

Date: 8 Nov 2015

Time: 9.00AM-11.59PM

Venue: Saga Dining Hall Anteroom

Note-Takers: Qistina, Maria, Feroz

Presiding Officer: Tee

Attendance: Anandita (late with apologies), Isabel, Matthew, Qi Siang, Qistina, Sara, Swarnima, Tamara, Tee, Jay (Late with apologies) , Adila, Avery, Daniel, Isaac, Dave

Absent:

Agenda:

- Remaining Articles
  - Article X: Procedures
  - Article XI: Definitions
  - By-laws, transition article
- Voting-in of Constitution by article
- Discussion on ratification

Summary:

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action
Remaining Articles	Remaining Articles 1. Procedures a. (2:2) Petitions will need to be signed by at least 10% of the student body. (This was changed from a suggested 60% given the number of students required to sign for a petition to pass.) b. Suggestion for conditions of petitions or a referendum	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Concern: Specifying what a petition is or is not should be made clear in cases of dispute</li> <li>ii. Referendum: Matthew suggests this as way for students to make amendments to the constitution directly (similar to California and Bolivia’s system)</li> <li>iii. The committee will create a petition form (an amended copy of the amendments form) for students to start their petitions. The form will stipulate with clarity the intent of the petition and signatories should have knowledge of the content of the petition before signing.</li> </ul> <p>c. (2:3) “hold a formal vote of the student body” (original) by direct democracy as before blurs the lines between direct democracy and petitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Matthew suggests making a distinction between the two by having the government reconsider and re-vote on the decision.</li> <li>ii. Duration of polling for direct democracy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Suggestion for 7 days of polling where decisions cannot be implemented until the 7th day has passed.</li> <li>2. Suggestion that within the 7 days (after implementation), should 50% be reached, the repeal of the decision should happen.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>Otherwise, it might slow down the progress of the government.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. Concern that waiting a week might be too long particularly for time-sensitive emergency situations.</li><li>4. Sara says that there are systems of checks and balances that will prevent extreme situations from happening e.g. disseminating students' personal information</li><li>5. The distinction made between petitions and direct democracy would be the clarity of intent behind voting.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Matthew: The formality of the channels of feedback does not align with the weightage given to them, i.e. Petitions are more formal and require signatures from 10% of the student body to have decisions reconsidered while direct democracy is less formal and requires 50% for the decision to be overturned.</li><li>b. Anandita: People might not actually start a petition but the direct democracy is important as a gauge of the dissent among students regarding decisions made by the government.</li></ol></li></ol>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. Matthew: in that case, why not make both online?</li> <li>d. Anandita: Yes, so as Matthew suggests, we can have both online and if we get 10% votes, the decision is reconsidered and if it surpasses 50%, it will be overturned.</li> <li>e. Isabel: A physical petition should still be an avenue for the students to have their voices heard but this will require 50% of the student body to keep in line with the online procedures.</li> </ul> <p>d. Amendment procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Should the government have the power to amend the constitution? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Anandita: Since the government is a legislative power, they should have the ability to make these amendments. The legislature could make an amendment and the judiciary will look through these amendments and only implement them if they fit with the spirit of the constitution.</li> <li>2. Qi Siang: The spirit of the constitution is subjective in interpretation. If there is too</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>much leeway for constitutional amendments, it might dilute the power of the constitution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>3. Tee suggests the system used by British parliament but Matthew has pointed out that in ambiguity, they have years of legal precedence and can refer to these decisions for guidance. As a young college, at this point in time, this is unfeasible.</li><li>4. Suggestion for government to suggest amendments and have students vote on them<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Though Anandita's counter is that anyone can already suggest amendments.</li><li>b. Isabel: There needs to be the channel for these amendments to be made.</li><li>c. Matthew: The government should not have the power to unilaterally amend the constitution but they should have the process to amend it and publicise these amendments. There must be an external check by the student body.</li><li>d. Qi Siang: It may be too cumbersome for the amendment to occur particularly in the case where ambivalence is high.</li></ol></li></ol>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>e. Matthew: The low quorum is the medium measure for government to pass amendments.</li><li>f. Qi Siang: If a student doesn't vote then it should be taken as abstention.</li><li>g. Anandita: 50% is a high threshold and it makes it impractical for implementation given that 500 people would be required to vote yes for the amendments to take place</li><li>h. Qi Siang: Having ambivalence acts as a bolster for the constitution as it concretises the power of the constitution and helps it plant its roots in the ground.</li><li>i. Anandita: Not a lot of controversial decisions have been made and the smaller non-controversial decisions are still important to be had. Since there is difficulty in getting 50% of students to vote, there should be a negation instead such that 50% no votes prevents the decision from taking effect. There should be a check by the</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>judiciary and also ratification by the student body.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>j. Matthew: Amendments to the constitution are the constitution and if the judiciary must reference these to the spirit of the current constitution, they are limited to the kind of amendments that can be implemented.</li><li>k. Anandita: There are limits to what kind of amendments can be made e.g. to the basic structure of the government where you should not eliminate the judiciary entirely.</li><li>l. Qi Siang: Then we should make it clear in the constitution that certain sections cannot be amended.</li><li>m. Swarnima: The environment of our school is constantly changing and if there is no longer a need for a judiciary for example, then there would be a section of the student government that would be irrelevant.</li><li>n. Tee: Then let us put a caveat to Qi Siang's suggestion in the case that an</li></ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>entire constitutional reform is called, changing the structure is allowed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="871 310 1417 672">o. Matthew: The judiciary should not be allowed to make the decisions for changing law particularly calling for removal of government bodies. The idea of the judiciary of reviewing the government is to eliminate negative amendments from being implemented that people might not agree with.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="779 691 1417 768">5. Strawpoll: Government should have powers to amend the constitution. (5 yes, 3 abstain)</p> <p data-bbox="779 787 1417 959">6. Judiciary will make opinion and offer advice to the government that is publicly accessible which will be non-binding in the amendment procedure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="871 979 1417 1101">a. Qi Siang: Specify what the spirit of the constitution in the preamble that can be referred to.</li> <li data-bbox="871 1120 1417 1292">b. Anandita, Swarnima disagree as this will not be able to encompass completely what the spirit of the constitution section should include.</li> <li data-bbox="871 1312 1417 1388">c. Jay: Is this % with or without the President's veto?</li> </ul>	
--	---	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. This veto remains as the amendments process is the same as a student initiated suggestion.</li> <li>ii. The veto is published and can be voted against in the direct democracy before it is overturned.</li> <li>iii. Matthew: The president should not have a veto in this case as there will be 2 direct democracy votes required: 1 to overturn the veto and then to vote on the amendment itself.</li> <li>iv. The committee has agreed that the President cannot veto these decisions in such cases.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Student Opinion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Qi Siang: Constitutional amendments should have a high quorum for them to be tabled, perhaps at 20% instead of 10%.</li> <li>2. Matthew: 2/3 of quorum (2/3 of those present) should be changed to 50% to pass an amendment outright with no other considerations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Anandita agrees: If there are no other considerations then it will need a much higher mandate for it to be passed.</li> <li>4. Matthew: If 50% agrees, it passes and it is much simpler to implement than <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> of <math>\frac{2}{3}</math>.</li> <li>5. Overturning a veto will equate to voting for the decision.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. Sunset clause amendment <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Students may call for a sunset clause amendment with a 10% petition.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
Voting-in of constitution by article	<p>Voting-in of constitution by article</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> </ol>	
Amendments Form	<p>Amendment of the Constitution</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Procedure for amendments <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. There is a form for students to submit amendments to the constitution after its release on Monday.</li> <li>b. Categories of amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Addition</li> <li>ii. Removal</li> <li>iii. Modification</li> <li>iv. Replacement</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

