Amendments 2022

A total of 8 amendment proposals came to fruition. However, out of those, only three would cause a significant change to the procedures of the Student Assembly. Find more information below.

All proposed amendments passed. The Student Assembly has grown to more than 350 people and with 173 votes, this has been the largest amendment process yet, but also the most delayed. This delay allowed much room for transparency in amendment discussions but has caused a one-month delay in Student Council elections following the many vacancies last year. This was the second year where interns were included in the amendment voting. However, quorum was achieved by a hair thin margin and only under the exclusion of interns to the quorum (see summary of SAM where this was voted on at the end of the document).

Key:
Observed problem
Possible Solution via Amendment

RESULTS

Possible voting alternatives

Major Amendments & Working Groups

1. **Changing The Elections Timeline (page 10 in blue)**
   Continuity of Student Councils has suffered from the complete exchange of officers following elections.
   A solution to that would be to change the elections process to twice-per-year so that only half a council would change.

   PASSED (82.8 %) A staggering majority of voters is in favor of staggered elections to have more overlap between SC Officers. Of those, a majority (63.8 %) voted for a model with a Vice-Chair position.
   NOTE: This vote did not include a second preference option, which in hindsight, is unusual in OIST Student Assembly votes. As both versions are very similar and rejection of an amendment is the least chosen option however, the decision seems clear. If you have any concerns, please contact studentcouncil@oist.jp and julian.katzke@oist.jp.
   NOTE: In the ToR now, the suggested amendment accidentally included GEDI Representatives as running for 12 months. This is an unintended error and should be amended out next year.

   Suggestion 0: Reject the Amendment. More Elections further reduce engagement of the SA. The timeline is reasonable as it is.

Suggestion 1: *See *_221205_.pdf* Elections in January and July. Positions to fill are logically split among the elections. That also means that Officers and Associate Officers are now elected in a single election. Vacancies can be covered in the next official elections.

Suggestion 2: *See *_221205_Vice_Chair.pdf* Elections in January and July. A Vice-Chair position is introduced to relief some pressure on leadership of the SC. A new Vice-Chair is elected each round and current Vice-Chair becomes Chair, current chair leaves office. Other positions to fill are logically split among the elections. That also means that Officers and Associate Officers are now elected in a single election. Vacancies can be covered in the next official elections.

2. Elevating Sustainability Representative to Officers (page 2)

Issues of sustainability are being addressed in meetings across the management of OIST, and the SC identifies a general lack of commitment in OIST management towards sustainability issues.

A solution would be to make the Sustainability Officer not an Associate any longer.

PASSED (80.6 %) The Sustainability Representative is now an Officer of the Student Council, not Associate.

Suggestion 0: Reject the Amendment. The sustainability officer benefits from not being burdened by SC regular workload and can thus act more creatively and engaged.

Suggestion 1: Move the Sustainability Officer from "Associated Officers" to "Officers". That further emphasizes sustainability, encourages exchange between the SC for sustainability matters, enables the Sustainability Officer to attend all meetings with admin that they desire to attend. It further adds Sustainability to the Student Council as it already embodies the needs of Health & Safety, Academic Issues, Welfare, Diversity.

3. Number Of Nominations To Accept (pages 11 and 12)

Students with a general volunteering spirit are negatively affected by restrictions on accepting nominations causing shifts between nominations to fill the SC.

A solution to that would be to enable members of the SA to accept more nominations.

PASSED (75.6 %) Students will be allowed to run for two SC positions if they are not the sole candidate for either of the two.

Suggestion 0: Reject the Amendment. Nominations were intended to decide for one role with commitment. A candidate running for two things at the same time might cause chaos in counting the votes.

Suggestion 1: Allow accepting up to two nominations. The counting process is robust to that case. Creates more emphasis on volunteering and engagement with student politics.

Minor Amendments

1. The Declaration of Results process is confounded by a first point of SC needing to sign off on a Results Sheet. (page 12)
   Move App.2.8.1 down to below current App.2.8.4.
   PASSED (87.7 %)

2. As awareness in general increases, and endeavors at OIST are being formed, being neurodivergent and/or having mental or physical attributes and disabilities shall be addressed under consideration of the Diversity Officer. (page 5)
   Add respective elements to 3.13.iv.A (Duties of the Diversity Officer).
   PASSED (94.2 %)

3. The timing of SAM is formally specified, whereas in reality, it is held around internal seminar and other events. (page 9)
   Remove "usually on the first Friday of each month" from 4.1.(a) (Meetings).
   PASSED (88.5 %)

4. App.2.2.6 and App.2.2.7 refer to taking office and forming handover. The wordings are loose and created trouble this year. (pages 10 and 11)
   Specify a handover period that emphasizes overlap between the officers.
   PASSED (95.5 %)

5. There is a typo in the GEDI Associated Officers position. (find with CTRL/CMD + F)
   Fix it, add the comma the second time the acronym is spelt out.
   PASSED (98.1 %)

Detailed Results & Demographics

Elections Timeline Voting
Reject 27
Amend, A   47
Amend, B   83

Sustainability Representative as Student Council Officer Voting
Reject 30

Move the Sustainability Officer from "Associated Officers" to "Officers"   125

Number Of Nominations Voting
Reject 38
Allow accepting up to two nominations   118

Minor Amendment Voting

	Vote For/Accept Amendment	**Reject Amendment**
1. Remove priority of Results Sheet	136	19
2. Widen examples in scope of Diversity Officer	147	9
3. Student Assembly Meeting does not need to be on the first Friday	139	18
4. Student Council Handover Period should be specified	149	7
5. Fix GEDI typos	153	3

Demographics of voters

Year	`n Votes`	`n Students`	`% voted`
pre17	6	13	46.2
17	14	26	53.8
18	13	31	41.9
19	18	45	40
20	30	57	52.6
21	24	43	55.8
22	26	49	53.1
NA	42	NA	NA

NOTE: Students were counted based on groups username. No voting results were looked at when obtaining username of a person who voted

SAM 2023/01/27 Summary of Minutes: Interns in Quorum?

Purpose of today's SAM is to discuss democratically the inclusion of interns in the count for amendment quorum. If the SA present here agrees, the number of votes for quorum will be decided based on the student percentage alone, while the outcome of the vote will include all

votes. Decision at SAM for transparency. We now have interns arriving at all different times of year, for different lengths of time and it's very hard to track.

We run into this problem every time we run amendments when we then have to scramble to reach quorum. Do we need to run amendments every year, it seems like overkill. we should not have to decide based on when it is convenient/inconvenient.

The university is still young and lots of things are changing, so it makes sense that we end up doing this every year. Maybe one day it will settle down.

This unscheduled vote of the SA at SAM 3 days before the vote closes.

Why are we allowed to do this at SAM?

ToR allows for SAM to be a platform for votes of the SA. We are doing this here today in the interest of transparency and having minutes of this meeting so that future councils have a record that this issue keeps coming up and needs addressing.

Julian could have made this call by himself as the sole interpreter of the ToR. He chose to include the SA to be fairer and we appreciate that.

Vote with clear majority to exclude interns from quorum.

Formal business concluded. Open discussion on how to fix the problem for future:

Why do we have to chase people if they are disengaged. If the amendment process fails, so be it. What about reducing threshold for intern quorum (ex. ¼ of total). Maybe not good solution. Not reaching quorum is a symptom of disengagement and a statement.

Those who don't vote really don't care, and we shouldn't have to chase them. Be cautious about that statement.

A lot of people may not vote because they don't understand the issues.We need to solve the problem with engagement, and improve understanding of the issues. We should improve on communication.