



University of Alberta Students' Union

**SCFC
COMMITTEE**

**February 8th, 2023
4:00 pm MST
Zoom**

The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students' Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwacîswâskahikan (Beaver Hills House), on Treaty 6 territory. From time immemorial, the banks along the river valley have been known as the Pehonan, a meeting place for the nêhiyawak (Cree), the Niitsitapi (Blackfoot), Métis, Dënesųłiné (Dene), Ojibway/Saulteaux/Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and others. The University, the Students' Union and much of the city are located on the unlawfully stolen land of the forcibly removed Papaschase Cree.

We acknowledge that sharing this land gives each of us the responsibility to research the historic contexts of Treaty 6, to reflect on our personal relationships to the land, the Nations we've named, and to our roles in upholding justice on this territory. Since they began, the Students' Union and the University have benefited from historic and ongoing dispossession of land and resources from Indigenous Peoples. As a result, it is our responsibility to seek the restitution of this land and its resources. Finally, we seek to do better by working to make our learning, research, and governance align with the histories, languages, teachings, and cultures of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples in the land presently occupied by the Canadian state.

We encourage critical reflection by asking the following question. In relation to the territory on which you are situated, what role do you play in strengthening the resistance and resurgence of Indigenous students within your communities?

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT
Julia Villosio, chair		Y
Paige Boyer		Y
Mackenzie Burnstick		N
Gregory Choi		Y
Leena El Jirari		N
Levi Flaman		Y
Himasha Rao		N
Pien Stienbusch		Y
Ivan Varela Del Rio		Y
Audrey Johnson		Y
Evan Sawyer		Y
Michael Griffiths		Y

Courtney Graham		N/A
Tanisha Sahu		N/A

MINUTES (SCFC-2022-03)

2022-03/1

INTRODUCTION

2022-03/1a

Call to Order

VILLOSO: CALLED the meeting to order at 4:06 PM

2022-03/1b

Approval of Agenda

STEINBUSCH/BOYER MOVE TO approve the agenda
CARRIED

2022-03/1c

Approval of Minutes

TABLED.

2022-03/1d

Chair's Business

VILLOSO: Informs that The Gateway hasn't responded to the questions sent to them by the Committee.

2022-03/2

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

BOYER: Asks if the budget form submitted by the applicants has only the expenses.

VILLOSO states that they only submit a file, and it's not a preset template they must fill.

FLAMAN: Suggests that the committee can create a template for them to fill in their revenue and expenses while filling out their application.

2022-03/3

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2022-03/3a

[SCF Green Fund Application #3: Q&A](#)

VILLOSO: Shares the document with the committee along with the applicants' responses.

BOYER: Asks if a committee member can attend to address any questions that could arise rather than exchanging emails back and forth.

VILLOSO: States that by adjudicating an application, the committee tried to protect everyone while grading them without bias. The committee relies on the questions asked in the application, but since the committee thinks there is a lack of information, we can add an interview process or anything that the committee agrees with.

GRIFFITHS: Adds that a brief presentation from the applicant would be nice

as we want to give out the money and can help them get the funds they need.

FLAMAN: Thinks there shouldn't be any second chances given and doesn't see a reason for rejecting them now so they can apply again.

BOYER: States that the committee is here to provide the money to the students. If we cancel their application just because they don't understand our question, we're being unfair to them. We have to change things and give them an opportunity to come and explain their application so that we can understand better.

VILLOSO: Agrees, as they don't know what exact information we're looking for. We can start by giving them a rubric to follow while applying for funds like these. If we ask them to come and present, it might be overwhelming for them as we never stated any presentation factor for the approval process. Maybe this is something that could be done for future applications.

BOYER: States that there are no numbers as we did not provide them with a template for the budget; hence, revenue is not mentioned. Adds that the wording from our end should be clear and detail-oriented. Asks if we could send the budget template to them, have them fill it out, and send us back.

JOHNSON: Concerned about the timeline and if this funding money is a way to get their project started and later on, the expenses are on them.

VARELA: Points that energy saving might be challenging, but since this is something like a prototype and hence needs a lot of funding.

VILLOSO: Points that they may be applying to other funding sources, and hence there is no certain revenue.

