

**Date:** 21 Nov 2015

**Time:** 10:30 AM-4:38 PM

**Venue:** Kewalram Chanrai Room

**Note-Takers:** Tamara, Avery, Isabel

**Presiding Officer:** Tee

**Attendance:** Anandita, Isabel, Qi Siang, Sara, Tamara, Tee, Avery, Swarnima, Jay (late)

**Present:** Andrew McGeehan (Dean of Students Office), Adrian Stymne, Zhang Yaolin, Lingges Rao, Daniel Silverman

**Absent:** Adila, Matthew

**Agenda:**

1. Dean of Student's Office comments
  - a. Budget
  - b. Judiciary
  - c. Advisor to Government
2. General amendments to the Constitution
3. All other amendments

<b>Agenda</b>	<b>Discussion Points</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Dean of Student's Office comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Andrew: We will be involved in allocating the budget. Main concern: Start sooner with weekly meetings for budgeting. Expresses concern about participation of students that do not belong to the Student Government in meetings for budget allocation. Perhaps budget meetings should not be available to the public.</li><li>● Sara: How are we going to regulate conflict of interests?</li><li>● Andrew: It would be helpful to have DOS staff members present and training people who will be part of the committee.</li><li>● Andrew: Currently, the Government budget will be draws funds from the Student Orgs. budget at large. Discussed with Tee that a separate process might be needed for Government to obtain its budget. While there is a separate account now, it is not being used. Asks whether the Student Government would prefer to apply for budget allocation separately.</li><li>● Andrew: Suggests a clause in which judiciary handles procedural matters only and for other matters to be referred to DOS or the disciplinary committee. Agrees with having Judiciary but claims</li></ul>	

	<p>it's necessary for it to interact with disciplinary committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Andrew: Advisor for Government. With a growing Government, we think it would be relevant to have an advisor for Student Government. Advisor's role would be to help prioritise issues and frame reports. Advisor would also help less experienced incoming Student Government members to adjust to their new roles.</li> <li>● Tee: Budget and Judiciary are pressing issues that need to be amended. Moves on to discuss budget.</li> </ul>	
<p>Budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Andrew: Suggests providing schedules on time so that people who apply and sign up for budget committee are more cognisant of the procedures and commitment the committee requires.</li> <li>● Tee: We have asked the Student Org. director to sit in the same committee. If we adopt a model where the Student Organisation director forms a single committee that deals with both recognition and budget, the remaining matters handled by the Budget director would be internal and it would be more like a treasurer.</li> <li>● Andrew: Suggests to reconsider time of elections to give incoming Student Government body more time to prepare.</li> <li>● Sara: Asks how the Budget meetings will separate discussions between different committees i.e. recognition committee.</li> <li>● Andrew: Suggests that recognition committee should have a larger participation.</li> <li>● Tee: What about confidentiality of the Budget meetings.</li> <li>● Anandita: How to reconcile the openness of Budget meetings and confidentiality of information?</li> <li>● Andrew: Sharing process where only a portion of the meetings are open and those where final decisions are made will remain closed. Worries that people will get conflicted with disparity on Budget Allocation.</li> <li>● Qi Siang: If minutes will be available, people will know what happens anyway. Doesn't see how having a closed meeting will solve issues of confidentiality of information.</li> <li>● Andrew: We aim to lessen accusations of unfairness in Budget Allocation.</li> <li>● Andrew: Referring to meetings where final decisions</li> </ul>	

