

Date: 8 Oct 2015

Time: 9.00PM-11.00PM

Venue: Kewalram Chanrai Dining

Hall

Note-Taker: Dave

Presiding Officer: Tee

Attendance: Dave, Tee, Adila, Anandita, Tamara, Jay (leaves early), Sara, Qi Siang, Avery

Absent: Subhas, Isabel, Matthew, Swarnima,

Agenda:

- Discussion of point brought up at last meeting dave's model
  - Legislative vs executive
  - Appointment of judiciary
  - Method of Chief Executive Appointment
  - Directors
- Discussion of articles suggested
- Delegation of work

Summary: This week the Constitution Review Committee voted to elect the chief executive through a second round of voting in the student body and to grant them veto power, with constraining power given to the student body. The committee also discussed the various methods for appointing the judiciary, whether directorial positions are a good idea and the separation of the executive from the judiciary. The committee gave in principle approval to a few different methods through the use of a 'straw poll.' The whole committee will vote on these proposals over the weekend.

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action
legislative vs executive	legislative vs executive.	

1. Current structure does not designate what job the legislature does and what the executive does?
  - a. First option is where the executive can do both
  - b. Second option is that you give specific functions to the executive and specific things to legislative
    - i. Create a contrast
  - c. Third option or “confidence system” is to have it function where the executive has to have the support of the legislature but ultimately drives the agenda
  - d. Fourth option is that you have full separation between the two bodies. Could only be done if you have a full separate election.
  - e. Fifth option: chief executive votes last but has veto power
2. Discussion on this topic:
3. Qi Siang: Prefers system with the executive driving the legislature (OPTION 3), as it creates consensus and gives the government some flexibility to do stuff. We want to ensure government is effective, fast and accountable
4. Adila: What are the pros and cons of two different elections?
5. Separating elections cons
  - a. Dilutes powers
  - b. inefficient
6. Separating elections pros
  - a. Know who will be the chief executive

7. These can be fixed using two separate elections
  - a. Pros
    - i. Mandate and legitimacy
    - ii. Give executive accountability to the people
  - b. Cons
    - i. It makes elections more inconvenient
8. Sara: What about a slate government? This is a partisan procedure.
9. Background
  - a. This was suggested in first process, but then wasn't reintroduced in second. It was a suggestion that everyone in student government run in pairs, so as to ensure that everyone can cooperate.
  - b. There is a theoretical question that administration may not be ok with political parties - issue of aligning with Singaporean parties. However, admin would likely find a way to work around it.

#### Discussion on Veto Power

1. Qi Siang: We have a small student body, so it may not be necessary
2. Tee: Bear in mind that you can create mechanisms to prevent veto power
3. Anandita: If not veto power, what other powers with chief executive have?
4. Adila: Chief executive will provide direction.
5. Tee: There are lots of CE powers: CE will set agenda, permit some things and exclude others, approval of budgets (last say)

6. Qi Siang: we should limit how much veto power we have. Direct constitutional constraint on veto.
7. Sara: What about direct democracy: student body can override veto.
8. Anandita: Veto power is important to legitimacy of the CE. And student body should also have power, so student body limits.
9. Tee and Tamara: So consensus, veto power but with checks. Student body and constitution as a check.
10. Tee: Vote on veto power?
11. Devil's Advocate:
  - a. Pros of veto power:
    - i. It gives a way for the executive to do something
  - b. No veto:
    - i. Can remove leadership from chief executive role
12. **MOTION** (passed) to give the chief executive veto power with constraint from student body
  - a. By acclaim
    - i. Abstain: Qi Siang and Jay
    - ii. Yes: Everyone else
  - b. Therefore we have settled on a veto, with control by the students

Devil's advocate leaves

Qi Siang becomes new devil's advocate

Discussion on options

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Avery: On the first option, chief executive votes last, but has veto power</li> <li>2. Tee: Should we add that as a fifth option?</li> <li>3. FIFTH OPTION ADDED</li> <li>4. Tamara: With full separation, what will happen when they clash on decisions?</li> <li>5. Devil's Advocate: May be some benefit, by having force consensus</li> <li>6. Anandita: Doesn't see how full separation is possible in the current system</li> <li>7. Devil's Advocate: might not act as a check and balance if the executive is integrated into the legislature</li> <li>8. Anandita: Everyone has voted for the legislature, so when you vote for the executive you conferring more powers. Veto important for the direction. There may well be other powers to the chief executive</li> <li>9. Avery: Seconds Anandita's point</li> </ol> <p>Voting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Straw poll indicated favour fifth option (6/8)</li> </ol>	
Appointment of judiciary	<p>Appointment of judiciary</p> <p>Options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Voting</li> <li>2. Random selection</li> </ol>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Can use demographics control</li> <li>3. Appointment by government</li> <li>4. Random draw to select a committee to appoint committee</li> </ul> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sara: What is the role of the judiciary</li> <li>2. Tee: the impression we had was that they would monitor weekly meetings, produce a monthly report and interpret constitution</li> <li>3. Qi Siang: You could split the judiciary, so have an elected committee, but have a randomly selected jury for conflict resolution</li> <li>4. Anandita: Are there enough people to form the judiciary?</li> <li>5. Dave: Based on public reps system there is</li> </ul> <p>Straw poll</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option 1: 2/8</li> <li>2. Option 2 (Random selection with demographic control): 4/7</li> <li>3. Option 3: 0/7</li> <li>4. Option 4: 1/7</li> </ul>	
Method of chief executive appointment	<p>Method of chief executive appointment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Few different election systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Most votes become chief-executive</li> <li>ii. Separate voting procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In student body</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