	<p>c. Miscellaneous amendments will be considered first as these may be more general and would thus affect the constitution more broadly.</p> <p>d. Terms of the amendments procedure as well as the amendment form will be disseminated in a soft-copy through email blasts and a hard copy in their suites.</p>	
<p>Ratification procedure</p>	<p>Jay: Ratifying amendments or ratifying this constitution? Last year, the standard was very very high.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tee: 2/3</li> <li>• Jay: If you don't get quorum, and if you get 65%, then it doesn't pass. Is that really good, considering the lack of participation in this college? I think 2/3 is too high. So either do 2/3</li> <li>• Matthew: 2/3 of 2/3 is 44%, so our threshold is only 44%. Is there any kind of legitimacy for increasing it?</li> <li>• Tee: 1/2 and 2/3 is 1/3 of the population.</li> <li>• Matthew: Lower threshold for the entire constitution when compared to changing something smaller. I do not know if that's a problem, but it's worth considering.</li> <li>• Tee: I wanted 50% as quorum, and 2/3 of yes vote. Someone asked me to change it (Matthew).</li> <li>• Tee: Let's look at the different options: 50/50, 2/3/ 2/3 or 50/ 2/3</li> <li>• Anandita: There are problems and pros and cons for both.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Matthew: Approval and negation are different problems. Those who do not come will usually not care about the outcome. You will usually have highest percentage from people who have stake in it.</li> <li>● Tee: Quorum is basically everyone, and since we are already establishing a quorum, we are already setting up a higher bar. Two problems: not enough people show up, not enough people vote “yes”. There is a higher requirement than a normal decision for the constitution to pass - it requires the quorum be met, and that the majority vote yes. There is a higher probability that the constitution will fail. We need to meet quorum and have people vote yes.</li> <li>● Matthew: Let’s say the constitution is ratified, but with a final vote that is less than half the student body. Opposition writes into Octant, what would you say to appease them?</li> <li>● Tee: You abstain by default if you do not participate, and we have done our due diligence to publicize.</li> <li>● Tamara: It’s not that they don’t care, it’s just they procrastinate.</li> <li>● Tee: We should think past the interest to pass it.</li> <li>● People are agreeing on 50/ %. 50 - quorum, % of quorum passes constitution. Implication - we value voting “yes” more than participation.</li> </ul>	
Mechanisms	<p>Computer stations in the library, with the email provision for people studying abroad.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Matthew: This was proposed for elections already, so we can use this for the constitution.</li> <li>● Tee: We put 10 MacBooks, and we put the officers there for voting.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Anandita: Why can't it be from the comfort of their own homes.</li> <li>● Matthew: The reason was hacking...</li> <li>● Tee: ... and influence from other people.</li> <li>● Avery: SHowing up will also increase participation.</li> <li>● Qi Siang: paper?</li> <li>● Tee: The algorithm will be too complex.</li> <li>● Tee: Yongzhi wants to set up two-tier ballots. Yes - new constitution, No - old constitution, Yes - government, No - no government.</li> <li>● Matthew: In effect, all student government duties would then be given to DOS.</li> <li>● Tee: YZ's arguments were that new government will get more legitimacy, and gives more options to students.</li> <li>● Tee: We will also add in the mascot voting during constitution, but we (as a committee) do not necessarily need to organize mascot process.</li> <li>● Sara: What about two votes, there are three votes.</li> <li>● Tee: YZ wanted two because you can vote in whatever way you want.</li> <li>● Sara: If you have two separate questions, you will get confusion.</li> <li>● Tee: Yes constitution, No to gov/t (you are preferentially in favour of new constitution, but would prefer nothing at all); Yes to constitution, Yes to gov/t; No, No (no conflict); No, Yes (no conflict).</li> <li>● Maria: YZ felt that it was more formal, and that it was easier.</li> <li>● Tee: It depends on the "spirit" of sunset clause.</li> <li>● Qi Siang: Wouldn't this system result in an outcome where voters will get confused?</li> <li>● Tee: While we do not underestimate the ability of voters, it is easy for voters with other commitments to overlook these nuances.</li> <li>● Jay: This has no place within the ratification process. I'm biased here, but that was not the spirit of the process at all. I see there are only two possible outcomes: 1. A concerted group of students cause</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>the constitution to fail, and opens up the process to be manipulated by students. 2. The gov/t gets more legitimacy because the idea of gov/t was voted yes. My inclination would be not to include it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Avery: This is a gamble, and I was confused at first without explanation. If I am confused and do not understand the point of them, a compromise could be “Yes, No, Neither”. This allows the student to express dissatisfaction.</li> <li>● Tee: The “Neither” option doesn’t fall into sunset clause. Gov/t could do separate ballot by themselves. We have done it in a way that makes it seem like there are two constitutions. But for us, this is actually yes/no in order to approve or disapprove changes to the old one (aka the new one).</li> <li>● Anandita: I feel like, as a voter, I could question the student government and see if they are questioning their own purpose. It does not increase legitimacy of gov/t.</li> <li>● Swarnima: I would agree with you, but it adds legitimacy to the constitution.</li> <li>● Jay: Since people will have a limited desire to participate, you’re going to get a disproportionate vote to not have student government. The point is that the people who do not like gov/t will turn up more, and this will make an apparent (but perhaps not true) dissatisfaction with gov/t.</li> <li>● General agreement that there shouldn’t be extra vote.</li> <li>● Avery: This isn’t up to us.</li> <li>● Maria: Gov/t takes opinion into consideration.</li> </ul> <p>Paper vs Online Balloting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee: Computer balloting means we can test out the system first before elections.</li> <li>● Maria: I do not think that people actually care that much about safety.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jay: Counting paper ballots sucks. Furthermore, it has to be a public process.</li> <li>● General agreement: NO PAPER BALLOTS!!!!!!!</li> </ul> <p>Two-day process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jay: The actual running of the thing does not require that much manpower, it really requires 2 people for each given shift.</li> <li>● Tee: If you drag it on, more people won't participate.</li> <li>● Jay: It shouldn't be a problem on that day, but just keep Thanksgiving in mind.</li> <li>● Tee: Do we need to call for volunteers?</li> <li>● General agreement to have volunteers.</li> <li>● Ratification must be done by constitutional committee.</li> <li>● Tee: The formation of the constitutional committee must be inside constitution, and will be formed when sunset clause is called for.</li> <li>● Tee: Public witnesses need to be there for the counting. The witnesses must be separate.</li> <li>● Jay: People who cannot be public witnesses: government members, not this committee, not ESC from last year</li> </ul> <p>Anything else?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Anandita: Why is this in the constitution?</li> <li>● Qi Siang: Will this happen every year?</li> <li>● Tee: no.</li> </ul>	
Meeting and Voting	<p>Jay: We wrote our own procedural rules, and we will default to Robert's rules of order if something is unclear.</p> <p>Meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee: Meetings - how frequent?</li> <li>● Avery: Do we want to put duties and powers under article 4?</li> <li>● Tee: Duties and powers of council under council section instead?</li> <li>● General agreement "yes".</li> </ul>	

