

Date: 14 Oct 2015

Time: 20.00PM-22.30PM

Venue: KC Room

Note-Taker: Dave

Presiding Officer: Tee

Attendance: Dave, Tee,, Anandita, Avery, Swarnima, Jay, Sara, Isabel, Matthew, Qi Siang

Absent: Subhas, Tamara, Adila

Agenda:

- Amendments
- Article Discussion Continued

Summary:

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action
Amendments	<p>Conflict of Interest Clause</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. One student has suggested a conflict of interest clause, where government will declare conflicts of interest prior to votes2. Devil’s Advocate: I see no reason against this3. Matthew: Would this be included in constitution bi-laws <p>Appointment of Directors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A student has called for a re-vote on the decision to allow the President to appoint directors. Reasons:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Apologies for not being in the meeting today. There is one problematic aspect of allowing the President to decide the process for the vice-director positions. Essentially, it institutionalizes a possible avenue of corruption and	

nepotism within Student Government. If the President can choose the process for who gets vice-directors, they will always have the option to overcome and overlook a structured and rigorous process and choose the vice-directors according to their whim. They will also be have the ability to mask this abuse of power by claiming choosing vice-directors is time efficient and/or the chosen vice-directors will best work with him/her. Moreover, allowing the President to choose vice-directors from the applicable candidates they share close relationships with allows the President to specifically appoint people who will possibly be more biased in favor of the President rather than the Student Government as a whole to positions of influence.

b. Therefore, giving the President the powers to choose vice-directors is not only a bad idea, it is decisively inferior to any structured process, whether that be a traditional election process or the meritocracy method. As many of you may know, one of my strongest arguments in favor of the meritocracy method has been that it is less likely to be a popularity contest than a conventional election. Elections for student government have the possibility of becoming popularity contests. But a popularity contest at least involves some sort of competition. Allowing the President of any student government administration to officially bypass any structured process for the vice-director positions does not.

2. Avery: The fact that they have already been selected means that everyone has already got the mandate of the students, so should be effective
3. Isabel: Two votes means that there is a fair bit of trust in the system

	<p>4. Qi Siang: Some benefits to having friendship. Allows them to work better together</p> <p>Resignation Clause</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggestion for resignation clause, since some members may benefit from this. 2. No objections raised 	
<p>Roles Continued</p>	<p>President</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the judiciary refuse a call to review members? -> postponed to next meeting <p>Vice-President</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qi Siang: Is having a vice-president as a check and balance running the risk of deadlock? 2. Avery: Other constitutions have merged budgetary responsibilities with vice-president <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Devil's Advocate: two portfolios could cause an overload of work load 3. Qi Siang: Student body would probably want democratic centralism, so having someone at the heart of government that causes disagreement might destroy this 4. Isabel: Sees this as beneficial, as the vice-president has the same levels of information as the president 5. Sara: Should exist as it is important for taking charge when the president is away or in the case that they resign 6. MOTION: we should have a Vice-President - passed by acclimation 7. Matthew: Can we debate the election procedure? 8. Dave: can we discuss the vice-president's roles first? 	

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">9. Tee: Let's discuss veto first<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Avery: The only reason I can see for them having veto is if the president isn't thereb. Sara: I just see the role of the vice-president as a replacement for when the President is awayc. Qi Siang: I don't see the point of the vice-presidentd. Swarnima: Two words. No veto.e. Devil's Advocate: Could be beneficial to ensure the government has cleared a hurdle in legislative policy and can ensure they don't get marginalised. Argument against it is that it would cause deadlock, and that they would be marginalised regardless.f. Consensus on no veto10. Tee: Should veto power transfer to President when they are not around?<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Matthew: If we have a clause on adoption of power, then it should be in thereb. Qi Siang: Should depend on time-periodc. Devil's Advocate: If the President is going to be abroad then should the vice-president be allowed to fully act in their role or should the vice-president just be there to hold the government togetherd. Sara: Didn't we decide that there was a direct democracy check and balance on this?e. Qi Siang: We are mainly concerned about someone sneaking policy through the government when the president is awayf. Tee: Possible solution could be for the President to delegate temporary powersg. Dave: Didn't we already agree on the ability to delegate powers? Should we revisit that? | |
|--|--|--|

