Date: 26 August 2016   **Time**: 7:15-8.06pm   **Venue:** Saga Anteroom

Note-Taker: Isaac   **Deputy Speaker**: Dee

Attendance: Dee, Joceline, Keith, Regina, Isaac, Izzy, Scott, Regina, Annette

Observers: Subhas Nair, Sara Rotenberg, Patrick Wu

Absent: Aadit, Ross, Meredith (Semester Abroad), Adam (Football training)

1. Administrative Things (5 minutes)
    a. Deputy Speaker:
    ○ **Logistics**
    ○ **External Communications**
2. Project/Portfolio updates (75 minutes)
    ○ President (20 Minutes)
        ■ VP and Pres: Proposed constitutional amendment for voting procedure (rank 1 votes)
        ■ Handover-- general
        ■ Recognition committee - student orgs
    ○ Vice President (10 minutes)
        ■ Handover
            ● Overview
            ● Input from council
    ○ Speaker (5 minutes)
        ■ Handover overview to be written and submitted to council prior to meeting
    ○ **Logistics** (5 minutes)
        ■ Handover
            ● Overview, input from council
    ○ **External Communications** (5 minutes)

- ■ Handover
  - ● Overview, input from council
- ○ **Academics** (5 minutes)
  - ■ Handover
    - ● Overview, input from council
- ○ **Student life** (5 minutes)
  - ■ Handover
    - ● Overview, input from council
- ○ **Events** (5 minutes)
  - ■ Handover
    - ● Overview, input from council
- ○ **Budget** (5 Minutes)
  - ■ Handover
    - ● Overview, input from council
- ○ **Student orgs** (5 minutes)
  - ■ Handover
    - ● Overview, input from council
- ○ **Athletics** (5 minutes)
  - ■ Handover
    - ● Overview, input from council
3. Other (*5* minutes)
4. Feedback updates (News around campus, new projects) (*10-20* minutes)
   - ○ by portfolio when necessary
5. Next Agenda (5 minutes)
   - ○ Next Friday's dinner

Summary:

In this meeting, the Council discussed whether to alter the minimum vote proportion for elections, handover details and recognising student organisations. The way in which the election votes are considered were discussed, due to the danger raised by Scott that it might be too easy for candidates to enter the council. However, there were concerns raised from other members of the council that such changes might be arbitrary, or might overly hamper the possibility that candidates can meet the new standards to enter council. A constitutional amendment proposal did not pass, but the format of the election quiz will ask voters to have a 'one candidate, one unique rank' system, and candidates which the voter does not want in council can have a 'no vote' option to place beside his/her name. Also discussed was the formation of a student organisations review committee to be overseen by the government. This was agreed that the Director for Student Organisations will be in charge of setting up this committee to recognise student orgs come the September round. Finally, the points of handovers were raised by the individual directors. Some helpful comments and tips would be relayed to the next council, but discretion was advised to allow the next council to chart their own direction for the coming Academic Year.

Agenda	Discussion Point	Actions taken

	1. Administrative Things (5 minutes)
	   a. Deputy Speaker:
	   b. Logistics
	   c. External Communications
	2. Project/Portfolio updates (75 minutes)
	   ○ President (20 Minutes)
	      ■ VP and Pres: Proposed constitutional amendment for voting procedure (rank 1 votes)
	Constitution Amendment:
	  - Scott: Proposed constitutional amendment to make minimum vote proportion required 1/n of RANK ONE votes rather than ALL VOTES. This would ensure bar for entry is not set too low.	