- Tee: Weekly meetings of full council
- Tee: For the meeting, the duties and powers are that there **are** meetings. The **procedure** is how they should be **held**. What is a quorum, what happens when you call for a motion?
- Sara: does this have to be in constitution?
- Tee: This could be left up to gov/t or just to the constitution
- Anandita: we should have at least 1 per week, but from there leave it up to the government.
- Tee: After you establish the need to have a meeting with Duties and Powers, then you use Procedures to tell people **how** to have those meetings. Does everyone feel that the President and the Council should be able to decide the procedures?
- Some (possible) general principles to be observed during the meeting
  - Question period?
  - {5 min break}
  - “Let’s get down to business.” - Tee
  - Openness? Equal time? Q/A segment?
  - Avery: Everyone **can** speak, and should have equal right to do so.
  - Qi Siang: Everyone should have the opportunity to hold the government to account.
  - Meetings must be open.
  - Adilla: what about time? If you want to drag the meeting, can you?
    - Tee: a member of government can motion for the meeting to be extended.
  - Tee: for formal meetings, a notice is generally served to the public before the meeting.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Current government voluntarily did this at some points, but it was not a requirement. Has not done this for a while.</li> <li>■ Sara: posting every week will just saturate facebook more.</li> <li>■ Avery: post on government website.</li> <li>■ Tee: platform can be anything online; no requirement to use a specific platform.</li> <li>■ Student body must be notified on potential changes of venue.</li> <li>■ Acclaim</li> <li>○ Jay: Meeting conduct outline. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Open Meetings Law: a set of procedures that describes how one conducts an open meeting that's <b>actually</b> open. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Where, when, <b>who</b> is conducting. Doesn't need to include what's being discussed.</li> <li>● Must have public comment. Must have procedure to select people for public comment (in case too many want to comment).</li> <li>● In some places, there's a rule that a certain proportion of the government <b>cannot meet</b> by itself 'secretly'. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How do you keep the government from being sketchy?</li> <li>○ Generally: the gov is perfectly capable of writing its own procedure. What you want to put in the <b>constitution</b> are things that are needed to keep the government in check.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tee: what is a secret meeting defined as? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Difference between secret meetings and ‘closed’ meetings. Govt has no secret meetings, only closed meetings whose minutes will be published eventually.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Sara: precedent used to debate was Athletics Captains meeting. Closed, but minutes were published. If transparency is one of the key principles of the constitution, this should be retained.</li> <li>○ Anandita: what about classified information? how will the government discuss classified information?</li> <li>○ Tamara: we can’t stipulate whether people can/cannot meet privately to discuss.</li> <li>○ QI Siang: we can make the minutes of meetings limitedly available, if there is classified information. Information can be made available on request, or published at a later date</li> <li>○ Matthew: perhaps we can still have the requirement to have minutes, but you can redact things from the minutes if they are classified.</li> <li>○ Jay: hypothetical. if the whole topic is classified, what will you do? (e.g. if admin meets with gov behind closed doors to announce closure of the school, etc) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Answered under Qi Siang’s framework re: when to release minutes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Tee: who decides what makes information important or secret such that it can’t be shared? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Matthew: the problem here is there are a lot of tricky grey areas re: statuses of availability. Too complicated. We can just use the redacted minutes model to avoid this.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ QI Siang: announce that the meeting was secret, and more information will be released at a later date OR the meeting involved classified/confidential information.</li> <li>■ Avery: if you don't give the government flexibility, there could be things we don't see that the government will need: we need to hold a closed meeting but we can't, etc.</li> <li>■ Matthew: we could have a limited 'other' clause to resolve this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The principle should be that meetings are open unless there is a very compelling reason for them not to be.</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Qi Siang: Freedom of Information provision, re: all 'secret' documents will eventually be declassified at a certain date.</li> <li>○ Resolution: Qi Siang will help Isabel with putting this together.</li> <li>○ Dave: what do we do with minutes of committee meetings? Government presently only publishes general meeting minutes, not committee meetings (status quo) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Anandita: This committee needn't decide on committee minutes, that can be left to the govt.</li> <li>■ Tee: 4 kinds of meetings.</li> <li>■ Matthew: we should change from 'secret' to 'closed-door, without meetings published'.</li> <li>■ Under special circumstances, closed door meetings need not publish minutes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What information should be published? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Avery: it occurred, date, and time.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OR: nothing at all, publish everything at a later date.</li> <li>■ How long is the 'later date'? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sara: these types of meetings generally involve somebody outside of government meeting with the government. What if the date can be decided between the two parties?</li> <li>● Tee: wiggle room clause.</li> <li>● Decision made on when to declassify the document cannot be made without knowing the contents of the meeting.</li> <li>● Tee: we can set a minimum date, which can be extended by the government.</li> <li>● Matthew: governments have to declare that a document exists before it is declassified?</li> <li>● Matt: It's ok for the student body to be suspicious of closed door meetings - they have a reason to be.</li> <li>● Tee: this is more controlling what the government can do, to prevent for e.g. every meeting being a secret meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We can allow judiciary to decide. They can be the ones who set the date, and approve when the minutes are released.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Sara: what if it's released at the end of the government's term?</li> <li>● Avery: issue of confidentiality agreement. Are govt members bound by confidentiality once their terms end? Matt, Adilla; yes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jay: first government never got sworn in by somebody, so we should consider adopting this for the next government.</li> <li>● Dave: what if the judiciary leaks? Avery: code of conduct applies to entire government, not just the council.</li> <li>● Tee: practically speaking, we don't really have anything to prevent someone from leaking something. Unless we want to make the constitution a legally binding document, we have no power to compel people to follow them. How should we get around this? get people to commit to observing the CoC. We don't have the punitive aspect.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Voting procedure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tee: Right now, we use %. Consider whether a change is needed. Simple majority? % of %?</li> <li>○ Quorum, and then votes. Currently, quorum is %, and vote to pass is % of that number.</li> <li>○ Acclaim to retain % system.</li> <li>○ Swarnima: why is the number different from the ratification process? What's the principle? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Anandita: greater legitimacy.</li> <li>■ Matthew: these are formal decisions which affect the student body immediately once they're voted on, so you may want a higher threshold within the student government. But then again, he would be ok with a simple majority.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ If there's no principle, just make it a consistent number.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

- Matthew: first, we should consider how voting not in person (in absentia) affects the quorum.
- Tee: also consider whether there are key people who must be in attendance for a meeting's votes to hold weight. e.g. in SG Parliament, now the mace must be present for the meeting to have order. Mace as a proxy for the President.
- Sara: consider P/VP/both for the meeting's vote to be legitimate.
- Jay: doesn't this assume that the executive > legislature?
  - this is still a very pending question.
  - Does president/director **execute** the vision or do they lead the council to **create** the vision?
  - Tee, Sara: We're not using this separation. Currently, president just has veto because he's the one who was first voted in.
  - Dave: if there's no president, there's no presiding officer/convenor.
- Jay: consider whether the president should not be convening the meeting.
  - When you're convening the meeting, you must be impartial. If the president has a substantive veto, they can't also be impartial. You don't want the convenor to have a substantive view on either side.
  - Select someone, who is not the president, to be the convenor and give up their voting rights for the entire term. Basically, a Speaker of the House in the UK model. You renounce your party affiliation, and you are obligated just to manage all of the procedures. You only vote when there's a tie to be broken, where you must always vote to maintain the status quo.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Jay: this Speaker model addresses the issue of the President's veto.</li> <li>■ Anandita: even if we shift the powers to a Speaker, the president would still have the right to call for meetings, right? doesn't this imply the president still has to be there?</li> <li>■ Tee: the president has a higher authority at every meeting, even if the procedural authority goes to the Speaker.</li> <li>■ Dave: also depends on the spirit of what the president should be. President-convenor: role of setting the agenda, directing the meeting. Non-convenor president: this role isn't done by the president.</li> <li>■ Jay: Agenda-setting in legislatures is often not done top-down, it's actually done bottom-up. In both the US and UK, there is a specific time given to members who are not in a leadership position to put forward agenda items. So at the beginning of a term, we're going to allot X amount of the time to A, B, C etc. Just putting that out there as an alternative.</li> <li>■ Tee: devil's advocate to look through the constitution document so far and make other recommendations based on what has been discussed prior.</li> <li>■ Dave: you can also consider making it the President's duty to make the agenda he has prepared public, for people to have input.</li> <li>■ Sara: there can also be some hard-provisions, eg there must always be 10 mins of AOB etc.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Tee: are we settled on the agenda issue? Jay: can we push this discussion later, especially re: legislative/executive separation.</li> <li>■ Most of us have already decided that the executive will have greater emphasis. President sets the vision, etc.</li> <li>■ Jay: president can have veto, but that doesn't mean the council can't have a substantive impact.</li> <li>■ Anandita: we have a mixed executive/legislature system.</li> <li>■ Jay: that makes sense.</li> <li>■ Matt: at the moment, we've given 0 special powers to the directorships beyond what they have already been provided.</li> <li>■ Avery: if we format the 'open meetings' in a way that other members of legislature can bring up points, others can speak as well.</li> <li>■ Matt: couldn't the convening power be divested to the rest of the council? Presiding vs convening power. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Presiding: ceremonial role to run meeting.</li> <li>● Convening power: present items to be discussed in the meeting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Dave: any good president would allow lower members of govt to bring things up on the agenda. At the same time, it's possible for a pres to ignore that under the const right now. So we can try to resolve this by giving president certain specific duties, etc.</li> <li>■ Qi Siang: a good check on the president is a vote of no-confidence. If the members feel unrepresented, they can take this option.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--