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h. Matthew: What if people question the idea that the highest member of government can delegate their powers to the entire government? i. Anandita: They should only be able to delegate powers to vice-president, as they are the only one with the democratic mandate of leadership j. Avery: Delegate anything to anyone is task based. Need to clarify phrasing k. Tee: So we are back to questions of how and when president can delegate duties. General agreement on ability to delegate powers and separate clause to force it for extensive leaves of absence l. Tee: should the Vice-President be in control of the budget? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Qi Siang: No, as it is a separate skill ii. Sara: are we considering meritocracy method? iii. Tee: Since we have asked for the directors to be selected by the President then it is up to the president to decide iv. MOTION: Treasurer should be separate to Vice-President - Passed by acclamation v. Avery: Shouldn't they be classified as a director m. Tee: What about the secretary? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Qi Siang: Do we need a secretary? Why are they not a director? ii. Devil's Advocate: Could be director of internal communications? iii. Isabel: Would they need co-directors? iv. Devil's Advocate: Could be decided | |
|--|---|--|

v. MOTION: Have Director of Internal Communications not Secretary - Passed by acclamation

- n. Tee: Anyone has any view on the other directors?
 - i. Avery: Should we include athletics and arts?
 - ii. Devil's Advocate: Difficult issue. Separating them could lead to them doing nothing. Merging them all into student life could be problematic due to lots of power.
 - iii. Sara: Should we have point people for each RC, athletics and arts among other?
 - iv. Swarnima: How will we create a committee for this?
 - v. Dave: There will be co/vice-directors?
 - vi. Avery: Where does athletics come from and are we in charge of this?
 - vii. Devil's Advocate: It's complicated.
 - viii. Qi Siang: Do we need to have a specific DDP person? Should we have one of their own take care of this?
 - ix. Tee: What if they are not elected
 - x. Devil's Advocate: Worth noting there will be other DDP programs, not just Law.
 - xi. Tee: Questions that have come up are that we may put too much stress on certain directors. We could give more flexibility to allow the President to appoint different numbers of vice-directors for each position
 - xii. Avery: Should still spell out a certain list of directors
 - xiii. Tee: Can codify that certain areas have to be covered
 - xiv. MOTION: To give the president some flexibility over how many directors to appoint and in what areas, but codify certain areas as mandatory.

	<p style="text-align: center;">1. Passed by acclimation</p> <p>o. Tee: Are all these directors necessary? Less stress since we have agreed on flexibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sara: should we have it so that the president should appoint person to liaise with each RCAC ii. Anandita: Should this be mandatory? iii. Avery: I think we should as it might slip through the cracks otherwise iv. Qi Siang: Should not be delegate out a director, but should be to delegate specific responsibility v. Avery: Very wishy washy vi. Matthew: Isn't this after we decide which areas should be codified in the constitution vii. Tee: We can postpone this discussion if people feel they do not have enough information viii. Avery: call motion to formalise all current director titles in constitution ix. MOTION: Include Student-life, Academics, Student Organisations, Event, Budget, Internal Communications and External Communications as mandatory in the constitution. x. Sara: calls for motion that we should include a point person in the constitution for all RCACs xi. MOTION: President must appoint RCAC liaisons - Passes by acclamation xii. Dave: confused about why this wouldn't fall under external communications xiii. Sara: Because it forces them to deal with it 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> xiv. Dave: Why is the constitution putting more precedence to liaising with RCACs than members of the administration, other external parties or students? xv. Dave: Move to nullify the vote and move discussion until we have outlined the the specific duties of the mandatory directors - Seconded and passed by acclamation p. Devil’s Advocate: Can we extend this until 10 because we need to do this ASAP 	
Elections	<p>Elections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Devil’s Advocate: Arguments for and against election models. Most important part of a government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. What are the general governing procedures? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Run-off voting of some kind (ranking followed by algorithm for preference) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pros: Immune to tactical voting b. Cons: Tactical voting is an important part of the political process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Anandita: How does a person rank 20+ people? ii. Tee: You can decide on arbitrary ranking iii. Matthew: You can also allow people to rank as far as they want, but not force them to c. Avery: Would we publish the results of this before round-2? Because that would influence the second round 	

