Date: 9 Nov 2015   **Time**: 6.30PM-8.30PM   **Venue:** Saga Dining Hall Anteroom

Note-Taker: Bing   **Presiding Officer**: Feroz, Ami

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

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

Absent: Qis (sick), Feroz (left halfway due to Floorball friendly)

Agenda:
- Committee Debrief (50 minutes)
- Should we include faculty in mascot voting? (10 minutes)
- Revisiting issue of "no to government" vote (25 minutes)
- Government review of the Constitution and endorsement (tabled, constitution not ready at this point)
- Jay's Exhortation (10 minutes)

Summary: The student government met to consolidate updates across the different committees with issues ranging from course timetabling to constitutional amendments. The issue of faculty voting on mascot options was also discussed and student government will contact faculty with the link for them to vote. The meeting concluded with an exhortation for current government members who will not be abroad next semester to run again for the next government.

Agenda	Discussion Points	Action

Committee Debrief	**Committee Debrief**
	
	1. Academics
	    a. Timetabling
	        i. Professors were upset that students were requesting to change course times.
	        ii. Suggestion for Government to work with Registry to push out a survey of sorts to understand timetable clashes before the official time table is released
	            1. Maria: This is a tedious process. Not a problem of should we do it, but CAN we do it. Registry gives Head of Studies the timetable of classes for approval. Problem might be with Head of Studies not checking before approval.
	            2. Dave: Canvas opinion on level of satisfaction with current process because it's usually a case of want, than need.
	            3. Ami: Current system where students organically organise to change timings work.
	                a. Tee: Change of course for one person will have ramifications on others. Moreover, not everybody is on Facebook.
	                b. Feroz: Start a mailing list for students who are interested in a class so that all will be informed if there is a change in time.
	            4. Jay: Talk to Registry to find out future plans and if they are aware of the current problem.
	2. Community Living
	    a. Healthcare and Sexual Assault	

i. Jay and Yongzhi have been working on some questions for an online poll on UHC insurance and alternative insurance schemes.
   b. Library Door
      i. Door is still not working, Facilities made a mistake with programming. Only thing Government can do is to keep pressuring the administration to get it up and working.
   c. Alcohol Policy
      i. Can be revisited when the new Dean of Students joins.
      ii. ~45% of student body find the current policy too strict.
   d. Guest Policy
      i. Require guests to have contact of host at all times. However, guests still have to be accompanied by host at all times.
   e. Lift Posting Policy
      i. Free speech in lifts is part of a larger conversation. No conclusion.
3. Communications
   a. DoS says that the money for whiteboards for calendar should come out of Government's budget.
4. Constitution Review
   a. Was not able to complete constitution yesterday, but will aim to complete it by tonight.
   b. Final constitution will have 10 articles, 8 out of 10 articles have been completed.
   c. New role: Neutral convener and mediator during meetings. Picked by the Council not the President. Will only vote to break ties.
   d. Directorship appointments: Ratified by Council, President no longer has power to approve directorship.
   e. Veto of President checked by Council and Direct Democracy.

  f. Petition and Direct Democracy combined to form Student Opinion (10% for Government to consider, and 50% to pass through).

  g. Impeachment system will be adversarial. They will have to each present their case.

  h. Inserted vote of no confidence for Council to be dissolved and President to be removed (50% of student body).

  i. Oaths for swearing in for Council members.

  j. Need approval from current Government regarding the following by-law:

    i. The members of the outgoing government shall meet with the incoming government following the Council elections of Jan 2016, to transfer knowledge gained over the course of their term of service. Each member of the outgoing government shall meet with those members of the incoming government who possess similar roles and duties, if possible.

      1. For those who are abroad, we can organise skype meetings if necessary.

      2. In principle approval (9 votes, Qistina and Feroz absent)

  k. Minimum number to form the Council is 9.

  l. Public Comment Period will start on Tuesday

    i. Online and hardcopy form (distributed to each suite). Lunch tables and dinner tables rotated among members of the committee.

5. Events

  a. General Assembly next Monday, 7-8.30pm at TCT Lecture Theatre.

  b. Will be led by Tee, explaining the constitution, and there will be a Q&A section and then a public comment section.

6. Identity

  a. Identity Survey

| | | i. Suggestion to include Faculty in the vote for Mascot. Committee can work out logistics involved in this process.
ii. Iwani's comment on Facebook. Dave has spoken to Iwani to inform her about the checks and balances involved in the process.
iii. Have gotten about half the school to participate in the survey. Survey will go on for 2 more weeks.
  b. Inter-varsity
    i. Have not met with MMA.
    ii. Emailed James and Wain to meet to go through the report.
7. Student Organisations
  a. Sync up Student Orgs recognition processes before handing over to the new Government.
  b. PS We Care
    i. Recognised by DoS but not the Student Orgs Recognition Board.
  c. Athletics Report
    i. Arranging a meet-up with Rector McAdoo to clear it.
  d. Disputes within Student Organisations
    i. Meeting up with Andrew from DoS to figure out who should mediate conflicts. If Student Government, what are the practical implications for mediating?
  e. Arts Council
    i. Arts Council meeting this Friday.
    ii. Arts Council deciding to give more structure to meetings.
    iii. Feedback on studio rooms and its usage
      1. People don't know how to use the equipment or don't take care of equipment.
      2. Doors to these studios are unlocked and therefore hard to hold anyone accountable when there are damages.
      3. The need to come up with a system to fix these problems. | **Yongzhi** will find out what happened to doors of certain studios. |