	<p>are made: Suggests keeping minutes available but for the meeting to remain closed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Avery: Having closed meetings does not necessarily contradict our principle of transparency, especially because we are working in collaboration with the DOS office.</li> <li>● Anandita: When would training for Budget Committee members begin?</li> <li>● Andrew: We hope to start on January with training meetings and policy updates on expenditures. Expects to meet for decision-making in March and April. Tentative timeline is for Budgets for Student Organisations to be due late February.</li> <li>● Anandita: In the Constitution we give the Budget Committee a term of a financial year. Would DOS be okay with having the same Budget Committee running for an entire financial year?</li> <li>● Andrew: Supports the idea.</li> <li>● Tee: Suggests breaking down matters regarding Budget.</li> <li>● Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Meetings will be open, except when making final decisions, for which only minutes will be public.</b> 5</li> <li>○ Both meetings and minutes will be open. 0</li> <li>○ Only final decisions meetings and minutes are closed. 2</li> <li>○ Student Organisations will present their plans and may attend all meetings except those where decisions are made. 3</li> <li>○ All meetings are closed and all minutes are public. 0</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Tee: For the first option, creating a clause to specify the definition of final decisions.</li> <li>● Andrew: Suggests to have back to back meetings</li> <li>● Tee: Suggests formalising a rule in which a member from the DOS office will be present in the meetings. Will the member from DOS office be a member of the committee (with voting power) or just sit in the meetings?</li> <li>● Anandita: Yes to voting powers because DOS staff will be more unbiased to all matters.</li> <li>● Qi Siang: No because it would jeopardise the legitimacy of it being a Student Organisation.</li> <li>● Adrian: Yes because it would increase legitimacy in the sense that opinions of DOS staff would be taken into consideration.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

- Motion:
  - Formalise a rule in which a member of the DOS office will be a member of the meetings with voting powers.
- Vote:
  - **Yes 5**
  - No 1
- Tee: Budget Director would become an internal Budget Director.
- Anandita: Involving people from Budget and Student Organisation portfolios in the same committee would be fine.
- Andrew: Agrees and thinks it allows members of the committee to fully understand the processes of Budget allocations and allows them to make informed decisions.
- Tee: Section 8, clause 5 under Budget needs to be taken out.
- Anandita: Will the Budget Director become a co-director along with the Student Organisation Director?
- Tee: They need to collaborate in order to get Budget recognition.
- Andrew: Every student Organisation that gets recognised gets funded
- Sara: Suggests a stipulation to create a standing committee where the Directors of Student Organisations and Budget will co-chair.
- Motion:
  - Creation of a standing committee in which the Directors of Student Organisations and Budget will co-chair.
- Vote:
  - **Yes 4**
  - No
  - Abstain 2
- Qi Siang: Suggests a formal internal process for Budget.
- Tee: Process should end with a stipulation claiming that the decision of the DOS is final.
- Tee: Budget Director is responsible for producing a Budget.
- Motion:
  - The Budget Director shall produce an internal budget proposal in consultation with the Council. This internal budget proposal will be finalised and ratified by a

	<p>vote of the Council. The President will present this internal budget proposal to the Dean of Student’s Office for approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Yes</b> 7</li> <li>○ No</li> <li>○ Abstain 1</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Andrew: Is there an validity in writing that the Budget Committee will be formed by early September for the new academic year?</li> <li>● Avery: Points out that members of the committee would be the same and the Directors would change in January. Might be problematic.</li> <li>● Andrew: Proposes for one set of committees to be formed in January and the other in September according to timeline needs of Budget Committee.</li> <li>● Andrew: We would have to make the time commitment very clear for entering members of the committee.</li> <li>● Avery: Suggests to recruit early.</li> <li>● Andrew: If recruiting early, there still isn’t a Budget.</li> <li>● Andrew: New Budget Director would stay in the committee anyway, it will be strange the first year but once the cycle has started it makes sense because if the incoming Director has the opportunity to sit for a semester and learn the procedures, it would make the transition smoother.</li> <li>● Anandita: What about vacancy due to study abroad?</li> <li>● Andrew: Since the standing committee will be co-chaired, in the event of a vacancy, either the Student Organisation Director takes over or a member of the DOS office will assist the standing committee.</li> <li>● Anandita: Agrees with Andrew’s idea.</li> <li>● Qi Siang:</li> <li>● Option: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One set of committees will be formed in January and the other in September</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Yes</b> 7</li> <li>○ No 0</li> <li>○ Abstain 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Judiciary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee: Judiciary’s decisions are binding in context of Constitution. Ex) Sexual harassment issue “solved”</li> </ul>	

in Judiciary without contacting Administration/any higher authority. That looks really bad, especially if there is an actual crime involved.

