

**Date:** 7 Sept 2015

**Time:** 6.30PM-8.30PM

**Venue:** Elm Dining Hall Anteroom

**Note-Taker:** Multiple

**Presiding Officer:** Jay

**Attendance:** Bing, Qis, Dave, Yongzhi, Feroz, Tee, Maria, Ami, Jay, Zach (late with apologies)

**Present:** Sara (DoS), Jolanda

**Absent:** Jared (with apologies)

**Agenda:**

- Community Values (Jolanda and Sara)
- RCACs and Student Government
- Student Government purchases
- Library Policy followup
- Athletics situation and feedback
- Budget restructuring

**Summary:**

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action
Community Values	<p><u>Community Values</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Students last semester suggested having an honour code and Jolanda, Sara and Ami have continued this conversation. They have a proposal they seek to put forward on how they want to develop it.</li><li>2. Jolanda would like student government support and draw people to the discussion. This committee would help draft a version of the honour code and lead the discussion.</li><li>3. Sara has kindly agreed to guide the process.</li></ol>	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. Dave asks how it would be formalized. Jolanda notes that nothing ratified this semester, could be done next sem but doesn't have to.</li><li>5. Yz asks what is contained in a social honour code. Jolanda notes things like stealing, trust, can build concrete rules based off of broader values. He also notes that this could be incorporated into another committee (community living). Jolanda notes that the honour code is a massive project and requires a very broad conversation.</li><li>6. Maria is wondering about a Code of Conduct as opposed to an honour code, because of the controversy of an honour code. Maria says that "code of conduct" is more encompassing and seems more legitimate. Sara notes that in a code of conduct the school holds students responsible, whereas in an honour code students hold each other accountable. Sara and Maria note that an honour code could be subsumed under the broader context of such a code of conduct.</li><li>7. Dave has the concern that momentum might fizzle out after the draft is published and would like Jolanda to consider how she might keep that going. Jay comments that there is a difficulty with getting information from the ground.</li><li>8. Jolanda says that an internal government committee keeps the honour code away from the college a bit more than a completely separate committee. Opening up a call makes it more obvious across the college.</li><li>9. Jolanda explains in response to Tee's question that the intent is to start a conversation that culminates in a document, but which does not <i>necessarily</i> culminate in a ratified code.</li><li>10. Tee raises the possibility that the honour code's information is already covered elsewhere, by law, by the constitution. Jolanda responds that it's a cultural expectation, and that it won't necessarily result in a ratified honour code.</li><li>11. Constitution can help with the honour code, but does not necessarily mean it has to be in the constitution. However, there may be possible conflicts if parts of the honour code are going to be incorporated into the constitution (as to what the role of the student government is)</li></ol>	
--	--	--

12. Jay wonders whether this starts the conversation off with a bias because there is already a clear end path.
13. Dave is concerned about whether (i) there are sufficient volunteers to form a new committee with good representation, (ii) whether we need to continue the conversation from 2018 that did not involve 40% the current student body, and (iii) whether starting a conversation top-down is ideal. Jolanda notes that (i) there should be sufficient interest, and creating a new committee announces to the school the project while ensuring committed members who sign up specifically for the honour code; (ii) present conversations already involve first-years, and (iii) the student government provides a structure and direction.

### Student Government Debate

1. Maria notes that this process is controversial. The Student Government, in taking any side, cannot possibly represent a clear majority.
2. Feroz suggests that we push out the Academic part of the honour code first.
3. Dave notes that formalisation of this process via the Student Government is problematic, because it is effectively Government endorsement of a specific side. Onus will then fall on opponents.
4. Tee points out the fire apology as a 'grassroots' action, and the government stance then is instructive.
5. Jay notes that Jolanda and Sara will proceed with the project; the question is simply whether Student Government or the DOS runs the project. Without exception, weighing costs and benefits, Jay believes it should be run by the Student Government.
6. Dave wants a group of students to write a code first; but Ami and Feroz find that such a group will have no legitimacy. But Dave does not want legitimacy lent to the project.
7. Yongzhi and Feroz are in favour of a survey of the student body: *do we need an Honour Code?* Will include clear questions that inform the average student.

	<p>8. Feroz also notes that Honour Code is meant to be legitimate. Literally the quantitative amount of “concerns” will be null if specific groups write it.</p> <p>9. Maria notes that Student Government taking on the project will be contentious and may upset elements of the student body.</p> <p>10. MOTION: This house believes that the Student Government should create a committee (or similar structure) to guide the discussion about a College-wide Honour code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yes: Ami (with rights: Student Government will create the committee but not run it.)</li> <li>b. No: Maria, Tee, Bing, Zach, Qis, Jay</li> <li>c. Abstain: Yongzhi, Dave, Feroz</li> <li>d. Absent: Jared</li> </ul> <p>11. MOTION: This house believes that an organic process concerning the creation of an Honour Code ought to be undertaken by students outside of SG &amp; DOS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Postponed to presentation of survey results.</li> </ul>	
<p>Library policy followup <b>(Comm Living)</b></p>	<p><u><b>Library Policy Feedback</b></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dave shares the response from the Library: Policy is open to be changed. Open-doors policy is experimental. However if there are significant concerns they are open to changing the policy.</li> <li>2. Dave has developed poll questions that can inform a policy that we develop and send to librarians.</li> <li>3. Qistina is giving feedback on whether the two study rooms past the locked doors can be opened. People have requested access to the locked section of the library. Opens the risk of theft.</li> <li>4. Maria makes the suggestion that a gate or door could close off the area. The stairwell could also be blocked. She also makes the case that access to the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Community living</b> will deal with this and report back to the government next meeting.</p>

