

RES01-2016/17

A Resolution

to

Implement the Stipend Proposal

in the eighth week of Student Government, 2016

Sponsor(s): Aditya Karkera (Director of Budget)

Recognising the validity of the [prior Student Council proposal](#) to approve-in-principle a stipend in the form of financial aid to needy government members;

Aware of this present Council's (2016/17) mandate, constitutional power, and responsibility to implement the proposal and move it beyond being in-principle and having it being enacted;

Affirming the necessity for such a proposal in the maintenance and strengthening of the Student Council as well as its unhindered functioning;

Understanding that this proposal is in line with the goals of government, does not alter the nature of government work, and is in the spirit of government's service and contribution to the student community of the college;

Accepting the mechanisms for its implementation, both as stated in the aforementioned proposal and defined by the present Council, namely

1. Financial aid of a maximum of **SS\$500 per academic year**, to be disbursed to a maximum of 5 members of government, at a budgetary allotment of **SS\$2,500 per academic year**.
2. An independent allotment authority in the form of the **Office of Admissions and Financial Aid**, with the final decision of allotment so derived being anonymous and entirely confidential, and at the discretion of the allotment authority.
3. A process of application whose submitted information will only be accessible by the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid, and the result of which will only be accessible by the applicant and (excluding the name) the Director of Budget;

Upholding the rationale and purpose of the Stipend proposal, whose salient features include:

1. Providing members of the Council with a compensation (rather than salary) for
 - a. Working, on average, 10-12 hours per week on government work alone (when CIPE recommends a maximum of 16 hours per week for all extracurriculars);
 - b. Forfeiting opportunities to use said hours for an activity/engagement that would otherwise earn them monetary returns;
 - c. Engaging in intensive work worthy of compensation (rather than payment) and financial relief to guard against any dissuasion that affects Council productivity.
2. Preventing socio-economic discrimination within and among the Council and its members, by ensuring that a member's financial background does not hinder their performance or ability to enact labour for and in the Council, as interpreted by the former Council in **Article I** of the Constitution: "*representation in the Government will not be subject to any form of discrimination.*"
3. Attracting the college's best and brightest minds to work for and with the Council by means of a financial incentive whose absence would have the Council lose valuable human resources to more lucrative opportunities on and off campus. A better Councilperson makes for a better Council, and a better Council is an objective of every Council and the student body that elects it.
4. Refining the effectiveness and inclusiveness of the Council by encouraging financially disadvantaged students - a significant portion of the student body - to run for office, thereby broadening the Council's representation and including more diverse opinions in its decisions and deliberations.
5. Ensuring that Student Government - which is not a student organisation and so does not violate Dean of Students Office (DOS) restrictions on the use of funding to compensate organisation members for services rendered - is able to better render broad services (of a far more important nature than those of any individual student organisation) to the student body effectively and is able to deploy its funding in the most beneficial avenues.
6. Evolving - gradually but eventually - to a standard and fixed salary for all Council members within a framework building upon this resolution and the former Council's proposal. This must be designed and implemented by this Council (2016/17) or the one that follows, with the power to continue deferring the framework in the hands of the next Council (2017/18);

*By the powers afforded to it and by the will of the President, this Council hereby **moves to pass this resolution as it stands**, and*

Instructs members of government to avail of the application process, as it stands upon release, on or before the last day of Semester 1, AY2016/2017;

Adopts the following measures to ensure transparency:

1. The Director of the Budget shall be the only entity of Student Government aware of the number of aid recipients (and not the names), and shall include the expenditure in both the annual budget and transaction register as official government expenses (but not a government scheme).
2. The amount of government finances used to fund this proposal must be released to the student body using non-budgetary means as well, including but not limited to announcements and declarations in the form of Facebook and government website posts;

Directs the Council and the Director of External Communications to ensure that the student body is very well aware of the proposal so implemented, and that it is informed of the measures in place for transparency, by the dissemination of information in the form of minutes and announcements, and the encouragement of student body feedback on the proposal;

Compels the Council to observe the following clauses concerning confidentiality:

1. No member - stipend recipient or not - may disclose any information concerning their (or anyone else's) stipend's existence or extent with any other member of the Council, except if that information is relevant to judicial inquiry. The President is the only member authorised to be approached to provide such information in this case.
2. All stipend recipients must sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) which will be provided to them at the time of the stipend's award. The NDA will effectively bar stipend recipients from discussing details of their stipend with the student body;

Accommodates the former government's concerns regarding the proposal's implementation by the following means:

1. On the question of the proposal's implementation altering the nature of government work:

The process by which an individual joins and works within the Council is not altered by this proposal, and indeed their effectiveness would only be positively affected. Nevertheless, to guard against moral hazard, this resolution provides for confidentiality, transparency, and judicial review. The only change in the nature of government work will be an increase in effectiveness and inclusiveness. Further, the stipend (S\$500 at maximum) is large enough to act as fair compensation but not large enough to spark conflicts of interest.

2. On the question of the size and extent of the stipend:

The power to determine the extent of the stipend is reserved for the independent allotment authority - the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid - based on procedures and calculus of their choosing. The size of the stipend proposal - both individually (S\$500 maximum) and in aggregate (S\$2,500) - is determined by consultation with and permission of the Dean of Students Office (DOS). Any changes in this specific regard require the same consultation and permission.

3. On the question of this resolution's and the proposal's constitutionality:

As per the proceedings of the [15th April 2016 meeting](#) of the former Council, the stipend's legitimacy and constitutionality are secured by Article I of the Constitution. This is complemented by a provision in Robert's Rules of Order that allows for the dispersal of Council funds to its members via a special committee (this being the independent allotment authority) whose sole purpose is to defend Article I. As per the same proceedings, the former judiciary voiced no dissent with regards to constitutionality and sided with the Council to unanimously approve the proposal in-principle. This does not proactively bar future judicial review and/or dissent;

Subjects the implemented proposal's ability to be invalidated to the following:

1. Majority Council vote to negate this resolution
2. Judicial decision ruling this resolution unconstitutional, by
 - a. Unfavourable judicial review of constitutionality
 - b. Judicial ruling in favour of a student body petition/case against this resolution, subject to appeal by the Council.