FLAMAN: Adds that it is good to know, even if it's a prospective revenue, giving us a better idea to see if they need all the money or if just a part of it will work.

STEINBUSCH: Adds that the funding might not be used for a particular project, and hence, no certain number is mentioned. In the application, we also don't question them for other sources of revenue. The best way is to have them fill out the budget template.

BOYER: Agrees, asking them to fill the template will be less overwhelming than asking for every financial piece of the document. In the end, we don't want to create an extra barrier for students to apply for the funds.

STEINBUSCH: Suggests that we add a note asking them for the possible

anticipated revenue coming in.

VILLOSO: States that they have given much information, like clubs fair fees, and chapter fees, that is unrelated to this project.

BOYER: Points that this might be their balance sheet as they seem to be a startup.

GRIFFITHS: Adds that we don't want to be daunting, even if we are asking them to come for a live Q&A.

BOYER: Suggests providing them with what we intend to ask to make it less scary.

COMMITTEE: Decided to ask the applicants if they are comfortable talking and give them options to answer over email or on a zoom call and, meanwhile, have them fill out the budget template. Decided to ask them how they would sustain the project after receiving the funding.

2022-03/3b

[SCF Green Fund Application #4](#)

STEINBUSCH: States that it seems to be a one-time thing and wonders if they have plans to grow these with time.

FLAMAN: Agrees and adds that they have no revenue and are asking for all the money from this application. Wonders if this could also be funded from other sources or if this application is their first stop towards funding.

VILLOSO states that it is just one person organising this, not a student group.

JOHNSON: Points that the speaker fee is a lot and questions if this is a rough cost.

VILLOSO: Adds that there are protocols to follow when having an indigenous person speak, and it depends on what event it is for, whom you ask, and what is considered a good honorarium. And hence things that \$2000 roughly seem right.

JOHNSON: Questions if \$2000 is still good for the other two speakers.

BOYER: Adds that we can't assume them to be indigenous. Points that we can't expect them to be charitable for this event, and students will hopefully take back the shared knowledge rather than questioning that the event could be cheaper.

SAWYER: Points that it is an expensive project.

VARELA: Thinks that the applicant just tried to make the budget reach \$10000. Points that there is no budget allocation for rental rooms or the event's location. Adds that he has never seen a translator in french for events that have taken place in Edmonton. Doubts about their budget's accuracy

COMMITTEE: Passes the application for the Round 1 of adjudication.

BOYER: States that the marketing budget of \$2400 seems unrealistic. A budget of \$300-\$400 looks like a reasonable marketing spend. An overall budget of about \$8000-9000 seems realistic.

VARELA: Agrees. There is no funding source or information on room rental or food accommodation. States that certain costs might not have been taken care of.

BOYER: Adds that it must be an on-campus event, and hence there is no room rent.

STEINBUSCH: States that the printing seems expensive and wants to check if they confirmed that number. Appreciates the translation efforts but wants to know how it will work.

Possibly they could also consider making some provision in the budget to accommodate translation in sign language.

VILLOSO: Thinks the translation could be in a document, but \$600 for real-time translating is affordable.

SAWYER: Adds that there might be alternatives on campus that cost less for speakers, and similar events could be done on a lesser budget.

JOHNSON: Points that it is not our place to tell them we can do the same event differently.

BOYER: Thinks that they may have begun planning months in advance and must have received quotes from the speakers to plan this event.

Wonders what post-event dissemination means and whether it involves conversing with individuals or creating a report.

STEINBUSCH: Suggests it'll be helpful to have a breakdown of each section of their budget.

GRIFFITHS: Think if they have a comprehensive plan to organise this, have the audience, and ensure that people attend this event.

FLAMAN: Wonders where on campus this event will be held as only student

organisations or departments can reserve rooms on campus.

COMMITTEE: Decides to send these questions to the applicant and have them answer these over zoom or email.

2022-03/4

INFORMATION ITEMS

2022-03/4a

[SCF Green Fund Application 2021/2022](#)

2022-03/5

ADJOURNMENT

VILLOSO: ADJOURNED the meeting at 5:02 PM.