

Date: 3 Sept 2015

Time: 12.00PM-1.00PM

Venue: Saga Dining Hall

Note-Taker: Dave

Presiding Officer: Tee

Attendance: Dave, Tee, Adila, Anandita, Avery, Isabel, Qi Siang, Sara, Subhas, Swarnima, Tamara

Absent: Matthew, Jay

Agenda:

- Introduction
- Background
- Principles of Review

Summary: This was the first meeting of the constitution review committee. The meeting began by introducing the roles, duties, rules and discussing some basic logistics. The committee then discussed the principles and rules of the review and decided to adopt a process that was heavy on transparency and accountability, over democratic centralism. The committee also agreed, as a rule, to extensively gather public feedback and make all minutes, complete with voting record, available online.

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action
a Background	<p>Meeting Times. Two options</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two meetings a week 2. 1 general meeting at lunch and longer meetings at night to hash out amendments <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Committee members voted for option 2 3. Subhas: What about weekend meetings? 4. Tee: weekends can be troublesome, but will be included on doodle. <p>Roles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Government roles <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Student government not to speak to much 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Convener just to organise ii. Secretary to take notes iii. Devil’s advocate to criticise but nothing else <p>2. Rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We have to pass things by voting b. Things to remember <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. ⅔ quorum ii. ⅔ majority iii. Also allows for online voting <p>3. Duties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Create a constitution by november b. Make process transparent and open c. Ratify constitution 	
<p>a. Principles of review</p>	<p>Creating principles of review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tee: Does anyone have any ideas for principles on which we all agree <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sara: Transparency b. Anandita: Maximum participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Tee: we need to define what mean by maximum participation ii. Anandita: If we can make it as accessible as possible then that would be good iii. Tee, should we perhaps call this maximum accessibility? c. Avery: Responsiveness d. Swarnima: Accountability e. Qi Siang: Democratic centralism f. Dave: Openness 	<p>Final Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transparency 2. Accountability 3. Openness 4. Responsiveness <p>Final Rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Feedback to be gathered through multiple channels, but then put

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Have open meetings 3. Heavy publicity before events 4. Updates through the student government website 5. Make minutes live and viewable <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Isabel: is this compatible with democratic centralism b. Qi Siang: you can have disagreement but you need to be shown to be united c. Dave: Every one agrees to stand behind whatever decision this committee reaches 6. Have a form where you can submit feedback on the constitution 7. Tee: should we have mutliple feedback channels or not? Multiple channels have the advantage of more feedback, but can remove accountability or reliability <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Guash: we should open as many feedback channels as possible, but encourage a formal submission b. Anandita: Maybe we should have all feedback channels, except verbal 8. Tee: is everyone ok with democratic centralism - no one dissents 9. Avery: We should make the constitution more publicly accessible and publicised 10. Tee: Does anyone have any thoughts on openness within the committee? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dave: is everyone ok with having their names attached to their statements in the minutes? - no one dissents 11. Tee: currently we go around the meeting table, starting from a random first person. This means the last person is more influenced by people's votes, but ensures a more concrete decision 12. Anandita: Blind voting could be used as a preliminary vote <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Avery and Tamara say they don't think this is necessary b. Subhas: do we want to publish our votes with names 	<p>through a back-end process to standardise</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Minutes to be made public, with everyone accountable for their votes and comments
--	---	---

- c. Tee: currently we publish the votes with names in the government, but we can vote against that if we want. Given the open minutes it would be fairly clear who feels which way as is. Does anyone have any concerns
 - d. Subhas: Having anonymous votes would be more effective, for showing a united front, but we can have named discussions
 - e. Dave: It's a trade-off between transparency and democratic centralism
 - f. Swarnima: We could have anonymous votes, but then have named votes
 - g. Dave: I think we should be transparent, as it creates greater info dissemination etc.
 - h. Tee: We should either be transparent or less so. middle ground isn't as good
 - i. Avery: Not being transparent could lead to a less informed public
 - j. Sara: We are mature adults, no one will persecute you for your views
13. As the issue was contentious enough, Tee called for a motion on whether we should make our votes available to the public. it is seconded
14. MOTION: The constitutional review committee shall reflect each committee member's named votes in the minutes
- a. Yes: Unanimous
 - b. No:
 - c. Abstain:
15. Ng Qi Siang: Should we therefore remove the democratic centralism?

16. Avery: Maybe remove the decision, but we should still make it clear that we agreed with all decisions the committee makes
17. Ng Qi Siang: Perhaps change to unity and consensus
18. Tee: Perhaps we should make this a rule rather than a principle

Public Feedback mechanism

1. Current ones:
 - a. Email
 - b. Facebook
 - c. Feedback Forms
 - d. Face to face communication
2. Tee: What are the thoughts on this method
3. Tamara: Perhaps we should establish something standardised and specific to amendments. This could be a new process
4. Avery: Everything is so disjointed, but only using one form could be a bit restrictive
5. Tee: We could use a back-end process that formalises everything
6. Dave: Are there any thoughts on a physical submission box, or something similar?
7. Avery: I don't know how much that suggestion box will be used, but it could be used as another form of advertisement
8. Adila: What if we just have an event to get a physical discussion
9. Swarnima and Tamara aren't sure we will get enough attendance
10. There is agreement on a back-end process
11. Subhas: Perhaps we should table this until the next meeting
12. Ng Qi Siang What if we hold the vote via whatsapp
13. The motion to table the responsibilities has been seconded