- Qi Siang: there's a problem with giving the whole council convening power. It's too diffuse, harder to ensure that issues that need to be discussed will be discussed.
- Jay: there's a mindset difference between the president models right now.
- Tee: we can take Jay's point on its principle, but we will discuss it further. As long as you account for one with other supporting articles, it should be fine.
- Jay: article 3 sec 2 clause 1 contradicts article 4 sec 1 clause 1. legislative/primary governing branch vs executive/legislative.
- Tee: are we decided on 50% and 2/3? Or 2/3 and 50%?
  - 50% quorum and 2/3 means that 7 members can make decisions.
  - Tee: but attendance is a requirement, so it's clear that >50% quorum will almost certainly be the case. It functionally isn't that difficult.
  - Absence means abstention, right? Dave: slight differences.
  - Feroz: online votes, counting to quorum?
  - Jay: 2/3 only comes into play when the motion is at least somewhat contentious.
  - So... 2/3 quorum, or 50% quorum?
    - Pros/cons: 2/3 gives more legitimacy. more contentious decisions are harder to pass by small groups. 50% makes it easier to pass decisions and get things done.
  - Tee: let's vote on quorum.
    - 2/3: 2.
    - 50%: 7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Resolution: 50% quorum, of which ⅔ must agree for decision to be passed.</li> <li>● Virtual meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do we want virtual votes? Do we want them during the meeting, or within a time window?</li> <li>○ Sara: going back to earlier re: number of times to meet, we should specify that those meetings are <b>physical</b> meetings. If a member can't be present, there can be good reasons for them to be virtually present e.g. working at library.</li> <li>○ Tee: the person hasn't participated in the full extent of the meeting, hasn't heard all the sides of the meetings.</li> <li>○ Swarnima; minutes can be used to solve this.</li> <li>○ Anandita: the minutes are not the same thing as being present at the meeting itself.</li> <li>○ Matt: a lot of what we're trying to do is make a system with more integrity. That gels well with making people be present physically. It's more legitimate. We have enough members now that this can happen.</li> <li>○ Distinction: absent but reading minutes =/= absent but on skype.</li> <li>○ Qi Siang: we must stipulate what specifically re: skype.</li> <li>○ Isabel: audio should be the bare minimum.</li> <li>○ Dave: keep it fairly vague re: platforms (e.g. not specifically saying skype) when drafting.</li> <li>○ TEe: also, we are not allowing slack votes. We are not allowing votes without participation.</li> <li>○ Matt: in a full council meeting, how are we imagining that video conferencing works in the setting? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Is it going to be effective? How do you participate in video?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Matt: we have to have procedural rules re: how to incorporate online presence.</li> <li>■ Tee: we can stipulate what sort of visibility... but that seems silly.</li> <li>■ Tee: specifics of meeting dynamics are beyond our consideration, but we can stipulate principles.</li> <li>○ TEE: Are we done with meetings and voting? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Jay: all members shall have the right to be recognised/speak: do you want to give some members specifically privileged rights to speak more about some things? e.g. do you want to always give the director the ability to respond to something specifically related to their portfolio.</li> <li>■ RRO: precedence and recency. Who's spoken less + who spoke longest ago gets priority. It's extremely egalitarian, but we would have to put some regulation if we want some other model.</li> <li>■ Tee: Egalitarian is fine. Acclaim</li> <li>■ Jay: the duty of the presiding officer would include recognising people who could contribute to the conversation. e.g. customary to recognise (i.e. call on) the committee chair first, then this group, then that group, then back-benchers, etc etc.</li> <li>■ Jay: offers to write up the procedural rules for this part.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Dissolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee: When does government end? exactly 1 year? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tamara: margin of 2 weeks? e.g. for preparing succession reports, etc</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sara: shouldn't it just be whenever the new government takes over? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Tee: what happens if there's a problem re: elections, and the next government is unelectable?</li> <li>■ This would extend govt ad infinitum.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Tee goes washroom break. Matthew is now convenor.</li> <li>● Matt: What kind of transition period will there be? How much time left for election? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sara: there shouldn't be a specific date.</li> <li>○ Matt: consider dates of election. There are some stipulations for election.</li> <li>○ Dave: context re: current constitution -- very vague re: when govt is supposed to end. 'year' is undefined: academic year? calendar year? start of sem/end of sem? What if the next govt can't be elected? e.g. if not enough people run.</li> <li>○ Matt: our lack of constituencies means it's unlikely that not enough people run.</li> <li>○ Jay: it takes effect the moment it's ratified, and the old government is in charge of managing the transition. If this committee says election in Dec, govt must respect this.</li> <li>○ If expiry date is not changed, then early next sem there will be 4 government members abroad.</li> <li>○ Jay: government will officially be the govt until the next gov, but it will functionally do nothing but the transition. Bound by the structures of the old constitution, but procedures of the new constitution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Campaign periods? Election times?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>{Tee returns.}</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ According to new const: the elections committee shall publicise info by the end of Nov.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Jay: we don't have to let the elections committee decide.</li> <li>■ Tee: all this is elections discussion. let's focus on dissolution.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Tee: so, the date is whenever the next gov is elected. If gov is not elected, what's gonna happen? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We have a transition article that's supposed to state that. There was an appendix for the transition, right? What's the recurring transition? There should be a transition section.</li> <li>○ Sara: it should stipulate how long between election and swearing-in, and how the old gov-new gov transition happens in terms of timing.</li> <li>○ Dissolution: not just failed election, but potentially also full impeachment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Dissolution. What other reasons for gov to dissolve? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Qi Siang: school closes.</li> <li>○ Mass resignation of more than half of gov? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Matt: but why not just have a huge by-election?</li> <li>■ Dave: mass resignation re: signaling no confidence, need to change the entire government.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 50% petition of student body calling for dissolution.</li> <li>○ Matt: there may be a way to resolve this through by-elections and no confidence votes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ By election solves people resigning for non-government reason.</li> <li>■ If resigning for govt reasons, then you need a no-confidence vote in the President. Would this take care of the problem?</li> <li>■ Anandita: what if the no confidence is in all of the government, not the president?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

