

Date: 26 Oct 2015

Time: 6.30PM-8.30PM

Venue: Elm Dining Hall Anteroom

Note-Taker: Yongzhi (Maria owes him a duty)

Presiding Officer: Tee

Attendance: Bing, Zach, Qis, Dave, Yongzhi, Feroz, Tee, Maria, Ami, Jay, Jared

Present: Bing, Dave, Feroz, Jared, Jay, Qistina, Tee, Yongzhi

Absent: Ami (sick), Maria (CIPE), Zach (CIPE)

Agenda:

- Arts Council update
- YNC Pride Update and Vote
- Academics Update
- Library Update
- Committee and Workload Distribution
- Payment for Student Work

Summary: In this meeting, student government members gave updates on the progress of starting an Arts Council, issues of security in the library as well as academic reviews and structures. Voting for YNC Pride has also been restructured to include images sourced from google unless none is available. Government has also raised the issues of student work and inequalities in payment across different jobs and departments. Lastly, student government discussed committee allocations and work distribution for various projects.

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action
--------	-------------------	--------

<p>Arts Council Update</p>	<p><u>Arts Council update</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on student requests to Student Government to help with setup of Arts Council. In response to feedback and also in line with Student Government's constitutional responsibility to ensure representation for Arts, Student Government convened a meeting two Fridays ago in the Elm Anteroom, attended by Student Representatives, Mark Joyce, and Gurjeet Singh (Senior Manager, Arts and Media). 2. In the meeting last Friday, Student Government was tasked with creation of an Arts Calendar. This Calendar may be hosted on the Student Government website, and should be made consistent with the existing Student Activities calendar. 3. At present, there is a lead version of the Arts Calendar. This will include upcoming events. 4. Dave: is the Arts Council formed? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Feroz: they are presently shy to call it that. It's a series of open meetings with student representatives from the Arts. Representatives will now also include ad-hoc projects, such as Hamlet, Chinese Opera, and the Little Shop of Horrors. 5. Actionables. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Feroz: Calendar to be published on the Government website. 6. Suggestion for a Calendar to extend beyond Arts, to include other areas of Student Life that Student Government can also keep up with. Jared notes that existing calendar systems are not being used; we can harness school resources and make these public. 7. Question of why just Arts calendar - we can have a calendar for <i>all</i> Student Organisations. Problem with physical calendars is that events may be changed. Jared suggests reimplementing the whiteboard notices to be placed in Saga and Elm Dining Hall. 8. Suggestion for concretising the Arts Council calendar. Issue is that the Representatives are presently happy for the Arts Council meetings without 	<p>Bing to purchase whiteboard</p> <p>Feroz and Yongzhi to print Arts Calendar for November</p>
----------------------------	---	---

	<p>having to take on administrative burden (eg minuting, booking rooms, Arts Calendar). In the future, this should be devolved to the Arts Council.</p> <p>9. Question of online calendar options. Dave, Jared note that existing resources are underused and there is no need to create new platforms. Question of how to add notifications to the existing student life calendar.</p>	<p>Jared to follow up on mechanism for adding events on the existing Calendar</p>
<p>YNC Pride Update and Vote</p>	<p><u>YNC Pride Update and Vote</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dave has found that there was a mascot suggestion not considered at the previous Student Government meeting, and so all options should be reviewed again. Options include re-reviewing all mascots or rejecting a review mechanism. 2. Dave has met with Public Affairs. Public Affairs prefers not to have Cabinet involved, and would like to see voting records and the top few options. 3. Jay suggests that we can add this new mascot to the existing options. Dave notes that the previous meeting may not have been sufficiently comprehensive. 4. Suggestion for all options to be placed before the student body, and a run-off voting mechanism to be implemented. 5. Question of payment and recompense. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Student-designers are being paid at a rate of \$10 per mascot design, but some have reflected that this is insufficient for the work being put in. 6. Question of whether student votes will be sufficient given broad student apathy on government votes. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Suggestion of physical voting booths, particularly during lunchtime; practical drawback of counting votes. Counter-suggestion of using laptops when manning booth. 7. Question of voting on the proposed mascot or both the proposed mascot and design. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Practical advantage of not having delays, not having to pay for ten different designs and only using one. <p>8. Run-off voting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dave notes that the final design will be done professionally. b. Question of whether the final design will use the the student's design. c. Yongzhi notes that students should vote based on which animal best represents Yale-NUS, rather than also judging based on appearance of the design. d. Jared suggests US straw poll system involving candy in the jar to get lots of participation, e.g. gummy bears and straw polls. e. Dave and Tee speak in favour of run-off procedures. <p>9. Voting based on icons or both icons and designs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dave believes that designs are an important component of any vote. b. Feroz finds that art is fundamentally tricky to standardise; there will be variation in quality and style. Also notes that pictures are useful in triggering visual impact, but this can be done with Google Images rather than actualised designs. Actual designs are unnecessary. c. Bing notes that if PA will have editing rights over the final design, then it is strange that students should vote on the designs. d. Dave: Mascots are used primarily as visual representation of a college identity, why then should students not then be able to assess them based on visuals? Dave also feels that students can adequately distinguish between rationale and aesthetics and including both allows them to do so. e. Tee: those who originally suggest options, may be unhappy with the actual design. Dave says that at some point the designs will have to be interpreted. Feroz finds that the student body can discriminate between strong and poor justifications for the mascots. Bing suggests that mascot suggestors can be given the opportunity to rewrite their 	
--	---	--