- Anandita: Middle ground. Judiciary + DoS.
- Sara: Who is actually in charge of dealing with sexual assault/on-campus crimes? Wouldn't it be the actual police?
- Tee: We can impeach people for misconduct.
- Andrew: At what point is not the Judiciary's problem? When should something go before the administration?
- Anandita: Judiciary only handles one aspect of it. Judiciary only handles impeachment, no other problems.
- Andrew: Internal process dealing with crimes is bad.
- Andrew: DoS shouldn't be there. Thoughts:
  - Judiciary will mainly handle government/procedural issues
  - Judiciary decisions go to DoS advisor so everyone is informed.
- Jay: Secret proceeding is okay in some circumstances. Could be detrimental to always report to DoS.
- Tee: So when does Judiciary must bring something to administration? List specific examples?
- Andrew: Mandatory reporters? Worry about random Judiciary people meting out justice for sexual assault. Judiciary is not prepared to deal with this.
- Jay: List mandatory reporting: sexual/non-sexual assault
- Andrew: Link to residential policy guidelines. More vague, but gives Judiciary some reference. Uncivil behaviors defined.
- Tee: So when issue falls under the residential policy guidelines, must refer
- Andrew: College guidelines:
  - Non-academic uncivil behaviours
  - New policy on sexual misconduct
  - Community standards for student organizations (to be released)
  - residential policy guidelines
- Andrew: Clarify that you must refer to DoS, not that DoS has to do anything
- Avery: Judiciary only has power as it refers to government (can't suspend ordinary students)

- Tee: Judiciary must make aware to the DoS any actions which violate the college guidelines (see above).
  - Yes: 6
  - No: 0
  - Abstain: 2
- Andrew: Make people understand that it is a referral, nothing is mandated, DoS may decide not to do anything, etc. Reduce pressure/limitations on reporting to Judiciary.
- Tee: Any other concerns?
- Andrew: More amendments will probably go through as the Judiciary actually works through cases. Good for now.
- Tee: Formalise role of advisor? Then move on to Chris's amendments.
- Tee: So what actually is the role of the advisor?
- Anandita: What are duties for an advisor for a student org?
- Andrew: Meet with Exco, provide guidance/thoughts, give staff/faculty perspective, etc
- Tee: We need to be specific.
- Jay: Strongly against having an advisor for Student Government. Want a degree of separation from administration.
- Sara: Why separation?
- Jay: Students need to trust in the autonomy of the student government. Students see advisor as pressure from administration.
- Qi Siang: Student Government should be check on administration.
- Sara: I disagree. Student Government is just a mechanism for student feedback. Administration runs the school. This would make it a partnership. Need someone to liaise.
- Andrew: "Liaisons" to DoS is essentially the same thing as having a DoS advisor. Offer guidance, not directions. It would be more efficient to talk with President/VP instead of each member of government individually.
- Jay: Is advisor DoS specific?
- Andrew: Not necessarily. But DoS makes the most sense/is the most relevant. Ex) Athletics report. DoS could have answered a lot of questions in the report. Save time and effort on basic things.
- Yaolin: Don't call advisor, just call liaison. Sounds