2. In legislature

- iii. Can split into different categories (chief executive and non-chief executive)
- iv. Can stand for multiple positions

Discussion on the topic:

- 2. Qi Siang: Issues of self-appointment as it creates more political maneuvering.
- 3. Tamara: Concerned around the idea of the most votes going to chief executive. Good because of the mandate, but could be a problem for people wanting to opt-out of chief executive. If the chief executive decides not to, then the mandate of the second most voted for is not as significant
- 4. Qi Siang: What if people vote for someone with a specific purpose in mind?
- 5. Tee: I think that it would be considered as another psychological factor.
- 6. Devil's Advocate: You can have it split into two separate elections to fix these issue. This raises its own issues.
- 7. Sara: I'm in favour of splitting it into two separate elections, among the legislature
- 8. Avery: I'm in favour of splitting it into two separate elections, among the student body. Two rounds of student elections.
- 9. Qi Siang: Do you choose before running in round 1, or do you wait until round 2?

	<p>10. Devil's Advocate: I think there's pros and cons to both. It will make voters consider executive in round 1 and we want to decide whether or not this is a good thing.</p> <p>11. Tee: You could also leave it up to the candidate about whether they declare it</p> <p>12. Anandita: I'm in favour of option 3, but can you stand for both positions?</p> <p>13. FOURTH OPTION ADDED</p> <p>14. Sara changed preference to 4</p> <p>15. Qi Siang: Issue could be a mandate problem</p> <p>16. Devil's Advocate:</p> <p>17. Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. More efficient</li><li>b. Forces voters to consider legislative and executive in context of the other (can be pro or con)</li></ul> <p>18. Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Forces voters to consider legislative and executive in context of the other (can be pro or con)</li><li>b. Effect of strategic voting. People may waste their votes on candidate because they expect them to get into chief executive</li><li>c. Each category can be dependent on one another</li></ul> <p>19. Qi Siang: issue can also reduce transparency in election, by creating tactical voting</p>	
--	--	--



- 20. Anandita: You could just have two categories (chief executive and non-chief executive) and there will be reduced overlap. It has efficiencies.
- 21. Dave: You may have people that run for each position individually which can lead to each election being determinate on the other
- 22. Devil's Advocate: It is important to consider the perception of voters
- 23. Tee: public perception is indeterminate. We should also consider how much choice we give to candidate and how much we give to voters
- 24. Devil's Advocate: Commitment thing is a valid point, but the con is that you may get talent pool
- 25. Adila: Still prefer candidates selected first and then after you are selected you run for chief executive (2.1)

Formal Vote

- 26. **MOTION** (rejected): Chief-executive to be elected based on number of votes
  - a. Unanimous No
- 27. Separate voting procedures
  - a. **MOTION** (passed): Chief-executive to be elected by a second round of voting in the student body
    - i. No: Sara, Anandita
    - ii. Yes: Qi Siang, Adila, Avery, Dave, Tee, Tamara
    - iii. Abstain: Jay
  - b. **MOTION** (rejected): Chief-executive to be elected by a second round of voting in the legislature

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. No: Avery, Adila, Avery, Anandita, Sara, Tamara, Dave</li> <li>ii. Abstain: Qi Siang, Tee, Jay</li> </ul> <p>28. <b>MOTION</b> (rejected): Chief-executive to be elected by a separate category, which is mutually exclusive to the legislature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yes: Tamara</li> <li>b. No: Avery, Anandita, Adila, Qi Siang, Sara, Dave</li> <li>c. Abstain: Tee, Jay</li> </ul> <p>29. <b>MOTION</b> (rejected): Chief-executive to be elected by a separate category, which is <i>not</i> mutually exclusive to the legislature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yes: Anandita, Sara</li> <li>b. No: Dave, Avery, Adila, Qi Siang, Tamara</li> <li>c. Abstain: Tee, Jay</li> </ul>	
Directors	<p>Directors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consensus for having directors</li> </ul> <p>Options for choosing directors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consensus in meeting</li> <li>2. Appointed by chief executive, duty to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Anandita: Like exporting duty to chief executive</li> <li>b. Tee (channeling devil’s advocate): How much do you want to control what happens and how much agency do you want to give?</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Rank preferences</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Have options in second round of elections</li> <li>5. Have a partisan option in second round of elections</li> </ul> <p>Options for Vice-Chief Executive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Running mates</li> <li>2. Second preference of chief-executive vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Avery: Issue is that you can in-fighting</li> <li>b. Devil’s Advocate: Could well lead to clashes between chief executive and vice-chief executive</li> <li>c. Anandita: There aren’t two set of strong ideologies in this college, and having a second opinion in a senior position in the government could be beneficial</li> <li>d. Devil’s Advocate: College may develop an ideological split in the future</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Same as director</li> <li>4. Vote within legislature</li> </ul> <p>Straw poll  Option 2: 5/8  Option 3: 3/8</p>	
Next meeting	2-4pm on Monday	
Online Voting	Voting on motions taken outside of quorum	

Agenda for our next meeting:

- 

Reminders/ Updates