- Matt: 3 scenarios. 1 by election, 2 no confidence in entire government, 3 no confidence in President.
- Tee: what happens if the vote of no confidence is passed by gov?
- Avery: for no confidence in gov, it goes to trial by judiciary. Qi Siang: why?
  - The only thing we should have is that the president is obliged to resign his position if there's a no confidence vote in the President.
  - Avery: status quo is re: impeachment hearing. Tee: highlight this, we'll go over it later.
- So, is mass resignation dissolution? Or does it call for a by election?
  - Avery: mass resignation that has been a result of no confidence in govt.
  - Qi Siang: what's the threshold for no confidence? Avery: for president, it's 50% for impeachment hearing.
  - Matt: we can replace mass resignation with vote of no confidence, it accomplishes the same thing.
- Qi Siang: if the majority of gov is overseas due to a trip for e.g., what happens? eg mass incapacitation, plane crash otw back from Yale or something.
  - Avery: emergency powers?
  - Tee: call for by-election.
  - Qi Siang: you can have a by election where new members come in and vote no-confidence.
  - What would happen? Avery: we can leave it out, they'll figure it out if half the government should die.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Jay: in such a big case, it would go back to the student body anyway.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Should the constitution prepare the government for these scenarios? Not needed. WOULD go back to students in the end, either way.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Transition. New government is main acting body. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tee: what if a new government is not elected?</li> <li>○ Jay: If the government is failed to be elected, the elections committee takes charge and comes up with a system to make a government exist</li> <li>○ Concern with having an election committee in power is that they are not elected.</li> <li>○ Avery: It's not that you don't have any government, you have judiciary. In this case, Structure of old government will remain, but procedures of new government will take over.</li> <li>○ Sara: Perhaps elections committee nominates people they see suitable</li> <li>○ Qi Siang: In this situation the student government has forfeited its right to choice?</li> <li>○ Tee: Other solution, extend old government and try again. If this fails again, then the whole process fails.</li> <li>○ Sara: When does this apply?</li> <li>○ Qi Siang: The government can only take place if they are able to fulfill a minimum of 9 positions.</li> <li>○ Matthew: What powers does the elections committee have during the transition period. We have to decide now what they will be able to decide on their own and what can we prescribe for them. We can't stipulate everything.</li> <li>○ Swaramina: If there is something that we cannot now foresee, than we trust that they will handle the situation well.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tee: The government must have a minimum of 9 people. 9 members up to 23 members is fine. This doesn't solve the problem of legitimacy for the government, because if you can't fill all the spots, this means that no one ran contested– this doesn't show the faith of the student body.</li> <li>○ Qi Siang: Have a minimum number of votes to make your candidacy legitimate?</li> <li>○ Matthew: There is this underlying assumption that uncontested seats are undemocratic, but on the other hand, the problems that you get if you have all these other thresholds is much more complicated and worse than if you have a government that just stood up.</li> <li>○ Avery: We say, it should be 23, but if it's fewer than that it's still legitimate, so long as it's greater than 9.</li> <li>● Back to what happens if you can't form a government? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Old government is incumbent: period between elections and government take over. As was said earlier, extend old government and try again. If this fails again, then the whole process fails.</li> <li>○ Avery: By the end of February, we either have a government or an anarchy.</li> <li>○ Matthew: If the old government cannot convene a new government, the election committee takes charge and has the power to start anew to get a government in place.</li> <li>○ Tee: Logistic officer officially handles the information transfer between student governments. Anything else that we foresee that will need to be transferred? Just logistics and knowledge transfer.</li> <li>○ Sara: What happens if all goes swimmingly? All 23 positions are elected.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tee: Incumbent period will be 2 weeks. Everyone agrees. Portfolios pass down portfolios.</li> <li>● 15 minute break. 3:25pm - 3:40pm</li> <li>● Definitions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tee: Should we define more clearly what is a “key term”?. Consensus is no. Anything in the constitution is more or less binding.</li> <li>○ Definitions will be in alphabetical order</li> <li>○ “Conflict of interest” definition does not work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Jay: you need to say what is a conflict of interest. it is when a person themselves is also involved in a decision the government is making. Recommends that if you, or significant other, is on exco of student orgs involved, you must disclose.</li> <li>■ Sara: you don’t have to disclose the details of the conflict, just declare that you have it.</li> <li>■ Jay changed definition. Everyone agrees with new definition.</li> <li>■ From this arose, that “in government capacity” must be defined.</li> <li>■ Jay: you can never, in a conflict of interest clause, account for every possible situation</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ “controlled for demographics” definition seems sufficient <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ question: should there be somewhere in the constitution that makes specific rules regarding minorities</li> <li>■ Anandita: In a school as small as ours there is no need to account for minorities because they will not fall through cracks.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Matthew: the government, and its structure, should ensure that there is no structural discrimination from the government on minorities.</li> <li>■ Jay: you get into a really sticky situation if you try and explicitly touch race and minorities. These are community concerns, not something that constitution must account for. Science students, for example, are a minority. At what point do you decide something should be special?</li> <li>■ Tee: Should the government be concerned with defining what a minority means?</li> <li>■ Committee agrees that “minority” should not be defined in the constitution.</li> <li>○ “Administration” , lots of definition pulled from Yale-NUS careers page definition of administration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ added: “a person or body of people”</li> <li>■ Definition made more specific by the inclusion of specific offices: DoS, DoF, Admissions, Rector’s Offices, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ “Assembly” definition was passed over to be looked at later.</li> <li>○ “Constitution” definition is sufficient</li> <li>○ “Direct democracy” was removed from lists of definitions as it is a relic term from the old government</li> <li>○ “Assembly” changed to “General Assembly”. First definition drafted: “assembly of students organised by the Government or initiated by the student body for purpose of gaining feedback from students...” – definition will be polished later</li> <li>○ “Government capacity” was decided to be unnecessary because the term is self-explanatory</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “General Assembly” definition changed to “Public event held by the government to gather student feedback in a manner that facilitates mass participation”</li> <li>○ “Impeachment” definition changed to “Refers to forced removal from a position, with its related duties and powers.”</li> <li>○ “Involuntary circumstances” defined as “Refers to situations and contexts where an individual does not have control over their situation. A lack of capacity by the individual to control or change their current situation. This includes but is not limited to:...”</li> <li>○ “Faculty” defined as “Refers to personnel hired by Yale-NUS College who teach students and/or perform research affiliated with the college.”</li> <li>○ “Majority” definition removed</li> <li>○ “Participation (in a meeting)” defined as “Presence and contribution either physical or virtual (through audio or video media), in a meeting.</li> <li>○ “Quorum” defined as “The minimum number of members of a body that must be present at any of its meetings to make the voted-upon decisions of that meeting valid”</li> <li>○ “Representative” definition removed</li> <li>○ “RCAC” defined as “Bodies of students recognized by the Rector’s Offices who serve to assist the Rectors in the activities of their respective residential colleges.</li> <li>○ “Retirement” changed to “Resignation”. Defined as “the voluntary relinquishment of representatives’ position, and its accompanying duties and powers.”</li> <li>○ “Serious Illness” definition is sufficient</li> <li>○ “Signature” definition left as Jay works on it</li> <li>○ “Simple majority” definition removed</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Staff” removed as it is never referenced in the constitution</li> <li>○ “Student body, students, matriculated students” defined as “Refers to all individuals currently enrolled full-time at Yale-NUS College. This includes people who are not physically present on campus but excludes exchange students of other academic institutions.”</li> <li>○ “Signature” defined by Jay, see Article X document.</li> <li>○ “Abstention” definition is sufficient</li> <li>○ “Yale-NUS College” defined as “The autonomous liberal arts residential college for undergraduates within the National University of Singapore (NUS) founded by Yale University and NUS located in Singapore.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Qi Siang: We need to distinguish ourselves from Yale and NUS</li> <li>■ Tee: Add in ‘in Singapore’ in the definition of “Yale-NUS College”</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ “Student Government”, sometimes referred to as ‘Government’, defined as “The body, also referred to as the Government, which comprises the Student Council and the Judiciary”</li> <li>○ “Student Organization” defined as “Any body of students who are recognized by the Student Government as having fulfilled the requirements to receive budgeting.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Main issue on the definition of student organizations is based on whether funding is given from the student government</li> <li>■ Tee: If there are student groups that apply for funding for events from the Rector’s Office, what are the implications of that?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The definition laid out in the Yale-NUS Dean of Students' Office Website page (<a href="http://studentlife.yale-nus.edu.sg/student-organisations/new-student-organisations/">http://studentlife.yale-nus.edu.sg/student-organisations/new-student-organisations/</a>) will not hold weight after the constitution is ratified.</li> <li>○ “Meeting” is not needed to be defined, as meetings can be defined based on the circumstances</li> <li>○ “Executive Sessions” defined in Article 1, Section 3</li> <li>○ “Standing and Select Committees” defined as</li> <li>○ “Portfolios” defined as “a specific realm of government headed by a Director who oversees the duties in that respective realm”</li> <li>○ “Agenda” is not needed to be defined</li> <li>○ “Veto” is defined as “A power accorded to the President for the unilateral rejection of a motion passed by the Student Council. This power is separate from the President’s vote as a member of the Council.”</li> <li>○ “Duty, Power, Responsibility” is not needed to be defined anymore as these words have been removed from the constitution</li> <li>○ “Records/archives” defined as</li> <li>○ “Public Representative” defined as “A member of the student body that is not also a member of Government, participating in standing or select committees.”</li> <li>○ “Randomly Chosen” is not needed to be defined.</li> <li>○ “Petition” defined as “A motion initiated by any member of the student body to enact or overturn Government action.”</li> <li>○ “By-laws” definition will be defined at a later date, during the crafting of the by-laws.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Unconstitutional” defined as “Not in accordance with the Constitution or with procedural rules.”</li> <li>○ “Amendment” defined as “A change to the Constitution that has been passed by the Council or ratified by the student body.”</li> <li>○ “Ratification” defined as “The process of giving formal consent to “The process through which the student body gives formal consent to the effecting of the Constitution or part thereof, thereby making it officially valid.”</li> <li>○ “Motion” is not needed to be defined as it is not used in a specific context, but generally.</li> <li>○ “Electoral Term” defined as “A period of time during which a Government with the authority of the Constitution holds office.”</li> <li>○ “Elections” is not needed to be defined as it is not used in a specific context, but generally.</li> <li>○ “Student Council” defined as “The body, also referred to as the Council, which comprises elected members of the student body, who, empowered by the Constitution, act as their representatives and protect their interests.”</li> </ul>	
By-Laws and Transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tee: why do we have to have a specific end-date for government? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matthew: It will never end because the current constitution does not specify an end date</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Tee: Power vacuum that will arise when constitution runs its course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matthew: When do the provisions of the current constitution go defunct and which one, and when do the provisions of the new constitution kick in and which one? By-law because it is external to both constitutions</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Tee: Bring into force Article 7 when .. (?)</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sara: Old government should help and assist new government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tee: Old government does not have a logistics director</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Tee: The stipulation that the old government needs to mentor the new government does not apply to the old government because they are under the old government. Therefore the by-laws need to be passed twice.</li> <li>- The passing is just a formal agreement to enact it if it passes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sara: What happens if we vote to keep the old constitution?</li> <li>- Matthew: The student government can pass the by-laws, or the by-laws could be put as an appendix to the new constitution. By-laws should technically not be set with a constitution.</li> <li>- Jay: Government can pass by-laws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matthew: What was wrong with the previous by-laws by the ESC?</li> <li>- Tee: Was added at the last minute and not considered enough. Also set after ratification.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- Swarnima: Are we going to refer to something to explain ourselves when people ask why we've proposed certain amendments? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tee: Rationale doc, or direct them to me</li> <li>- Jay: Working on two documents, one to explain the features of the new constitution that are significant in relation to old constitution, the other is by clause. People who will really have problems will wait a few days before reacting</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Passing of information will include minutes</li> <li>- Anandita: Some Constitution Review members to be tasked with explaining? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tee: Mainly me</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Added " If this constitution is ratified, any member of the newly-formed student government member can approach any</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>member of the constitution review committee for any clarification on the constitution. The guidance given by the committee is not a binding interpretation of the constitution but serves as a useful aid ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Oath a by-law? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jay: not necessarily. Could be that or into the preamble of the constitution</li> <li>- QS: Should not go in the preamble.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- QS: Two schedules in mind: First is for oaths and second is for amendments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avery: Petition does not have to be in the constitution</li> <li>- Tamara: Should be separate</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Oath is for swearing-in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matthew, QS and Adila to form the oath</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Avery motions to consider Article 2 (Duties and powers of council) as part of Article 4 (council)</li> <li>- Article 1 (Matthew and QS)</li> <li>- Article 3 well-formed, other than Jay comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Should drafters handle the comments or should we do it as a body?</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Article 6, Judiciary</li> <li>- Article 8 and 9 seem done <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avery: in 9, impeachment hearing procedures to be worked on</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Jay: Why do we have any sort of impeachment of judiciary members? If they are randomly selected, they have no obligations. What could</li> </ul>	
--	---	--