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">d. Tee: What are the thoughts on this?<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Devil's Advocate: Run-off voting in person is a logistical nightmare?2. Tee: Are there other suggestions for voting?<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. First past the post?<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Avery: Does not like?ii. Matthew: It sucks.iii. Sara: You can have a large number of people who are not voted foriv. Devil's Advocate: Is a simple method so easy for voters to understandb. Meritocracy?<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. No notable support3. Qi Siang: Should we have a different election methods for round 2?4. Swarnima: Why do they need be different?5. Qi Siang: Because the election dynamic is different6. Matthew: Nothing that stops us using run-off for both. It can be used for both7. Avery: Using run-off can ensure mandate8. Tee: Let's talk about the first round for legislature first9. Avery: We need to work out what we are calling the legislature | |
|--|---|--|

10. MOTION: For run-off voting in the first round if algorithm is explained - Passed by acclimation

11. Algorithm discussion to be had during specific article

12. MOTION: For run-off voting in the second round if algorithm is explained - Passed by acclimation

- ii. Who makes up the election committee?
 - 1. Outgoing members of the government
 - a. Dave: Current method so should be discussed
 - b. Devil's Advocate:
 - i. Pros: Government already has authority
 - ii. Cons: Incumbents will have a closer connection so it may not be the most impartial system. What if there is a romantic relationship?
 - 2. Candidates
 - a. Jay (personally): Always been confused why the candidates don't form on the elections, as they are the ones that have a stake in it
 - b. Avery: Sketchy to have the rules of elections dictated by those who will be elected
 - c. Qi Siang: Has potential for collusion
 - d. Sara: Should be made up of candidates

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. Qi Siang: We need to have confidence in this process and it could damage this 3. Separate committee (different methods) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Isabel: Issue of expediency 4. Administration 5. Judiciary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Isabel: Is a neutral arbiter 6. No one who has ever served on government 7. Principle Question: Do you want there to be conflicts of interest or not? 8. Devil's Advocate: All of these options will have a personal stake of some sort. 9. Dave: Can have combinations of these different methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tee: Anyone want to suggest a mix? b. Jay (after declaring conflict of interest of planning to run again): No issue with having candidates dictate ground rules but we will need moderators to deal with disputes. 10. Matthew/Avery: How much power does this committee have? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii. You need to say what the election committee is allowed to do? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timelimit 2. Free speech iv. Do you have rules for elections in the constitution? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alternative is leaving it up to the committee 2. By having it in constitution you remove conflicts of interest but it makes less flexible 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. Do you want people to be able to ‘run’ for judiciary and other roles? Do you run this before or after? Do you have them declare before or after? vi. Anandita: Do we have a separate selection for independent arbiter? vii. MOTION: for election committee to be formed of outgoing members of government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2 viii. MOTION: for election committee to be formed of candidates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2 ix. MOTION: for election committee to be formed of separate committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 4 x. MOTION: for election committee to be formed of administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 xi. MOTION: for election committee to be formed of judiciary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2 xii. MOTION: for election committee to be formed of noone who has ever served on government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 xiii. MOTION: for election committee to be formed of a mix of members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 6 <p>b. Terms (Avery switches to Secretary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. When do you want to have terms? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Possible dates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. MOTION: September o 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Has First year representation ii. Means that first years might not have the ability to select iii. Study abroad problem <p>b. MOTION December- 0 votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Won't have first year representation ii. Will allow first years to become more familiar with students iii. Solves study abroad problem iv. Sara: What about seniors? <p>c. MOTION January- 7 votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Similar to December but has different campaigning structure ii. Pro: Matthew. Maintains government continuity over every single break (under assumption of 2 semester). Continuity until new government takes office in January. Balance between freshman representation. Senior don't get to run. Voters are most informed. iii. Qi Siang: Good month for planning the election. Soon after school reconvenes. iv. Devil's Advocate: Don't assume that seniors can't run in this 	
--	---	--