| Should we include Faculty in mascot voting | ### Should we include Faculty in mascot voting?
 1. Suggested by Faculty. Brought up by Public Affairs as well.
 2. Arguments for:
   a. Creates a greater sense of community
   b. Mascot will also represent the Faculty
   c. Their input will lend it more weight with the Cabinet
 3. Arguments against:
   a. Logistics
   b. We are the Student Government and we should be focusing more on student opinion
   c. Some students might be upset with involving Faculty
   d. Faulty make up a substantive proportion and have rather skewed demographics
     i. Suggestion to give them a weightage, but we need to justify the weightage.
 4. Maria: Arguments against are invalid because 1) logistics can be resolved by us, 2) this mascot survey involves the wider YNC community
 5. **MOTION**: This house believes that we should include faculty, and only faculty, in addition to students, in the mascot voting process. (PASS)
   a. Yes: Jay, Maria, Bing, Ami, Zach
   b. Absent: Qis
   c. Abstain: Yongzhi, Feroz, Dave
   d. No: Jared, Tee
 6. How should we include the Faculty?
   a. Give them a link which is different from the student link
   b. Issue of recognition of identity of Faculty
     i. Use staff numbers
 7. Should we include Staff?
   a. Maria: We should not include Staff because they do not have a strong tie with the identity of the school compared to Professors. | |

	i. Zach: Nature of Professor positions is different from that of Staff. Staff positions are more transient. Decision to become a student or professor in Yale-NUS is defining of their lives. There are distinctions made between Faculty and Staff. Staff like Doris Sohmen-Pao are very few, and these members of staff will still have a say at the end of the process. b. Ami: Might differ depending on the type of Staff. For example, Doris Sohmen-Pao might have a greater stake in the mascot than other staff. c. Tee: Very hard to differentiate between types of Staff. Either open it to everyone in the community or keep it among students. i. Jared: We are not in the position to adjudicate who is worthy to vote on this or not. We should just open up the vote to the entire community.	

Revisiting issue of "no to government" vote	## Revisiting issue of "no to government" vote
	
	1. Ballot paper to choose between constitutions, and a second ballot paper on whether the voters wants the constitution or not to renew mandate.
	2. 2 completely separate ballots:
	    a. Do you want a constitution?
	    b. Do you want the new constitution?
	3. There might be dissent among student body if they are not allowed to vote for "no to government".
	4. Feroz: What if students vote "no to government"? It will be detrimental to the student body.
	    a. Yongzhi: Every Government needs majority support to function.
	        i. Dave: They should decide if they need a Government, we should not decide for them. We cannot assume that the mandate stands, even though I suspect and hope that they will vote in favour of a government.
	    b. Jay: Neither outcome is worth the effort and risk. People can spoil their vote if they want to vote "no to government". Does not increase	

	legitimacy of the Government. Does not think it should happen at the same time as Constitution voting because of limited participation.
	    i. Tee: There will only be increased participation because mascot and constitution are being reviewed at the same time.
	  c. Maria: Fear that the school does not take this "no to government" vote seriously. They might just not care but vote "no to government".
	    i. Dave: It is problematic that the Government does not seem to support democracy and believes that trolls will skew the votes. If you are so scared about trolls why even have a ratification process in the first place?
	       1. Maria: Not a question about democracy. If students do not want a Government, they have the ability to dissolve it through petitioning.
	       2. Dave: While that is true, it is more difficult through the current petition process and relies on the majority to be vocal, which they might not be.
	  d. Dave: If there is a concern about turnout number then these concerns apply to the ratification as a whole and we should reconsider our quorum requirement
	5. **MOTION**: This house believes that there should be a separate "no government/ yes government" ballot alongside the ratification vote. (PASS)
	  a. Yes: Yongzhi, Dave, Tee, Bing, Feroz (with rights), Ami, Zach
	  b. No: Maria
	  c. Absent: Qis
	  d. Abstain: Jared, Jay
	6. Vote counting for the ratification will be done by volunteers as the Constitution Review Committee has a vested interest. We can use computer stations for the "no government/ yes government" vote.	

Jay's Exhortation	## Jay's Exhortation 1. Encourage those who are not abroad to run because elections will not be competitive due to number of positions.	

2. Most probably Freshmen dominated Government who require experienced voice and guidance.
3. Dave is willing to run again, but has made a commitment not to run again upon joining the Constitution Review Committee.
   a. Tee: People who have invested a substantive time crafting the Constitution should not be allowed to run because they have a vested interest when reviewing the Constitution.
   b. Jay: There might be a justification to remove this rule because we might be diluting the talent pool. Those involved have been under the impression that they cannot run and therefore do not have vested interest up to this point.
   c. Maria: The public has the power to vote against them if they object.
   d. Jared: Vote should be tabled to next meeting because the Constitution Review process is not over. If we vote today and if it passes, there might be attempts to influence the Constitution before it is completed.
      i. Zach: In theory, since the idea of allowing Constitution Review Committee members to run again exists, there might already be vested interest.
         1. Jared: At least we absolve ourselves of responsibility on paper.
      ii. Tee: Constitution may still change during the public comment period, so we can only vote after the public comment period (next Friday).
   e. Tee: Sees no reason why the principle should sway at this time although there are capable members in the Constitution Review Committee. It might come across as Government controlling who is eligible to run. Members of the Constitution Review Committee can still run, but they run the risk of being disqualified.
      i. Jay: The decisions made by the Student Government are binding.

	1. Tee: No, they can still run, but they will just be disqualified.
	f. **MOTION**: The members and former members of the Constitution Review Committee, except the Devil's Advocate, should not be allowed to run for the Government next semester. (PASS)
	   i. Yes: Yongzhi, Zach, Tee, Ami, Jared, Bing
	  ii. No:
	 iii. Absent: Feroz, Qis
	 iv. Abstain: Dave, Maria, Jay	

Agenda for our next meeting:

Reminders/ Updates