	<p>better.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Andrew: Consultant?</li> <li>● Jay: DoS is not the only administrative group with which Student Govt is involved. We deal with Dean of Faculty a lot, too. Will actually cause a difficulty in communication. Agree with Yaolin. Keep it fluid.</li> <li>● Avery: President and VP should meet with DoS liaison/consultant</li> <li>● Andrew: Consultant comes to general meetings once or twice, not at every meeting, use President and VP as main channels of information. Streamline. Relieves admin burden.</li> <li>● Tee: DoS and Student Government both have vested interest in working together. Do Faculty would prefer to have students come. Curic. will soon stabilize.</li> <li>● Jay: President, VP, Speaker attend meeting with consultant. In principle, Chief Justice, but not elected, so no.</li> <li>● Qi Siang: Chief Justice’s role is to arbitrate.</li> <li>● Tee: Vote to formally allow in the Constitution for a staff liaison from the Dean of Students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes: 5</li> <li>○ No: 0</li> <li>○ Abstain: 3</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Chris Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “Chris”: “In section 11 (page 6), the constitution describes the liaison roles. I would suggest appointing student liaisons to both ERT (rather than “Arts” as Arts Programming is a part of ERT) and Infrastructure (which includes facilities, safety, and security). You may want to consider appointing a liaison for CIPE (or to the CIPE Student Advisory Committee) as that is another office with a very student-facing position at the College.”</li> <li>● Andrew: Student-focused mission/want more student involvement. Ex) having students involved in computer programming, etc.</li> <li>● [Andrew leaves. Much thanks.]</li> <li>● Jay: Sounds good.</li> <li>● Include by acclaim.</li> </ul>	
Actual Amendments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee: We will consider General amendments first, then Article 1, 2, etc</li> </ul>	
General Amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jay: Facebook is just as legitimate as Canvas and email.</li> </ul>	

<p>1: Facebook is the worst</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee: Fb is crowded, Fb spirals out of control. Distinction between private/public will be grey. Everyone has an email.</li> <li>● Sara: I see rationale, but FB is still effective. Don't put in Constitution. Social media changes anyway, will date the Constitution. Will FB even exist in three years?</li> <li>● Anandita: Email spam</li> <li>● Swarnima: Like the idea of using an official student government account on email/Fb. But not stipulated under Constitution.</li> <li>● Tee: Vote on banning FB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes: 0</li> <li>○ <b>No: 5</b></li> <li>○ Abstain: 2</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>General 2: Reasonable Individual</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jay: What even is a decision made in the mind of a "reasonable" individual? This makes things more confusing.</li> <li>● Tee: Brings morality into document, which we didn't want</li> <li>● Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes: 0</li> <li>○ <b>No: 5</b></li> <li>○ Abstain: 3</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>General 3: funding for committees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jay: This is covered in Robert's Rules. Council will give money to committees</li> <li>● Tee: Value to making this more clear?</li> <li>● Avery: Agree. Make more obvious.</li> <li>● Jay: By adding this, adding a layer of potential contradiction. Conflict with Robert's Rules.</li> <li>● Avery: <i>In accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, the Council has the authority to discharge funds to committees.</i></li> <li>● Vote on above: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Yes: 3</b></li> <li>○ No: 0</li> <li>○ Abstain: 5</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>General 4: What is Legislation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Avery: Do we even have legislation? Example?</li> <li>● Jay: Legislation does not imply policy.</li> <li>● Tee: Define.</li> </ul>	
<p>Article 1, Clause 1:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Remove political views from discrimination clause</li> <li>● Jay: I think this person misunderstands the</li> </ul>	