	<p>situation. Have normative by-elections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. Qi Siang: By-elections are confusing. vi. Tee: Government members will leave, so must account for this. Swarnima agrees. vii. Matthew on by-elections: Want fewer by-elections. Importance of an election/mandate from an election is diminished. viii. Devil’s Advocate: Have elections committee do all their stuff during December (during break). Then ready for campaigning and elections right after we get back. ix. <p>d. MOTION May o Votes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sara: In favor. You will have people for every break. <p>ii. Dealing with study abroad/absences (after deciding on January vote)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tee: A lot of people apply for study abroad. Depends on year. 2. Jay: Study abroad during sophomore/junior year. Usually. 3. OPTION 1: Votes: 7. Contentious decision. Matthew: If you stand for President, pledge not to study abroad during 	
--	--	--

	<p>the entire term. (Other leaves of absence are okay). Other candidates- people might not vote for people who are planning to study abroad.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. OPTION 2: Votes: 1. Qi Siang: Constituency based on years. Isolate junior year and have separate election. 5. OPTION 3: Votes: 6. By-elections applicable for everyone. Jay: Make by-elections normal and tolerable. Similar to Matthew's idea. Other issues for leaving besides study abroad. Ex) death in family, member's death, mental illness, etc. Serious issue. 6. Tee: This would require a separate election. 7. Matthew: There are loads of contingencies. 8. Qi Siang: Just make an exception for juniors. 9. Avery/Anandita: No constituencies. 10. Tee: Definitely have a by <p>iii. How long should they be?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 sem 2. 2 sem- confirmed by vote by acclamation 3. Devil's Advocate: Mixed term rotational multimember. System: half of government is outgoing at the end of one semester. Can serve one semester or two, rotating. No longer a suggestion. 4. Shorter gives more flexibility and accountability but removes long-term vision. Vice Versa for long term. 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Term limits. No decision made→ postponed to next physical meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MOTION: Have them. Votes: 5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Brings new blood into the government 2. MOTION: Don't have them. Votes: 4. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If they're winning why should they be denied b. Ana: Gives government members incentive to work well, accountability c. Qi Siang: No more than 2 terms. 3 is excessive. Don't care consecutive/nonconsecutive. d. Devil's Advocate: Most members of government won't want to run for 3 terms anyway. Is it really problematic to be in government for 3 terms? Valuable question. If you run for 3 terms, you can't study abroad at all. Do we even need to legislate this? 3. MOTION: No consecutive terms. (Jay). Votes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o. (Cancelled as an option). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Con: Continuity is valuable v. Also, what happens to the transitional government, based on the changes we make <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jay: These changes don't conflict with our current form of government. 	
Publicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Publicity poster is wrong. 2. Please publicize meeting times beforehand. <p>Important Decisions:</p>	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The President MUST appoint Directors of: Student Life, Academics, Student Organizations, Events, Budget, Internal Communications, External Communications.2) President can create other Directorships as they choose.3) Elections for Executive Board/Cabinet and President will be held under the principle of runoff voting. Specific algorithm to be determined.4) Elections Committee will be formed of a mix of impartial arbiters and candidates.5) Elections will be held in January, with the elections committee meeting during December to determine guidelines/campaign regulations.6) Contentious decision: If you stand for President, pledge not to study abroad during the entire term. Other leaves of absence are acceptable for President, including illness, etc. Other candidates do not have to pledge not to study abroad, with the understanding that this may impact voting decisions.	
--	--	--

Agenda for our next meeting:

- Assignment of drafting postponed until tomorrow
- Judiciary Discussion

Reminders/ Updates