	<p>give cause for impeachment? Necessary to be able to impeach, but we should consider what they can be impeached for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Article X seems alright</li> <li>- Appeals committee not put in anywhere (Sara)</li> <li>- Procedures need to be tidied up (Isabel)</li> <li>- Avery: Issue with selection of directors.</li> <li>- Jay: Section 3 needs to be clearer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Any member of public can suggest an agenda item</li> <li>- All agenda items put forth by a council member must be considered</li> <li>- Jay: Two types of agenda (meeting and government). Anyone can add to meeting agenda, president drives the agenda and actively adds to it. Who is in charge of the government agenda? How is the agenda formed (i.e. define process)</li> <li>- Tee: President must consider input of members of council</li> <li>- Tee: For regular meetings, President has duty to include suggested agenda items.</li> <li>- Matthew: One way to separate the two agendas is to have a speaker of the house figure, whose role is to only set the agenda and moderate discourse of meetings (i.e. convenor)</li> <li>- Jay: This speaker of the house figure usually votes no. If you created that role, you won't have to add another separate role to government.</li> <li>- Avery: A neutral convenor who sets the daily agenda will call for council meetings.</li> <li>- Matthew: What's the advantage of the president doing that instead of the convenor</li> <li>- Matthew: Having a convenor removes ability of president to promote her or his own agenda</li> <li>- QS: Internal check and balance</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jay: Speaker role should not do anything else</li> <li>- Matthew: If the speaker is appointed by president, the neutrality of this person could be compromised. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sara: What if all council meetings were allowed to be called by anyone?</li> <li>- Tee: Why doesn't the VP do the convening? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jay and QS: Powers of VP are all delegated by President</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- Tee: What happens when speaker is not present? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sara: This is why Director of Logistics should be the speaker, because the 2nd in command would be able to stand in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What if the agenda point of the meeting is logistical?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- Matthew: One other option is to allow a speaker to appoint a deputy.</li> <li>- Jay: Speaker elected, speaker selects a deputy from within the government. Speaker can also be booted out of the role but the threshold is high as there has to be a direct challenger for the role. This role should be the only one not appointed by the president.</li> <li>- Matthew: Entire agenda goes through and is streamlined by the speaker, who also manages decorum and etc.</li> <li>- QS: Mediation function in addition to the above</li> <li>- Jay: requires a lot of thought and skill, ability to manage the agenda</li> <li>- Anandita: Feel like we are wasting one public representative just to work for the government and not the student body</li> <li>- Daniel: Could have a non-elected person to be the speaker</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sara: What if a judiciary member was put as speaker of the house? They have a vested interest in making sure it's balanced and includes the voices of the students. No legislative agenda also.</li> <li>- Matthew; Important to maintain speaker's role as legislative. need to know intimately how chamber works, and needs to mediate between two or more sides who may have competing agendas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Daniel: No legislative powers does not mean inability to understand how the chamber works.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Avery: Having it to be a member of judiciary fits because they have something to do in meetings and are far from the President <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tee; Judiciary separate in the sense that she should not participate but be a scrutiniser.</li> <li>- QS: Judiciary serving as speaker affects their ability to work without fear or favour as judiciary</li> </ul> </li> <li>- 4 options for speaker: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Speaker as member of judiciary, 4</li> <li>- speaker as the logistics director, 0</li> <li>- speaker as member of council that is voted in by council at start, 7</li> <li>- completely different public representative, 1</li> <li>- Tee and Devil's Advocate abstaining</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Jay: Does not think role wastes a member of student government.</li> <li>- Daniel: This person as someone who initiates meetings or more of a mediator and facilitator?</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Jay: More of the first but has functions of the second. This is because you want to have the body be ran internally in a way that cause it to be self-focused on its goal.</li> <li>- QS: Do not actually lose one member, because there are the other 24 members</li> <li>- Speaker selects her deputy, if necessary</li> <li>- Jay: Even if speaker temporarily rescinds the role to a deputy, they should not be part of the debate.</li> </ul> <p>-break, ended at 8.41pm-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avery: Right now we have president choosing directors. Options now are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- President chooses based on what they want</li> <li>- Rank</li> <li>- Meritocracy test</li> <li>- Chooses and then ratified by council</li> <li>- President and VP must agree</li> <li>- Council votes on positions within itself</li> <li>- Council debates on positions and votes</li> <li>- Students to vote</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Tee: Speakers to be appointed first; takes away voting power and speaker might need to mediate for subsequent voting</li> <li>- Daniel: regarding having directors be members of legislative assembly, thinks there will be a divide between executive and legislative. Also may not be feasible. Should also allow student government to open as many positions as they want. Basically, directorships should not be members of legislation.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AVery: Merged because we are still a small college, didn't want anything to be lost between two bodies. Also, worried that there may not even be enough people running for government.</li> <li>- Sara: All directors and deputies are currently set as executives.</li> <li>- QS: Thinks there is added benefit because they make the executives accountable to the legislature</li> <li>- Daniel: Could still have president be briefed by directors and then report back to legislative assembly.</li> <li>- Tamara: Motions to move forward</li> <li>- Tee: Daniel should write out this proposed amendment because it is complex</li> <li>- Matthew, regarding AVery's suggestions: Is every member of legislature going to be involved in some way, and how will it affect the way they are chosen? We actually strengthen the system if we allow the body to vote for the directors instead of having president appoint them.</li> <li>- Daniel: Current way of choosing directors allows for a lot of corruption</li> <li>- Avery: After electing council and president, vote on positions? -rest: no</li> <li>- Avery: Council votes and president ultimate choice, and president chooses and council ratifies?</li> <li>- Anandita: Voting will be very complex within the council</li> <li>- Sara: Second option better because it takes into account that the president would have an informed view of the whole body and could then choose who would be best suited.</li> <li>- Avery: Council voting on positions is a good idea, but doesn't give the flexibility for a co-director, or to create a new director role if that is necessary. Would favour president chooses based on rank or council chooses and president has ultimate decision.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Anandita: President should be final decider of portfolios. Some will be popular and some will not be.</li> <li>- Sara: Having someone overseeing the process of sorting portfolios based on abilities and preferences would be good</li> <li>- Matthew: A system with no backbenchers: no opposition, no one in government co-opted by president to carry out agenda.</li> <li>- Avery: If everyone is a director, no one is.</li> <li>- Sara: How would co-directors provide opposition. There would be unclear roles?</li> <li>- Matt: The backbenchers only play a role in the legislature.</li> <li>- Daniel: Why can the meritocracy method not even be considered an option?</li> <li>- Tee: I suggest we look at the options: options are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1. President chooses based on nothing</li> <li>- 2. President chooses based on requests/ranked preferences/formal application from Council members</li> <li>- 3. President chooses based on meritocracy tests</li> <li>- 4. President chooses, and then roles are ratified by a 2/3 vote of the Council*</li> <li>- 5. President chooses, roles ratified by a 2/3 vote of the student body</li> <li>- 6. President and VP must agree based on requests</li> <li>- 7. Council votes on positions within itself</li> <li>- 8. Council debates on positions, votes on recommendation to the President. President still has the ultimate choice, but is required to hear the Council's opinion and heavily consider the Council's vote. (Threat: vote of no confidence)*</li> </ul> </li> <li>- VOTE (based on numbers). Convener, Devil's Advocate both abstain. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1. no votes</li> <li>- 2. seven votes</li> <li>- 3. no votes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4. six votes</li> <li>- 5. no votes</li> <li>- 6. one vote</li> <li>- 7. three votes</li> <li>- 8. five votes</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tee: We will vote again on options 2, 4, 8</li> <li>- Avery: It would be clumsy if there is a ratification process.</li> <li>- Anandita: Preferences aren't binding, so the President is not liable to go by my preference, so ratification is important.</li> <li>- Jay: I do not think option 2 has to be preferences - President can also decide on merits of people applying. 2 vs 4 - President and then legislature, and then council is created and legislature chooses president. Option 8 is the opposite direction. What kind of culture do you want to create? Top-down, council says something and president makes changes, or council and president work together. The last option can be framed as the other way around: Council has the ultimate choice.</li> <li>- Avery: Option 4 is the converse of 8.</li> <li>- Jay: I read it differently phrasing-wise. Is the intention of 4 to have the president have a list and then council ratifies?</li> <li>- Avery: President makes a list and council ratifies.</li> <li>- Qi Siang: President knows himself best, and should be able to form his own team. Otherwise, the team may not be suited to his OR HER direction.</li> <li>- Avery: Proposes option 9: "President chooses based on formal application submitted by council members, and then the council ratifies it).</li> <li>- Tee calls for a revote with new options.</li> <li>- Jay: Qi Siang makes an interesting point of having president doing it independently. Is there a recall for directorship?</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avery: President can.</li> <li>- Jay: So if you want to induce another check in the process, you can have legislature also boot.</li> <li>- CALLING FOR A REVOTE</li> <li>- 2. President chooses based on requests/ranked preferences/formal application from Council members</li> <li>- 4. President chooses, and then roles are ratified by a 2/3 vote of the Council*</li> <li>- 6. President and VP must agree based on requests</li> <li>- 7. Council votes on positions within itself</li> <li>- 8. Council debates on positions, votes on recommendation to the President. President still has the ultimate choice, but is required to hear the Council's opinion and heavily consider the Council's vote. (Threat: vote of no confidence)*</li> <li>- 9. President chooses based on formal application submitted by council members, and then the council ratifies it). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2. eight votes</li> <li>- 4. seven votes</li> <li>- 6. no votes</li> <li>- 7. no votes</li> <li>- 8. four votes</li> <li>- 9. seven votes</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Qi Siang: Motion to only be able to vote once.