- Regina: How to ensure everyone votes rank 1? And that they don't vote two rank 1s?
- Isaac: We will disqualify such votes. Manually.
- Regina: Isn't that too much effort?
- Scott: Yes but I'm willing to do it.
- Scott: Yes. I am happy to have it implemented, as long as we make it clear in the instructions for the voting.
- Patrick: Is there a possibility that we end up with fewer Council members that the minimum 10 needed?
- Scott: We have over 770 students, and quorum is 60%. So we would need 28 rank "1" votes.
- Patrick: This will make it harder for freshmen candidates, some people who are popular can get many rank 1 votes. Could we look retroactively at last elections?
- Scott: In an ideal world, each rank has an allocated point, and we can then need an accumulation of a certain number of points.
- Sara: As we go forward, as X increases, then barrier to get into council would reduce
- Scott: but X is not the student body, but rather the number of candidates.
- Sara: So thinking ahead, the system should be alright.
- Scott: The purpose of the ranks is for instant runoff, such that we can differentiate between similarly popular candidates who receive a similar number of votes.
- Keith: Why do we choose only rank "1" votes?
- Regina: We want to raise the bar for getting into council, but not limit too much such that too few get in.

- Scott: There is an added pressure on voters to decide "who do you really want in council".
- Regina: Looking at the previous voting results, some of our current government members got very few rank "1" votes. I think we would get 9 out of 14 candidates elected, which would not have been enough to form a government.
- Patrick: It is a mark of popular candidates to get more rank "1" votes, but we would severely restrict the number of elected representatives.
- Scott: People do rank all the candidates, and this forces them to put some thought into it.
- Regina: Why don't we just don't increase the publicity on "no vote".
- Scott: Okay. Remind them that voting for someone means they want them on the Council.
- Sara: What if not enough people are elected?
- Scott: We would re-hold elections.
- Dee: Motion to amend the constitution. [no second]
  - ■ Handover -- general
- Regina: For the general handover, we would do it during meeting. Larger issues like how the government is structured, role of the government, and the challenges that the government currently faces, especially in the big picture.
- Scott: Individual meals with directors can also be done.
- Dee: Can we do the individual handovers during that same meeting.
- Regina: Sounds better logistically. After the main handover we can break up into smaller groups.
- Dee: Who crafts the general document?
- Regina: I am crafting a document and am calling for input.

	- Regina: Issues like should we have an advisor? - Dee: Stances of the previous government should definitely be told to the new government. - Regina: At the same time they may face less limitations than us, they have more energy and more time, and can do things differently. - Dee: Individual handover documents will also be prepared by the directors. Can each person talk about what your portfolio handover will include? - Scott: I manage special projects, maintain relations with people like Dean Bridges, and be in charge of projects like the Elections Committee. - Isaac: Minutes taking mostly. - Regina: We can explain our minutes policy and leave it up to them to decide if they want to continue/change. - Jocie: I hope that the new person in charge would be aware of the government's image, the platforms available, and a to-do list which the next director could take charge. One example is the judiciary page on the website, and other publicity materials. - Regina: We can share how we tried to increase engagement, wrt mailing list for example. Some ideas which were tried but didn't work. For example, our feedback form got less messages this semester, although it might be the short term. - Dee: Regarding student life, most of the handover would be on the mascot, and get the new council to work on collating information (especially via student surveys). There is a community living survey drafted by the first govt which we didn't launch. It was more that our government may not have had enough time to act on the information which would have been gotten through the feedback.	

- Dee: Student life gets a lot of feedback though. - Jocie: We can also clarify areas where we have acted on feedback, and when we haven't - e.g. refer dining hall feedback to the dining committee. - Dee: Internet portfolio by Aadit. - Annette: the events portfolio has not much. But especially on the event held with G-spot, collaborating with other student orgs is good. More events could be held such that students could get to know more parts of the college better (people which one may not necessarily meet with on an everyday basis). Such events could go under events too. - Dee: Also note, when other surveys given by other school bodies should be taken into account when the next council intends to run surveys. - Annette: technically, other events could make up for the fewer town halls held. Perhaps other avenues to meet with students could be explored. - Keith: Does my successor need to form the budget committee already? - Regina: Yes, in April. - Keith: Internal budget, some follow-ups on Scott's project (e.g. the need-based funding for the persons who work the student government) - Keith: for the budget committee, part of it has to be a part of the council. - Regina: On collecting feedback, we had office hours but they didn't really work, any thoughts on why? - Sara: 1 possible reason was that there was not enough publicity. Translating from a Facebook post to a physical reminder. - Dee: Could it be because Office Hours were segregated to the individual directors. Persons might have been confused as to which director to approach.	

