Date: 5 Oct 2015   Time: 12.00PM-13.00PM   Venue: Saga Dining Hall

Note-Taker: Dave   Presiding Officer: Tee

Attendance: Dave, Tee, Adila, Anandita, Avery, Swarnima, Tamara, Jay, Sara, Subhas, Isabel, Fatima, Matthew, Qi Siang, Adam Goh

Absent:

Agenda:

- Adam Goh's objection to meritocracy
- Comments on week 6-7 document
- Proposal for dividing it up
- Allocation

Summary: In this meeting Adam Goh presented an objection the 'meritocracy method' proposed by Daniel Silverman a few weeks ago. We also discussed the current base model, pointing out its benefits and deficiencies. 4 areas of contention were identified: legislative vs executive, appointment of judiciary, method of chief executive appointment and having directors. These will be discussed at the next meeting.

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action
Adam Goh's objection to meritocracy	More Objections to the Meritocracy Method 1. When proposed last time it ranked the lowest among other options, with strong disagreement from the student body 2. First argument: measures short-term skills rather than long-term skills. Unable to measure a candidate's commitment or passion a. Best people to measure these are the students, as they are able to see candidates perform on a day-to-day basis 3. Second argument: Daniel's argument about popularity contest is an insult to the voters' rationality	

| | 4. Third argument: this method will trivialise elections, leading to disenfranchisement
5. Fourth argument: Meritocracy Method could lead to distrust from the students, administration and other bodies. For example DOSAC was appointed, so received little support
6. It's true that we can experiment in different government methods, but these need to be reasonable risks

Comments
   1. Qi Siang: How can we address the concern that an assessment of a person's ability is based on skills?
      a. Adam: We are a small student body, so we can assess them in our regular life.
   2. Qi Siang: How do you account for different social circles and the growing student body?
   3. How does democratic method ensure that close-relations don't further bias votes?
      a. Adam: Can be addressed by educating voters to ensure they are informed. Debates, campaigns etc.
   4. What are the aspects that are considered to be 'meritocratic?'
      a. In terms of values of merit, students can assess that themselves

Devil's Advocate
   1. Can voters make decisions?
      a. If yes, then we have democracy
      b. If no, then we don't (could have meritocracy) | |

Comments on week 6-7 document	Comments and questions:
	1. Avery: How are these roles appointed?
	    a. Dave: decided based on number of votes
	2. Anandita: What happens if everyone has the same strength, who get elected?
	    a. Dave: is done through the democratic method, where different demographics vote for people of their demographics?
	3. Qi Siang: What is the method of run-off voting?
	    a. Jay: you use instant run-off voting, where students rank candidates. There are then different formulas that are used to rank them
	
	Devil's Advocate
	1. Objection to categorising things into areas: Siloing people from certain areas can leave members of the executive board feeling isolated from specific issues. E.g. spoon issue covered both community living and student organisations. What happens if two directors don't get on well?
	    a. Also a strong argument for: it gives people a specific job-scope
	2. Why divide executive and legislative functions? Who ratifies and who implements? This is lacking from current proposal. Will save arguments for until later.
	3. Appointed based on number of votes:
	    a. For:
	        i. Saves time
	        ii. representative
	        iii. aren't relying on internal selection mechanism
	    b. Against:	

	i. No tendency for landslide in this college. What about statistical insignificance?
	ii. Assumes same qualities in executive position as legislative ones
	4. Separate judiciary: Should be an odd number
	5. Random selection: seem dangerous. Could need greater accountability than random. However election and appointment have issues
	6. RCAC too complicated to deal with now.
	    a. Isable: RCACs have made comment on no elections as just community building
	    b. Jay: Counter-argument is that maybe you need to be elected for community building
	7. Could challenge the issue of not having separate elections
	    a. Would add more time but would make it more representative
	    b. This would be a middle ground between full election or full appointment
	
	Dave's reply
	2. Division of executive and legislative- agree that it is unclear
	3. On most votes→ chief executive. Jay used the results of just one election, that's not a lot of evidence. Runoff voting will fix this problem.
	4. Needs to be made more clear online: legislative will be done through committees. RCACs will be invited to attend.
	    ● Options: RCAC member sent to sit in on Student Govt OR Student govt member sit in on RCAC meetings.
	    ● Committees- adjusted for class and college. These are not elected, will correct for lack of representation.	

	Legislative vs. executive: Smaller voting body, but members (vice-directors) to help out with organizing things.
	5. Sure let's make judiciary an odd number.
	6. Random selection of judiciary- can't be appointed by government, separate election is problematic.
	7. RCACs aren't discussed currently
	
	  1. Qi Siang: If you have RC executives and class executives then it reduces competition
	  2. Matthew: would you be less aware of the possible chief-executives. Would look different percpetions
	  3. Qi Siang: What if they don't want the position?
	  4. Dave: There are methods of declining
	
	Tee summary:
	  1. Main contentions
	    a. legislative vs executive
	    b. appointment of judiciary
	    c. method of chief executive appointment
	    d. directors	

Proposal for dividing it up	Tee: We will postpone deciding until Thursday for the committee to look at the different proposals, since it seems that not enough people have suggested alterations	

AOB	1. Tee: how well has the feedback form been publicised?
	  a. Posters were taken down
	  b. No other channels	

	2. Dave: a lot of misinformation at the moment. Need for more publicity to correct this
	3. Tee: any progress on the white-board?
	    a. No
	    b. Tee: can we have this by Wednesday? I will deal with reimbursement	

Agenda for our next meeting:

- Discussion of point brought up at last meeting dave's model

- Discussion of articles suggested

- Delegation of work

Reminders/ Updates