</li> <li>- REVOTE (WITH JUST ONE VOTE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2. two votes</li> <li>- 4. one vote</li> <li>- 9. six votes</li> </ul> </li> <li>- REVOTE (WITHOUT 4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2. one vote</li> <li>- 9. eight votes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tee: What are the implications on the article? Who will get to recall directorships?</li> <li>- Jay: This isn't booting them out, but just changing their title.</li> <li>- Tee: Ten minutes on comments on the meritocracy method.</li> <li>- Tee: Because we are a new college, experimenting with new forms of governments is exciting. However, a lot of people already come in with an idea of what governments should be like. People make governments in the way that they are used to. While I think it is good to adopt a meritocracy method to fit into the elections, people might still not understand it.</li> <li>- Tamara: It is very difficult to standardize what you place merit on. I feel like it is not a proper method for student government, as there are different opinions of what makes someone suitable.</li> <li>- Qi Siang: People are already used to the democratic method, so there may be a reluctance to change. Leadership is not just about what you do well, but can also be about other things (charisma, etc).</li> <li>- Daniel: Directors are not necessarily leaders, but rather gears in the machine. I just find it disappointing that people do not want to try new things.</li> <li>- Swarnima: There is no fixed gauge of how to "judge" people. What are the qualities? What would meritocracy look like? How would you even judge those are the right qualities? It's so subjective.</li> <li>- Tee: I see the positive in this, people with charisma may stop coming to government meetings in the second semester. So there is merit to electing someone who is very good at what they do.</li> <li>- Sara: It is a great ideal, but it is too idealistic. I think there is an element of bias/popularity. In terms of efficiency, the element of bias is not eliminated from that. An election is the most efficient way to get a government. It may be difficult to implement it in real life.</li> </ul> <p>Implications of the vote</p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matthew: What happens to the appointing directors/co-directors? I feel like there should be some sort of limit. Otherwise, everyone's job is tied to directorship. So imagine if every directorship has a co-director.</li> <li>- Tee: It seems odd that if the council ratifies the directorships, but then the President can rearrange as they see fit.</li> <li>- Avery: What if someone resigns, or you could say that president can rearrange with ratification.</li> <li>- Tee: We have to change the word "ratification." Should we have limits, and what is the limit? If the council is ratifying, then the council has power to limit.</li> <li>- Matthew: How, if at all, will we account for opposition in the chamber? How do we allow for a dissenting voice on something? At the moment, we have no mechanism to allow for that. There is value in allowing people to take a principled stance.</li> <li>- Jay: We do not have an opposition now.</li> <li>- Matthew: If everyone is in a directorship, who is in the council?</li> <li>- Sara: How does having a directorship role mean you don't have opposition?</li> <li>- Matthew: In a directorship role, you're implementing the agenda. If you are implementing the agenda, but also arguing against the agenda, isn't this a problem?</li> <li>- Tee: So what do you suggest practically?</li> <li>- Matthew: I'm not sure on this myself, and have not come to a proposal that I'm satisfied with. The options I preferred the most is having the council elect the directors. I think we should facilitate effective opposition within the chamber. Having some degree of a backbench would be good.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sara: Even in this committee, there is a lot of disagreement. Even though we all worked together to do something, people will still disagree.</li> <li>- Jay: The gov/t will be very big though. The new government will act more like a legislature. Should it act like a large committee, or a small legislature?</li> <li>- Tee: At this point of writing the constitution, I need a specific, solid suggestion of something that needs to be voted on. Thus, I need something solid.</li> <li>- Sara: So are we putting something in about slate legislature (creation of political parties)?</li> <li>- Tee: We cannot have parties due to Singapore law.</li> <li>- Jay: I would say limit the number of directors. The goal is to have 23 people run, so you want to make it so that the director position is a select number of people, and you put a cap in the constitution.</li> <li>- Tee: Limit the number of directors by stipulating a numerical limit in the constitution.</li> <li>- Anandita: Cannot determine the exact number as we do not know the circumstances of the incoming student government, and we do not want to limit them with an arbitrary number</li> <li>- Sara: If we reduce the directorships, we reduce the way work is spread out (whether evenly or not) among the directors.</li> <li>- Matthew: Proposes that there should be 7 (co-directors/ deputy directors) and preserve 6 members of the political backbench as backup to the executive</li> <li>- Jay: The American University has a similar system as the model that Matthew proposes, and it works very well. But has a question on whether the 7 (co-directors/ deputy directors) mandatory?</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matthew: The 7 (co-directors/ deputy directors) can be allocated either to become political backbench and/or supporting the directors.</li> <li>- Jay: A potential objection is the lack of flexibility that would be imposed on the student government.</li> <li>- Tee: That's what constitutional amendments for.</li> <li>- Anandita: Does this system lead to a lack of backbenchers?</li> <li>- Matthew: The backbenchers can take on other roles that the Directors/ Co-directors cannot hold.</li> <li>- If there are not enough people to form a student government of 23, then the system prizes functionality of the student government and will drop-off backbenchers first.</li> <li>- Committee votes on the system that Matthew proposes: 9 For - 0 Against, 2 Abstentions: PASSES</li> <li>- Avery: Proposes the idea that the Judiciary will break the deadlock if the Council cannot decide how to allocate the directorships.</li> <li>- Jay: The Council will be 'locked in' until the Council decide on the allocation of Directorships - termed as a 'Sequester'</li> <li>- Committee votes on how the Council breaks the deadlock of the allocation of Directorships: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sequester: 8 For - 0 Against, 1 Abstain</li> <li>- Judiciary: 0 For - 9 Against</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Jay: Issue of veto - why is it only that Direct Democracy can overturn the veto</li> <li>- Committee votes on the % vote that the committee needs to take to overcome a presidential veto: 7 For - 0 Against, 3 Abstain</li> <li>- Issue of matters of confidentiality: If the Council is unable to reach a decision, the President will decide on it. If the President's decision is contested, the issue will be surfaced to the judiciary.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sara: If the student government is allocating the budget for student orgs, that is fine - but we do not have the training to advise the college on</li> <li>- Jay: If we do not place it within the constitution that the meta-budget issues are surfaced to the administration by the budget director, the student government might give the responsibility to someone who is not trained or elected to deal with such issues</li> <li>- Committee votes on whether the budget should address broad student concerns on college-level budgeting: 5 For - 1 Against, 5 Abstain</li> <li>- Deputy-directors can be appointed as head convener of committees, can directors be appointed too? Yes, it is stated in the constitution under the Directors' powers</li> <li>- Jay: The question w.r.t. non-standing committees, is there any problem with backbenchers creating their own committees with the approval of the government?</li> <li>- Committee votes on whether backbenchers can convene committees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can convene all committees: 1 For</li> <li>- Can only convene select, but not standing committees: 5 For - PASSES</li> <li>- Cannot convene any committees: 0 For</li> <li>- 5 Abstains</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Committee dissolves for a break at 10.58pm</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Article V, Judiciary</b></p>	<p>Section 4: judiciary-imposed penalties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tee notes that there is no capital punishment, no jailing, and no pecuniary penalties.</li> </ul> <p>Section 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avery asks where the quorum statement is written for the judiciary.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Anandita notes that you must clarify the meaning of “<math>\frac{2}{3}</math> majority.” <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> of the <b>total</b> members is 6, <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> of <b>present</b> members is potentially less.</li> <li>● Qi Siang notes that a simple majority is the common rule for most judicial systems.</li> <li>● Options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 50% Quorum, <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> majority</li> <li>○ <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> Quorum, 50% majority</li> <li>○ No quorum, <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> majority</li> <li>○ No quorum, 50% majority</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Avery suggests that 50% quorum and then a <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> majority. Qi Siang prefers a <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> quorum and a 50% majority.</li> <li>● Tee suggests that the entire judiciary should be present, because there are 9 people who are required to meet once a month.</li> <li>● <b>Consensus</b> that entire judiciary must be present, requires a <math>\frac{2}{3}</math> majority for vote.</li> <li>● Qi Siang asks about Rules of Procedure in the event of a Constitutional dispute. There is nothing in the Constitution that instructs the judiciary on how to adjudicate disputes.</li> <li>● Sara thinks that since judiciary meetings are open, it can invite witnesses. Adila agrees with Sara.</li> <li>● Qi Siang raises concerns that this is inconsistent with the impeachment process. Matthew likes the adversarial idea, but wonders if this role should be entrusted to students without legal experience.</li> <li>● Anandita prefers Sara’s suggestion of the flexible, open system. Jay argues in support of Qi Siang’s position because he believes that the adversarial system generates better analysis.</li> <li>● Matthew asks who should defend when someone brings forth a challenge.</li> <li>● Options:</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adversarial Method: with plaintiff and defendant. (2)</li> <li>○ Informal arbitration, judiciary gathers information and debates amongst themselves in a public meeting. May invite the disputing parties. (5)</li> <li>○ Abstentions: Tee, Jay, Isabel, Swarnima</li> <li>○ But Jay votes for Adversarial Method and Tee abstains, so the House is divided.</li> <li>● Revote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Adversarial method:</b> with plaintiff and defendant. (1)</li> <li>○ <b>Informal arbitration,</b> judiciary gathers information and debates amongst themselves in a public meeting. May invite the disputing parties. (2)</li> <li>○ <b>Open signup approach.</b> Judiciary will publish its cases prior to the meeting, and invested parties may sign up to defend any side. The judiciary reserves the right to determine who it wishes to hear. (7)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Article VII, Code of Conduct</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Question of whether government will be compelled by the student body's will, even in cases where the government believes it acts in the student's' interests.</li> <li>● Tee notes that the student body has alternative modes of recourse: direct democracy.</li> </ul> <p><b>OFFICIAL DISSOLUTION OF EXTRAORDINARY SUNDAY MEETING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Tee has decided that the meeting is officially dissolved as of 1208am.</b> But Tee has declared that he will stay on, and anyone who wishes to stay and redraft with him may opt to do so.</li> <li>● <b>Delegation of work.</b></li> </ul>	

