the benefits of this proposal (in terms of students) i.e. that products are being offered.
        9. The SRC President is concerned that this proposal is not applicable to UP students (dongle while there is WIFI at UP). Furthermore, he is concerned with book allowances being used for purposes other than what is has been allotted for.
        10. The SRC President elaborated on the contractual aspect of this proposal. He stated that the organisations would either enter into a physical agreement with students or it would be implemented in the system (n/a as UP Executive has already rejected this proposal).
        11. The SRC President made it clear to the company that it would have to benefit the student population.
     2. SRC Residential Accommodation
        1. The Academics Officer informed the SRC of a proposal (from UP Security) to purchase a building for temporary accommodation during the registration period.
        2. The SRC President responded that either the Transformation Committee or Institutional Forum (hereinafter IF) will have to be approached in this regard.
        3. Members of the IF Executive (Finances and Postgraduate) will present this issue during their meeting tomorrow.
        4. The Student Culture SRC member asked that this matter (together with alternatives) be discussed within the SRC before making any submissions to IF.
        5. The SRC President believes that collective input is imperative. He is currently collating statistics of students in temporary accommodation during the registration period.
        6. The Academics 2 Officer inquired about whether Elim Full Gospel Church and Arcadia Village was remunerated by the University for their temporary housing of students.

1. **Other matters arising:**
   1. Deputy Secretary
      1. **Transparency regarding meetings with political organisations**
         1. There was a meeting with political organisations (of which its members never pitched). She wanted to clarity on this meeting and what transpired thereafter.
         2. The SRC President highlighted that political organisations (PYA and EFF) did not arrive at the said meeting.
         3. The SRC President provided these organisations with a breakdown of the daily activities of the SRC.
         4. Political organisations would like better communication from the SRC regarding what they are and have been doing on the ground.
         5. Included in the discussions was the disparity within NSFAS, DHET and tertiary educational institutions (on which the SRC President provided clarification).
         6. The organisations requested information regarding students that still have issues surrounding historic debt, exclusion etc. The POPI Act prevents communication thereof.
         7. Political organisations wanted to set up a meeting with UP Executive Management to which the SRC responded that the SRC is the only recognised leadership structure that is allowed (and has specifically been designated) to fulfil the duty of escalating student-related issues with Management.
         8. The SRC President stated that the SRC has in fact (whether during ordinary meetings or briefings) been kept in the loop with SAUS meetings (of which only one has taken place this year).
   2. Facilities, Safety & Security
      1. **Security in Hatfield**
         1. The Officer received two complaints of recent muggings in the area.
         2. In both instances, female students were targeted. A laptop in one instance and a phone in another have been stolen.
         3. The Officer would like to start a Security Forum (besides the CID Forum). She would like to find out who would be interested to sit on such a committee.
         4. She would like to know whether a statement on this issue can be released (either by the SRC President or the SRC Secretary).
         5. The SRC President highlighted procedure that all statements have to be signed off by either the SRC Secretary or the SRC Deputy Secretary.
         6. The Facilities Officer would like to establish a platform to ensure safety within the University environment (she mentioned the contact details of TuksRes Security EC members’).
   3. Societies
      1. **Sonop Society**
         1. The Office bearer provided context of the situation.
         2. The former UP Residence has created a society (known as Blossoms Delight).
         3. The Officer bearer opines that the DSA might have a personal vendetta against the former UP Residence.
         4. The Facilities Office stated that there are no grounds for disqualifying the society (in terms of regulations of societies).
         5. The Student Culture also believes that the society cannot be prevented from participating.
         6. The RAG Officer stated that the University has (for good reason) excluded the Sonop from TuksRes. She believes that the former UP Residence has found a way to circumvent their exclusion.
         7. The SRC Secretary is of the belief that an advisory opinion should be obtained from the Tribunal – this matter might extend to constitutionality and not merely societies.
         8. The Residences 2 Officer said that the society should not necessarily be banned but that they should be compelled to conform to rules and policies of UP.
         9. The Societies Officer referred to a clause in the Sub-Council Constitution that allows for the banning of a society if more than 40% of its members form part of another society.
         10. The Deputy Secretary added to the last point made by the Residences 2 Officer. She stated that first-years that merely want to participate are unreasonably disadvantaged.
         11. The Finance Officer asked whether the aforementioned provision will be applied across the board or only to the society concerned.
         12. The Student Culture Representative responded that the first-years (referred to in 6.3.1.10) had a choice of joining the accommodation in the first place.
         13. She continued to ask whether STUKU should allow them to participate in cultural activities and whether there are transformational policies preventing them from doing so.
         14. The Societies Officer elucidated on the aforesaid provision (i.e. a financial constraint).
         15. She added that this is a matter based on procedure and ethics. She briefly explained why quota would be unreasonable and unfair.
   4. Treasurer
      1. **SRC Budget**
         1. The Treasurer explained that certain portfolios’ budgets are outside of the Treasurers discretion in terms of allocation. RAG, Student Sport and Student Culture budgets are allocated by the University and not the SRC Treasurer.
         2. The Treasurer will seek clarity with Toonbank tomorrow.
   5. SRC President
      1. **Disciplinary Committee**
         1. The SRC President stated that the committee is chaired by the office of the Deputy President, with two sitting members of the DSA, one executive members of the SRC and one non-executive SRC member of the SRC. The SRC will be voting on the latter two.
         2. The Academics 1 Officer asked for clarity on what this committee does. The SRC President responded that the committee deals with internal discipline within the Council.
         3. The SRC Secretary and SRC Deputy Secretary agreed that the manner of voting would be by way of raise of hands.
         4. The Student Culture member asked for short manifestos from those that would like to serve on the committee. Each candidate was allowed a maximum of 30 seconds to motivate their candidacy.
         5. The SRC Secretary was voted in to serve on this committee with a total of six (6) votes (and the deciding vote of the SRC President). The Treasurer received six (6) votes and the SRC Deputy Secretary received three (3) votes.
         6. The SRC Student Culture Representative was elected to serve as the non-executive member of the committee.
         7. The President emphasised that proper attire excludes jeans, t-shirts, political regalia and anything that has not been purchased by the MMC office (via email as requested).
         8. This matter has been decided upon during the previous meeting.
2. **Time and date of next meeting:**
   1. Not scheduled.
3. **Closing:**
   1. The meeting was officially adjourned at 21:21.

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