	- Keith: Perhaps in the future, lunch office hours might be opened such that there are more council members available to speak with. - Sara: Feedback: Big problem, as a captain of the Volleyball Team, the MPH is too warm (because the air-conditioning is not turned on). Infra has agreed that if the PSI goes over 150, the air-conditioning will be switched on. There was a new policy this academic year such that the MPH would no longer have the air-conditioning switched on, and the information was not communicated to the student body. - Dee: At the very least, a statement ought to be given by infra to explain why some air-conditioning systems are turned on over others. - Regina: Will get Adam on this. - Regina: For handover, the use of standing committees were introduced in our government with the new Constitution. However, they were not used very effectively. Could they be consulted for more things? - Jocie: What issues warrant consults in the first place? - Dee: The nature of the government would then decide how the standing committees are then used. The council has been quite reactionary thus far. - Annette: How the next council forms will decide how they will respond to issues. If the government is more reactionary, then a standing committee may lack effectiveness as it would lack consistent meetings. If an agenda is set out for the next year, then more effectiveness could be conducted over the academic year. - Dee: There needs to be a balance between advice and restraint. - Annette: The future government might also have to consider how the new government would communicate and maintain relations with the judiciary.	

	- Patrick: The Judiciary can help the council answer questions on the Constitution, but its main role is really helping the student body if they have complaints against the student council. ■ Recognition committee - student orgs - Regina: The recognition committee looks at student orgs, reviews the principles set by the previous student government, and decides whether new student organisations can be set-up. The next round of recognition begins Sep 1-14, which is too late for the new govt, so Andrew (DoS) is asking us to conduct this. - Regina: there will be two meetings: one where the committee prepares additional questions for the student org proposals, the second where they are approved/rejected. - Izzy: The documents for the student organisations are reviewed as a whole in the second meeting. - Regina: In the new Constitution, would recognition be now done by the student government? - Scott: Or is it only the budget that is handled by the new student council? - Dee: who is part of this committee. - Izzy: It is not just within the government; students not from the student government, randomly selected, will be part of the committee. - Dee: If this position is an annual thing, then it makes sense that there is a rotation of students who are a part of this committee. - Izzy: If we do this now, what will this committee do after this one round? The next govt will probably form their own committee again. - Regina: Do we need an external committee? Can't the Council do this ourselves?	

	- Izzy: The proposals come in on September 1st, and they need to be finalised on September 14th?
	- Izzy: Then the new student council would have 4 days to make a decision on this problem. I would not mind doing it, the student government would collectively be needed to handle this change.
	- Patrick: It sounds like this job need not necessarily require an external committee. The Constitution gives the Council, specifically the Student Orgs director, the power to recognise new student organisations.
	- Dee: It will take time for a new committee to be formed to be added to this committee.
	- Izzy: Think that a committee with external representatives would be best, following tradition of SORB which had external representatives. A single person may not be able to decide which student organisations are to be recognised.
	- Regina: The agreement is that Izzy calls for a committee of external students on this issue.
	
	3. Next Agenda (5 minutes)
	    ○ Where shall we go out to eat next week
	    ○ Regina: For next friday instead of calling a meeting we will be going out for dinner together.
	    ○ Keith: to check if internal appreciation budget can be used
	    ○ Dee: Korean bbq?
	    ○ Annette: family-style dinner?
	    ○ Regina: We could go Two Chefs Eating Place near Commonwealth MRT. Similar to Wah Chee. Budget about $15 without subsidy.	