

Date: 17 Sept 2015

Time: 21.00PM-23.00PM

Venue: Kewalram Chanrai Room

Note-Taker: Dave

Presiding Officer: Tee

Attendance: Dave, Tee, Adila, Avery, Tamara, Sara, Qi Siang, Matthew, Swarnima, Daniel, Vasudha, Glen (participating through e-conference)

Absent: Jay (participating through e-conference), Anandita, Isabel, Subhas (all with apologies)

Agenda:

1. The committee hears an amendment suggestion from Daniel Silverman '17
2. In Principle Approval (IPA) sought for a single draft proposal for further modification
3. IPA sought for a process of review

Summary:

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action
Daniel's Amendment	Meritocracy Method 1. Explanation <ol style="list-style-type: none">a. For a hierarchical system, but could work for an equal council systemb. Rather than having a vote, positions are instead decided by trials, that are hosted and voted upon by the student body or the previous chief executive. Whoever does the best in the trials, is given to the positionc. Purpose of this is to test skills required for jobs, rather than 'popularity contest.' Designed to display skills without having it legitimised through vote.	The Committee is to consider the meritocracy method in the creation of the new election process

d. From original it has been revised so that the chief executive would be voted in by the majority of the student body. Would help remove cronyism of chief executive picking the roles

2. Committee Questions:

a. Qi Siang: How long will this selection process take? Is it practical? Would this make the government less legitimate, since they won't be given a democratic mandate? What happens if the chief executive can't work well with other members?

i. Daniel: Has to be accountability compromise. They can still be effective members of government without being legitimised by a vote. Helps remove the issue of popularity, which may occur in Yale-NUS. This could be necessary for Chief executive, but not for other roles. Is a new school, so gives a good chance to experiment.

ii. Daniel: Originally it would have been held over a weekend, with varying time limits and different tasks to decide their ability.

iii. Daniel: Issue of lack of cooperation exists with most models of appointment and election.

b. Avery: What sort of government would work with this? What do you think about going through this, publishing the results and then letting the student body vote?

i. Daniel: One suggestion was to have a separate legislative council that's voted in, but the executive being selected through the meritocratic process. It can be paired with multiple other systems.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">ii. Daniel: It would still be a popularity contest. Lots of people may well ignore it or pay very little attention to this.c. Sara: Who would run the trials and who would establish the questions?<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Daniel: An MC voted upon either by the current government or the student body would run the events. The trials would be decided upon by the student body, perhaps through an online poll.d. Avery: Won't this make it so that people could cheat?<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Daniel: You wouldn't be able to cheat on them. It would be tasked based, e.g. organise a picnic on the UTown green.e. Sara: How do you quantify a response?<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Daniel: It depends on who proposes what. You could have a list of accomplishments and whoever can achieve the most would do the best. Subjective trials could be voted on by a council of judges.f. Sara: Given how long and intense the process is, how would you get involvement?<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Daniel: The idea would be to create a sense of collective effervescence. Should foster community.g. Adila: Who will judge the contests?<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Daniel: The MC would not decide the outcomes. That would be decided by a panel of judges that would either be selected by the previous government or by voting in the Student Body. Similar to Elected Student Committee.h. Adila: How do you ensure class and rc representatives? | |
|--|--|--|

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Daniel: They could be done separate to the meritocracy games. They would likely all get voting power. i. Avery: Could you list some roles that you don't think should be elected? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Daniel: Secretary, treasurer, events, liaison with other universities (like a diplomat who could work with NUSSU), admin liaison, possible vice president j. Qi Siang: How will you get the student body involved with this selection process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Daniel: People can generate hype through publicity k. Dave: How would you ensure administration regards this government as legitimate, or any of the decisions it presents on behalf of students as representative? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Daniel: The DOS, provided they're consistent, is interested regardless of the process, assuming the government has student body. How would this be different from the current system? A hybrid system could also prevent that. The Student Body would still have a lot of input in this stuff to lend legitimacy. l. Qi Siang: It's not a problem with regard to legitimacy provided you have an elected parliament <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Daniel: Additionally, any proposal would have to go through the chief executive who would be elected. 	
<p>IPA sought for a single draft proposal for further modification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tee: We shall use a raise of hands to decide whether we vote in a full proposal vs piece by piece <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Full: Qi Siang, Avery, Adila, Sara, Dave, Tee, Tamara b. Component: Matthew <p>Vote on the different proposals</p>	

2. Avery and Swarnima's Proposal (vote only for one)
 - a. Sara, Avery, Adila, Swarnima
3. Qi Siang's System
 - a. Qi Siang
4. Dave
 - a. Tamara, Matthew, Dave, Tee, Jay

Jay's reasoning:

1. Avery and Swarnima
 - a. Likes size and simplicity
 - b. Doesn't like how you deal with the RCACs
2. Dave
 - a. Likes dealing with RCACs
 - b. Doesn't want RCACs to have undue influence
 - c. Thinks it's too big
 - d. Voted for Dave's because he'd like to see a larger government and doesn't want an RC rep if we aren't dealing with RCACs

Glen: Raises objection, asking why you should include RCACs as it's voluntary

1. Dave: Under the RCAC proposal they would have to be elected.
2. Matthew: We should vote on what sort of stance we want on the RCACs
3. Sara: I do not think the RCACs should be elected. It's important to allow them to get involved
4. Tee: So let's debate whether we want them elected or selected
 - a. Qi Siang: would prefer them to be elected since their role is to represent the student body as RCACs. He has no objection to

them being appointed, provided they're not included in the government

- b. Tee: I can't allow this discussion to carry on for too long. So we should do this by a simple vote:
 - i. Swarnima: What are the objections?
 - ii. Sara: It may stop people being able to participate in the community if they want
 - iii. Vasudha: You could have a nomination system through the Rectors, which is then voted on by the Student Body
 - iv. Devil's Advocate: On elected RCACs
 - 1. Pros:
 - a. Government needs official RCAC connection and representation but an appointed body makes that impossible
 - b. Official agenda with student government
 - c. Keep RC administration accountability
 - 2. Cons:
 - a. Rectors may disagree
 - b. RCACs will become a political item instead of a random low-commitment thing
 - c. Student government won't have something to push back against within the RC Community, so you get a sort of idea vacuum effect

	<p style="text-align: center;">d. Could get talent pool dilution from large government</p> <p>5. Tee calls for vote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. in favour of elected RCAC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Qi Siang ii. Swarnima iii. Avery iv. Adila v. Dave vi. Tee vii. Matthew viii. Tamara b. in favour of selected RCAC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sara c. Abstain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Jay 	
<p>Drafting Process</p>	<p>Drafting Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The two suggested methods for drafting are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Splitting it up article by article and working through them as a committee b. Dividing into groups to work on drafting each article. Then vote on them as a committee at the end. 2. Tee calls for vote on drafting process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Splitting it up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Qi Siang ii. Swarnima iii. Avery iv. Adila v. Dave 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. Tee vii. Matthew viii. Sara e. Doing it article by article: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Noone f. Abstain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Jay 	
	<p>Actionables</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Everyone to suggest modifications to Dave's proposal 2. Everyone to submit suggested articles 3. Everyone to create glossary, without definitions 	

Agenda for our next meeting:

- Discuss Daniel's amendment at the next meeting, together with the draft proposal that has been elected

Reminders/ Updates