	<p>printers after closing hours aren't as important given that students can print at the ERC which is not particularly far away.</p> <p>5. We will have the poll on the website so that we can get more voices from the ground and use that to inform our follow-up with the librarians.</p>	
<p>Athletics Situation and Feedback <b>(Identity)</b></p>	<p><u><b>Athletics Situation and Feedback</b></u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Zach: The IFG Committee (five students picked by Athletics department) understands “students’ concerns” and too are not pleased with it. They were operating with understanding from NUS that the “controversial” shirt design would not continue. They sent an email to captains of teams playing in IFGs on first weekend. However, the message in the email was not clear.</li> <li>2. The administration’s stance is that they understand where students are coming from, and the Student Government shouldn’t the overturn IFG committee’s decision since students are represented on the committee.</li> <li>3. Jay: These issues (Athletics Council, Department, IFG Committee) have been simmering in the crockpot of our college. We have received feedback from students that the Athletics Council is making decisions without consulting students, and is not communicating them effectively. Students are holding James accountable because he acts speaks to students on Wain’s behalf. Question from students: why is athletics managed solely by Wain?</li> <li>4. Dave: Student Government has oversight over almost everything except Athletics.</li> <li>5. Maria notes that the Athletics Council’s structure is presently unclear and somewhat disorganised, but it could generate sufficient representation <i>without</i> Student Government intervention.</li> <li>6. Zach agrees, but notes that presently, the Council does not have a decision-making body that is properly transparent and representative.</li> <li>7. Dave: the Constitution mandates that the Government should advocate representation where it is lacking, so we are empowered to do something about the situation.</li> <li>8. Maria: in response to Ami’s idea about polling students, most students may feel</li> </ol>	<p><b>Tee</b> to be presiding officer at the special meeting called by the Government on Monday</p>

	<p>this is a situation amongst a few, and be apathetic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Feroz: most students, being not captains, don't understand the situation well; in fact captains themselves are unclear.</li> <li>10. Feroz proposes to invite all Athletics captains to meet with the Government to set up a discussion regarding the Council. Seconded by Jay, Maria, Yongzhi.</li> <li>11. Dave: We should step in as student government, given the feedback. Students do care about athletics but don't understand intricacies of Athletics.</li> <li>12. <b>MOTION:</b> The Student Government will invite all sports captains and the Yale-NUS representatives on the IFG committee down to the Student Government meeting on 14 September to discuss the current system of athletics management. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yes: Ami, Bing, Feroz, Jay, Qis, Tee, Yongzhi, Zach</li> <li>b. No:</li> <li>c. Abstain: Dave, Maria</li> <li>d. Absent: Jared</li> </ol> </li> <li>13. Dave registers a conflict of interest as sports editor of the Octant. Feroz seconds this conflict of interest.</li> <li>14. Feroz: Attendance is crucial. Legitimacy is a function of how representative the meeting is, which rests almost entirely on how many captains show up.</li> <li>15. Yongzhi: It's important to include 'mind sports' captains in any conversations around IFGs, as they participate actively as well.</li> <li>16. Jay would like to clarify that given our discussion on sports which includes IFGs and ICGs and that mind sports teams participate in in the same capacity as other sports teams, they should also be invited for the discussion.</li> <li>17. Jay has volunteered Tee for Presiding Officer for Special Meeting with Sports Captains. Approved by acclaim.</li> <li>18. The agenda of the meeting: Dave proposes discharging this to the athletically involved members of the government. Motion was seconded and sustained.</li> </ol>	
--	---	--

<p>RCAC and Student Government (Comm Living, Govt Affairs)</p>	<p><b><u>RCAC and Student Government</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dave has sent email to all Rectors. Rectors have agreed to <b>ask their RCACs</b> if they would like to send a Rep to the Community Living meeting, on Wednesday 4PM.</li> <li>2. Formal relationship will be that RCAC reps will be on the CL Committee, to streamline processes and promote gathering of feedback and information.</li> <li>3. Jay notes the language of “Residential College government” exists. Concerns with RCACs. Question of whether an appointed student body should oversee funding. Saga Rep Dave is also concerned about the lack of publicity of applications and elections for the RCACs, though not opposed to idea of RCACs.</li> <li>4. Jay raises the possibility that RCAC principles may conflict with Government, and Government should be prepared for that. Dave, quotes rector: “Government oversees the College, whereas RCAC looks at residential colleges”.</li> <li>5. Ami: They way the Cendana RCAC has functioned is by working with him and is more events-centric and not policy based.</li> <li>6. Bing: It is the same for her and that RCAC have control over budgets for individual colleges.</li> <li>7. Yongzhi: Government Members have met with Rectors last semester and Rector Weiss said then that “RCACs should be elected bodies”. The model suggested would be that student government runs elections first, and then RCAC runs elections. Instead of butting heads now, we could work with them to come out with elections process.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Tee</b> to present idea of RCAC elections at the next Constitution Review Committee meeting</p> <p><b>Dave &amp; Yongzhi</b> to note in next Comm Living agenda, on discussing structures of RCAC</p>
<p>Budget Restructuring and Student Government Purchases</p>	<p><b><u>Budget Restructuring</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maria: Need to restructure given that we have an excess of funds given that we have sought alternatives to printing and also not bought polo tees. Restructured budget must account for the Welcome Tea, and student organisations fair booth.</li> </ol>	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. Jay: will get quotation for gavel and name tags, to do so within the week.</li><li>3. We will repurpose funds originally intended for the website. These funds will then be channelled to events. Maria notes that Chris does not want a restructured budget: excess funds should remain as excess.</li><li>4. Jay proposes a handover event for the next Student Government.</li></ol>	
--	--	--

**Agenda for our next meeting:**

- 1.

**Reminders/ Updates**