	<p>discrimination clause.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jay: Oath of Office will prevent autocratic government member</li> <li>● Tee: No problem except definitional one. Define political views.</li> <li>● Anandita + Jay: I don't feel the need to define it, "all political views tolerated" not contradictory with democratic principles</li> <li>● Tee: It's <i>representation</i> that will not be discriminated...</li> <li>● MOTION: Keep this clause <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes 0</li> <li>○ <b>No everyone else 4</b></li> <li>○ Abstain 2</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Tee: Are there any more article 1's? Let me look for more article 1s...</li> </ul>	
<p>Article 1, Section 2, Clause 5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Change already remedied by DoS amendments</li> </ul>	
<p>Article 1, Section 3, Clause 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Government shouldn't be able to make statements on behalf of the student body</li> <li>● Qi Siang: Student government can't express the diversity.</li> <li>● Tee: Govt shouldn't have the power to represent students for ex) a formal apology.</li> <li>● Qi Siang: It is important for student government to make these statements</li> <li>● Tee: Spirit is important, student government does not completely represent one and all. How do we define/limit the scope in which the student government can represent students?</li> <li>● Jay: this wouldn't improve the government</li> <li>● Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes: 0</li> <li>○ <b>No: 5</b></li> <li>○ Abstain: 3</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>Article 3, Section 3, Clause 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Council doesn't have the power to ratify President's arrangement of portfolios (oversight)</li> <li>● Agree by acclaim</li> </ul>	
<p>Article 3, Section 5, Clause 1a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Specify how the President should consider input</li> <li>● Swarnima: Current is too vague</li> <li>● Qi Siang: formally submit plan for vision. Speech. Debate. Vote on letting that be the trajectory.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Avery: I don't find this useful.</li> <li>● Daniel Silverman: Emergencies arise, you won't stick to the vision.</li> <li>● Jay: This will just make things difficult.</li> <li>● Isabel: Adds bureaucracy. Minimize formalized structure unless they are absolutely necessary.</li> <li>● Vote: (on whether to clarify how the President should consider input on year-long plan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes: 0</li> <li>○ <b>No: 5</b></li> <li>○ Abstain: 3</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>Daniel Silverman Amendment (General amendment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Separate President and Vice President elections from legislature</li> <li>● Executive Body of Directors separate from legislative body. Not directly elected. Recommended by President, legislature confirms/rejects them.</li> <li>● Daniel Silverman: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Avery mentioned won't be enough people <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ But only need 11</li> <li>■ Don't need to push for 23 right now</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ P and VP will be contested, will want to run</li> <li>○ Concerns with putting executive powers with legislative reps. School will grow. Have separate body for executive decisions, will allow for more participation.</li> <li>○ Short run concerns, but long term.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Swarnima: Why do you want this to be separate?</li> <li>● Daniel: Too much power in the hands of a select few. Should mirror national government.</li> <li>● Qi Siang: MPs do have this power.</li> <li>● Swarnima: This will be inefficient.</li> <li>● Legislation- makes policy</li> <li>● Executive Body- is given the policy, in charge of lobbying and actually making it happen</li> <li>● Qi Siang: Generally admirable to have separation of powers, but we don't want too big. Don't want duplication.</li> <li>● Sara: Agree with size issue. We want mid-sized.</li> <li>● Isabel: Need flexibility.</li> <li>● Tee: vote in parts?</li> <li>● Daniel: No</li> <li>● Vote: Separate P and VP elections from legislature .Executive Body of Directors separate from legislative body. Not directly elected. Recommended by President, legislature confirms/rejects them. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Yes: 0</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<input type="radio"/> <b>No: 3</b> <input type="radio"/> Abstain: 6	
Daniel Silverman Amendment 2. Article 6, Section 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Change elections to be in Fall</li> <li>● Interim government for one semester</li> <li>● Sara: Freshman won't know anything in the fall.</li> <li>● Daniel: This will cause issues for people studying abroad in second semester. Especially seniors.</li> <li>● Jay: Freshman can run in the fall based on campaign</li> <li>● Sara: I know people better now, and I know what they can contribute. Points out that by-elections will be held throughout the year. What about being elected in May?</li> <li>● Daniel: I'm also okay with May. May is a pretty season, and I like the flowers. I'm particularly concerned with seniors. Greater cohesion if over an academic year.</li> <li>● Jay: Summer loss of momentum.</li> <li>● Avery: Would juniors run if elections were in May?</li> <li>● Isabel: lack of freshman representation</li> <li>● Anandita: summer communication will be even worse with a new government. Also, this may conflict with exams, papers, etc.</li> <li>● Avery: Lack of freshman participation?</li> <li>● Sara: By-elections and committees.</li> <li>● Daniel: Impossible to cater to juniors. But can help the seniors.</li> <li>● Sara: Someone is going to lose out. Don't place value judgments on who is the most important. What will make the government the most effective?</li> <li>● Vote: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May: 4</li> <li>○ September: 2</li> <li>○ January: 3</li> <li>○ Abstain: 1</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Motion to divide the house <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May: 4</li> <li>○ September: 3</li> <li>○ January: 3</li> <li>○ Abstain : 0</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Jay's problems with May: Want freshman to be involved earlier. Cliques form after time. Nothing gets done in the summer.</li> <li>● REVOTE (1 vote each, no abstentions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ May: 1</li> <li>○ <b>September: 6</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p style="text-align: center;"><input type="radio"/> January: 2</p> <p>Things that change as a result:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Transitional government/transition period</li> <li>● Budget</li> <li>● Elections article</li> </ul> <p>Members to draft the consequent amendments in Constitution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jay</li> <li>● Isabel</li> <li>● Avery</li> <li>● Sara</li> <li>● Qi Siang</li> </ul>	