- Article I: Matthew and Qi Siang  
Matthew asks what needs to be done for Article I.
- Article VI: Isabel  
Isabel says the Article is already cleaned up, and she just needs to know more about the algorithm.
- Article VII: Avery  
Avery notes that it is 90% complete.
- Article VIII: Avery
- Article IX: Isabel  
Isabel notes that it is mostly done. Only the last two sections are incomplete.
- Article X: Anandita notes it is done.
- Swarnima, Anandita, Avery are staying. Isabel is heading off.
- Splitting up of printing.
- Tee needs the appendix documents to be reviewed: the Rationale Document, the Convener's Note, and the Amendment form. **Sara** and **Tamara** will look through them. **Swarnima** will work on formatting.

**CONTINUATION OF MEETING**

- Discussing **ARTICLE VII: Code of Conduct, Section 2**
- Tee notes that although the government meetings must execute their duty, there is no injunction against them stating their personal beliefs.
- Matthew says that in theory an option under the existing framework does not satisfy the issue.
- Tee says that he sees no problem with relinquishing your specific appointment and going to the backbench but this should still be allowed for by the other members of the Council.
- Sara agrees with having the idea of opposition.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee says then what should the government do?</li> <li>● Matthew says that members can't start impeaching - suggests removal without replacement.</li> <li>● Sara: If something was that controversial, it would be controversial to more than one person and there would be support from those members of the student body.</li> <li>● Avery and Sara support removal without replacement.</li> <li>● Sara adds that since the judiciary is supposed to mitigate challenges between the government so they can just go to them.</li> <li>● President has some degree of control but not entirely.</li> <li>● Isaac (member of public): The member of government who disagrees with the position presents a paper to the President and the Council, if it still cannot be resolved it will be presented to the student body in an unbiased way which will be then voted on by Direct Democracy.</li> <li>● Isaac: If the decision infringes on the sovereign right of the individuals then the student body can decide on what grounds the decision should or should not be acted on.</li> <li>● Matthew: There will be an appeal to the general public but there would be no support from the Council itself. Working relationships are important, though.</li> <li>● Sara: Discuss if this is something that should involve the whole government.</li> <li>● Avery reiterates the process.</li> <li>● Tee, regarding the judiciary: can't judge on this matter because this is a moral, rather than a legal matter and they have no jurisdiction.</li> <li>● Tee suggests allows this to happen on any grounds (not just personal beliefs/morality/philosophical grounds) and the result just goes to the student body.</li> <li>● Matthew suggests that a structure (an affirmation or a negation) suggests a bias.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Isaac: suggests continuing to work for a month before handing in their resignation for such an issue.</li> <li>● Matthew to Isaac: vote yes to the decision or vote no to the status quo?</li> <li>● Matthew is in favour of public affirmation to sustain the person's objection - the positive is allowing the director agency to choose.</li> <li>● Tee votes the same way.</li> <li>● Matthew: There should be strong public support for a government member deciding to go against a decision they have decided on otherwise it erodes legitimacy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Section 5: Resignation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Avery redrafts the clause.</li> <li>● Matthew is uncomfortable about the release of private information of the government members.</li> <li>● Tee decides to <b>revisit the Resignation Clause.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Section 2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee: Any government member can start a petition so we can use that word.</li> <li>● Moving things to Procedures.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Confidentiality of conflict of interest:</li> <li>● Dave: Disclose what organisations you have a conflict of interest with, you don't have to say why. What's the point of having a conflict of interest if you don't even declare it?</li> <li>● Dave: the point of declaring all the conflicts of interest at the beginning of the semester.</li> <li>● Avery: What about publicising broad conflicts of interest and keeping the reasons private?</li> <li>● Dave and Matthew pretty much agree.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Vote by acclamation: publicise broad conflicts of interest and keep the reasons private.</b></li> <li>● tee: If something is public to the Council it is public to everyone.</li> </ul> <p><b>ARTICLE IX: Removal from Office and Resignation, Section 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Tee: Should we even have the President ‘approve’ absences?</li> <li>● Tee: Unaccepted absences for more than one-third of the meetings are unacceptable.</li> <li>● Tee: Who decides what ‘academic duress’ is? Judiciary, government?</li> <li>● Avery: This only becomes a problem when they’ve missed over one-third.</li> <li>● Tee: The impeachment process is handled by the judiciary.</li> <li>● Avery: if students want the judiciary to remove a member of government they can approach the judiciary. the president can do this on their own/of their own volition.</li> <li>● Dave: Members of the public might call a review even if they don’t want to remove a government member.</li> <li>● Tee: This seems to be very quick to jump to an Impeachment Hearing.</li> <li>● Tee’s suggestion: The grounds for the summoning of a government member to an Impeachment hearing: should be that the judiciary, after considering the actions of the government member , summons the member after reviewing the evidence.</li> <li>● Avery adds the power to review into the Roles part of the Constitution.</li> </ul> <p><b>Section 3: Impeachment of Council members</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Three votes of no confidence: Council against the Council, Council against the President, Student Body against the Council</li> <li>● Tee: What is a ‘vote of no confidence’?</li> <li>● Delete d.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Impeachment goes to judiciary as it requires the demonstration of some wrongdoing.</li> <li>● Vote of no confidence does not go to the judiciary and is more likely to come about as a result of the desire to refresh the government (not that someone has actually done anything wrong).</li> <li>● Dave: is it better to have a dissolution or ‘a vote of no confidence’?</li> <li>● Tee: Let’s include vote of no confidence in the removal from office article.</li> <li>● Tee: Do we even need the dissolution section?</li> <li>● Anandita: Yep. Because dissolution is different from removal from office. Dissolution is not a procedure.</li> <li>● Dissolution to be put after resignation instead of in the Procedures document.</li> <li>● For dissolution, we can put vote of no confidence in the entire Council.</li> <li>● Tee: no confidence in President should come under removal from office.</li> <li>● Avery: Doesn’t make sense to have dissolution and removal from office in the same section.</li> <li>● Anandita: We should define what a vote of no confidence in the definitions.</li> <li>● Define what a vote of no confidence means.</li> <li>●</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

Agenda for our next meeting:

-

Reminders/ Updates