

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON STUDENT FEE  
ALLOCATION MODELS OF THE STUDENT FEE DTF  
October 28, 1971

Prefatory Note

In developing a model for the allocation of students' fees we had a number of central considerations that we wanted to address in the model:

1. Maximum participation by a wide range of students
2. A knowledge of the evil effects of traditional student board arrangements, e.g.:
  - a. Lust for power
  - b. Ego motivation
  - c. Limited points of view
  - d. Lack of popular participation
3. Continuity
4. Accountability and locatability
5. Recognition of the responsibility and authority of the Dean of Developmental Services in the process

The following process takes into account these various considerations.

The central body for the allocation of student monies would be a board composed of eight students, the Director of Recreation and Campus Activities, the Dean of Developmental Services, the Vice President for Business (or his designee), and a representative of the Public Events Desk.

The eight students would sit as a "jury of peers" and would only review the proposals of others during their tenure. They would not be concerned with authoring their own proposals or with on-going administration of funded programs or projects. Their's would be a role of review and allocation only.

The other members of the body sit in an ex-officio status as resource persons by virtue of their varied responsibilities and involvement with this process. We call particular attention to the Dean of Developmental Services in this regard. The process that we shall outline in this report recognizes the veto power of the Dean of Developmental Services over any decisions of the Allocation Board. The Dean will, of course, be expected to adhere to the principles put forth in the COG report. He must be accountable and locatable for his decisions. In keeping with this we suggest that upon the occasion that the Dean would want to exercise his approval power he must first consult with and inform the members of the board of his pending decision in order to initiate discourse. If his decision is executed, it would be incumbent on him to furnish a written explanation of his decision to the board. Appellate procedures are outlined in COG.

In addition to members listed thus far, it is the feeling of this sub-committee that a Student Help position be established to aid in the paperwork and record-keeping functions of this group. Optimally, this position would not be renewable during the school year to aid in continuity. We think that a maximum of 19½ hours/week would be sufficient hours in which to successfully meet the obligations of the position. This clerk/secretary position would be responsible for record keeping, case research, correspondence, and meeting mechanics, i.e., publication, location, etc.

The selection of this person would be initially accomplished by the Dean of Developmental Services filing a request for student help with the Office of Financial Aid and Placement. Interviews for the position could be initially executed by either the Dean of Developmental Services or the first student members of the committee.

The student members of the committee would serve in staggering terms (maximum 3 months, see attachment A). They would be randomly selected from the community service list.

To accomplish the initial selection, we recommend that the Dean of Developmental Services, the Director of Recreation and Campus Activities and two students selected randomly from the community service list be charged with the selection of the first student members.

They would first randomly generate 50 or so names from the community service list. They would then, through a series of interviews and/or written communications, determine the eligibility of each person to serve on the board. This would be accomplished simply by asking a series of questions:

1. Do you have time to serve on a body constituted to review proposals for use of student monies? (Specific terms could be suggested here. See attachment A.)
2. Do you foresee any conflicts of interest?
3. Would you voluntarily dismiss yourself from the committee should such a conflict arise?
4. Would you be willing to assume a role of review only and not make any proposal during the duration of your tenure?

The interview process would be continued until a list of 50 or so eligible names was obtained.

On the basis of free time the students would be appointed to the various slots on the committee (see attachment A). With time considerations equal, students would be selected at random (e.g., by lots) to fill the slots.

Untimely vacancies in the various slots would be filled from the community service list. For only the duration of the specific slot the alternates would not be eligible to serve again during the same school year. Students would only be able to serve once during any year to facilitate broader participation from the community service list.

The committee would select a moderator by lots from its current membership immediately prior to each meeting and would have the responsibility to set the agenda <sup>for</sup> the next meeting. We suggest that the committee meet regularly on a bi-monthly basis with the flexibility to meet more often if the work load should warrant.

The body would function on a consensus basis with the authority to call Advisory DTF's for further study of proposals.

Although the committee will have no stringent guidelines with the exception of general law, we suggest that certain flexible considerations be used. e.g., cost/student, impact on total community, need arguments to establish that requests for capital equipment do not duplicate existing equipment resources and that the requested equipment will service a significant segment of the total community, etc., etc., etc. In addition to this we strongly recommend that all authors of proposals would be responsible to embody self-evaluative procedures and determinants into the actual plan of the project or program.

In turn, authors of proposals would be expected to consider these factors in proposal presentations. We suggest that the first board might suitably profit from devising a uniform application form. The form could list suggested guidelines as reminders for proposers to the board. In addition, a uniform format would facilitate record keeping functions.

Indeed, all members of the board, as time progressed during an academic year, would experience changing roles, e.g., allocation to evaluation. We believe that even the solely evaluative involvement in this process will not make the student participants feel less needed in the total scheme.

The board would be expected to meet all year. However, we suggest that they refrain from any allocations when students are ostensibly away from the College.

The summer members of the board would execute highly critical functions of evaluation and study. Programs that were funded during the year could be evaluated for their eligibility for further funding. The summer group might also design the questionnaire for use during the forthcoming academic year.

As a continuing responsibility, all the various members of the board would be charged with soliciting popular student opinion frequently and conscientiously.

Past members of the board would be likely and qualified candidates to serve on advisory DTF's to the board.

Traditionally, committees or organizations charged with similar responsibilities have not had the benefit of any substantial empirical evidence to show the popular will of students of how their own money will be spent.

To facilitate this we propose the following:

Prior to any deliberations each year, a questionnaire would be circulated to all students to try to identify priority areas. With the total (hopefully) response of the students this would provide a clear indication of student body wishes regarding the expenditure of these monies for the committee.



When new students enrolled during the year they would also be given the questionnaire. If the board felt that the results of the first questionnaire were to become anachronous during a later part of the year, they might wish to design and circulate a different version.

The questionnaire would be designed to include mention of many operative programs and options as well as a lesser emphasis on other projects that may be not essential for simple day-today operation of the College.

Some probable items for the former list would be: Activities building funding, cost sharing with academic programs for special projects, transportation, clubs, information center, etc.

As a final part of our report we make two additional suggestions to the President's Council.

1. That no arbitrary budget determinations on student funds be made by the administration, and,
2. That suitable office space be granted to this function in the library as well as access to administrative support services. (Temporary until Activities Building is open, conceivably)

This, then, is a brief report of the process we recommend. We further recommend that the final model be published extensively for student reaction and understanding as soon as possible so that we might begin this process by early November.

Additional Note:

We will also be submitting an additional report that concerns a novel suggestion for a different fee structure at The Evergreen State College as well as a legislative recommendation to implement the structure.