Article 3, Section 5, Clause 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● President ensures that Directors fulfill duties</li> <li>● Sara: How would we make it more specific?</li> <li>● Qi Siang: This gives President flexibility.</li> <li>● Vote: The President shall come up with an assessment mechanism to evaluate Director/DD performance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> Yes: 3</li> <li><input type="radio"/> <b>No: 5</b></li> <li><input type="radio"/> Abstain: 1</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Article 3, Section 8, Clause 2b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment recommends the addition of concerns regarding CIPE academic programs to director of academics' responsibilities.</li> <li>● Amendment <b>Passed</b> by acclamation</li> </ul>	
Article 3, Section 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment's concern: Currently, the Constitution does not stipulate that directors have to advocate for students. Suggest to add advocacy to responsibilities of directors.</li> <li>● Amendment <b>Passed</b> by acclamation</li> </ul>	
Article 3, Section 5, Clause 2e	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment recommends the reduction of the Council vote requirement to override President's veto. Suggest reduce from <math>\frac{4}{5}</math> to <math>\frac{3}{5}</math>.</li> <li>● Qi Siang and Avery: the principle is reasonable. But <math>\frac{3}{5}</math> is arbitrary; suggested change to <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> vote for consistency.</li> <li>● Modified amendment to reduce to <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> <b>Passed</b> by acclamation.</li> </ul>	
Article 3, Section 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment asks for phrasing to clarify the function of liaisons. Do they work with organisations external to the Government, or to the wider College?</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Committee unanimously agrees that liaisons work with bodies external to the government, not to the College (liaisons work within the college).</li> <li>● Amendment <b>Passed</b> by acclamation.</li> </ul>	
Article 3, Section 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment suggests that Constitution should formalise Council's contact with future alumni.</li> <li>● Committee unanimously agrees that formal point of contact should be External Communications Director.</li> <li>● Amendment <b>Passed</b> by acclamation.</li> </ul>	
Article 6, Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment suggests limiting the number of consecutive terms to stand for elections to two.</li> <li>● Swarnima: Two terms seems arbitrary.</li> <li>● Jay: No one will run for four back-to-back terms!</li> <li>● Qi Siang: Suggests to enact amendment in part - term limit only applicable to President. This will reduce worries of autocratic hold on power, but still allow most to run freely.</li> <li>● Modified amendment to set term limit of 2 terms for President <b>Passed</b> by acclamation.</li> </ul>	
Article 6, Section 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment suggests that if less than 23 students run for Council, to remove lowest 25% of number of candidates by votes (e.g. if 15, bottom 4) from forming Council. This to ensure legitimacy of Council formed.</li> <li>● Convener suggests an alternative that will achieve intentions of submitted amendment. Have a minimum vote percentage as a requirement to be elected to Council. This proportion increases as the number of people running decreases (i.e. increasing legitimacy is needed as number of candidates gets limited). The proportion follows the following formula: Inverse of <math>n</math>, where <math>n</math> is the number of candidates running. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ie. total 23 candidates; threshold: <math>1/23</math> of votes   22 candidates; threshold: <math>1/22</math> of votes   <math>n</math> candidates; threshold: <math>1/n</math> votes</li> </ul> </li> <li>● VOTE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Status quo (no stipulation): 1</li> <li>○ Suggested option by submitted amendment (article 6, section 3 (no. 28)): 2</li> <li>○ Requirement of minimum percentage of student vote: 7</li> <li>○ Abstain: 1</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Qi Siang: reminder to add this amendment to the appendix.</li> </ul>	
Article 6, Section 3, Clause 6.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment suggested methods with regard to increasing competition to ensure Council legitimacy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The total number of seats in the council is determined by the number of students who receive a minimum vote share determined by the Election Committee before the vote takes place.</li> <li>○ The total number of seats in the council is determined by the number of students who receive a minimum total ranking score determined by the Election Committee before the vote takes place.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Given the previous amendment had already addressed the concerns of this amendment, the Committee unanimously voted against enacting any part of this amendment.</li> </ul>	
Article 8, Section 2, Clause 1, subclause c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment is concerned that “academic duress” may describe too broad a condition for excusable leaves of absence which may be applicable at too many times.</li> <li>● Qi Siang: The wording was intentional. The Judiciary should be able to decide how academic duress can apply, given that a variety of context-specific situations could arise that the Constitution will not be able to fully account for.</li> <li>● The Committee unanimously voted <b>against</b> the amendment.</li> </ul>	
Article 8, Section 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment calls for higher commitment requirement in terms of Council members’ attendance.</li> <li>● Convener: There is a need to clarify the type of meetings mentioned.</li> <li>● Sara: Agrees with the amendment that members have to be held accountable, but given the number of meetings, one-third (status quo) should be sufficient.</li> <li>● Committee unanimously votes <b>against</b> the amendment.</li> </ul>	
Article 8, Section 4,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment asks for clarification on the percentages needed for a petition.</li> </ul>	