	<p>descriptions. Dave points out that under the status quo rationales and descriptions are still included in the survey.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Dave notes that there are disparities across the descriptions. Feroz believes that disparities can exist but students can make their own judgment. Jared suggests that we can standardise the description, and the images can be Googled. Feroz agrees. g. Dave: what about the designs that are fictional (e.g. Bull-Lion and Fusion of East and West Dragons)? We have an illustration of one of them, but that gives more weight to the other options, as they will have more reference images? Additionally, having google images increases the disparity between designs, since there is no element of standardisation, which makes comparison more difficult. h. Options : (a) get 4 more designs, (b) ask creators to standardise description, (c) standardise the descriptions and provide stock images. <p>10. MOTION: Student vote on Identity Mascot should be based on description of Mascot suggestions without designs created by Yale-NUS students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. YES: Bing, Feroz, Jared, Yongzhi b. NO: Dave, Qistina (with rights) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Qistina votes no to recognise that there has already been effort put towards making the designs. If this had not been the case, Qistina would have voted yes. c. ABSTAIN: Jay, Tee <p>11. MOTION: Student vote on Identity Mascot should be based on description of Mascot suggestions standardised by the Identity Committee, accompanied by stock images (and where not available, using provided images).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. YES: Bing, Feroz, Jared, Qistina, Yongzhi b. NO: Dave (with rights) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Dave notes that this creates disparity across the images, and that it cannot be done fairly or transparently. c. ABSTAIN: Jay, Tee 	
--	--	--

	<p>12. Question of quorum and majority required for ratification of the Yale-NUS Mascot.</p> <p>a. Dave suggests that it should require the same threshold as approval for Student Government Constitution.</p> <p>13. Question of how to move on from status quo, and why were questions not flagged out earlier. Dave registers that the meeting conduct was inappropriate, and that major changes are made directly before the survey. Prior government meetings on the question of identity have been rushed. Dave believes that government members who register a lack of prior debate or information, are responsible for having rushed prior meetings.</p> <p>14. Coat of Arms. Dave asks if the principle of choosing without aesthetic strength extends to the coat of arms. Jared finds that description alone should not justify what a coat of arms will look like. Feroz believes that the principle does not extend. Dave finds that the coat of arms can be more contentious and room for rationale being the key deciding factor. He is also confused why we feel that the decision on the mascot should not depend on aesthetics, yet the crest should.</p>	
<p>Academics Updates</p>	<p><u>Academics Updates</u></p> <p>1. Feedback submitted on MST Exam was mixed but primarily negative. Feedback was that students did not like format, that it was left to rote learning. Other students said that an exam was required for students to go through all the content learnt.</p> <p>2. Sample size.</p> <p>a. Feedback based on FGD was 1; feedback through email and other online communicative channels was approximately 12.</p> <p>3. Common Curriculum review results will be out in November.</p> <p>4. Dean of Faculty will email more information on Capstone at the end of the semester.</p> <p>5. Feedback needs to be obtained on Honours.</p>	<p>Acads to obtain</p>

	6. S/U option will be up by mid- or late-November. S/U option for common curriculum only applicable for Class of 2017.	feedback on Honours system.
Library Update	<p><u>Library Update</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ken Panko has not responded to the email, but updated that the door for the computer lab is still not working. Panko says that it's not a critical issue because at present, the library doors will be locked after-hours. 2. Suggestion to ask Ken Panko to look into fixing doors, because non-YNC students may stay past library hours in the computer lab. 	Community Living to look into question of computer lab door fixes.
Payment for Student Work	<p><u>Payment for Student Work</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Question of student work compensation. Lack of consistency across what constitutes justifiable compensation. A student associate job should be meaningfully differentiated from extracurriculars. 2. Example: Buttery managers are not paid at a higher rate than buttery workers. Tutors from CTL are paid at \$18 per hour. 3. Administrative response is that tutor rate is approximated to the going-rate in Singapore, not sufficient budget for buttery pay. But such principles can be extended to other jobs. 	Maria and Jared will ask the DOS.
Committee and Workload Distribution	<p><u>Committee and Workload Distribution</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Question of clarifying committee distribution and level of involvement within individual committee. 2. Question of government not being on the same page, government dropping the ball on feedback. 3. Committee <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Academics: Jared, Jay, Maria, Tee b. Comms: Bing, Dave, Feroz, Tee c. Student Organisations: Feroz, Jared, Qistina, Yongzhi d. Events: Bing, Maria, Qistina 	<p>Reinstate committee updates.</p> <p>Presiding Officer is to obtain update from each Committee</p>

	<p>e. Community Living: Dave, Yongzhi, Zach, Ami, Bing, Tee, Jay</p> <p>f. Identity: Ami, Dave, Jay, Zach</p> <p>g. Sunset Clause/Internal Affairs: Tee, Jay, Dave</p> <p>h. Halloween: Dave</p> <p>4. Dave points out that comms isn't a committee.</p> <p>5. Suggestion to have DOS help transition to the new government. Jay suggests that there is a core problem of credit, such as for Comms and Events.</p> <p>6. Question of Sunset Clause Committee. Jared asks what if the Constitution does not pass. Jay claims that we can either dissolve ourselves and endorse anarchy, or arbitrarily change the Constitution such that it does not expire.</p> <p>7. MOTION: Restructure of the Constitutional Review Committee, to enforce a structural abstention on the Secretary, and to institute a rotational Secretary position from members of Student Government.</p> <p>a. YES: Bing, Feroz, Jared, Qistina, Tee, Yongzhi</p> <p>b. NO:</p> <p>c. Abstain: Dave, Jay</p> <p>8. Wednesdays: Qis, Bing; Thursdays: Feroz, Maria; Sundays: Jared, Yongzhi</p>	<p>Leader.</p>
--	--	----------------

Agenda for our next meeting:

- Committee and Workload Distribution
- Jay's Exhortation
- Credit to Government members

Reminders/ Updates