<p>Clause 1, subclause c</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Anandita: Given that the number is present in the schedules, we can draft a clause in the definition for petitions that refers to it.</li> <li>● Amendment <b>Passed</b> by acclamation.</li> </ul>	
<p>Article 9, Section 6, Clause 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Suggestion for clearer language in the clause.</li> <li>● Qi Siang assigned to rephrase the clause.</li> </ul>	
<p>Article 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment states that “legislation” should be defined.</li> <li>● Devil’s Advocate: The meanings of legislate in the legal and layman sense are not the same. In this case, no part of the Constitution suggests that the Council can pass binding laws on students. Suggest to not accept the amendment.</li> <li>● Committee unanimously votes <b>against</b> the amendment.</li> </ul>	
<p>Schedule II: Oaths of Office</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amendment suggests the removal of the optional suggestion of “So help me God” in the Oaths.</li> <li>● Devil’s Advocate: An alternative could be to phrase it as: “Optional: declaration of faith to any religion of choice.”</li> <li>● Modified amendment <b>Passed</b> by acclamation.</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Convener briefs the Committee on ratification procedures</li> <li>● The Convener assigns duties. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Public announcement on the Committee’s consideration of all amendments to be done by Tamara, Sara.</li> <li>○ Gmail for e-voting to be created by Qi Siang</li> <li>○ The Convener to send out an email to all students advising them on the ratification process</li> </ul> </li> <li>● The Convener declares the meeting ended at 1638 hrs.</li> </ul>	