The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students’ Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwaciwâskahikan (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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julia Villoso, Chair</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige Boyer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Burnstick</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Choi</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leena El Jirari</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Flaman</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himasha Rao</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pien Stienbusch</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Johnson</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Griffiths</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Sawyer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES (SCFC-2022-02)

2022-02/1  INTRODUCTION

2022-02/1a  Call to Order
VILLOSO: CALLED the meeting to order at 4:03 PM

2022-02/1b  Approval of Agenda
STEINBUSCH/GRIFFITHS MOVE TO approve the agenda of the meeting.
CARRIED

2022-02/1c  Approval of Minutes
TABLED

2022-02/1d  Chair’s Business

2022-02/2  QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2022-02/3  COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2022-02/3a  SCF Green Fund Application #1
VILLOSO: Declares that the first round of adjudication is to determine if the applicants’ objectives match the requirements for funding. Ask for feedback from members regarding the first application.

VARELA: Agrees with the social and economic parts.

STEINBUSCH: Agrees.

FLAMAN: Disagrees, as this fund is intended to support activities in their early phases, and The Gateway is not a student-led group; instead, students are deploying on behalf of an organization that has been around for a decade. Further remarks that it becomes more operational than a unique concept.

Observe that the sum they have requested is just half of the cost they would incur and ask whether they have any other means of generating revenue. Believes that their report lacks forward-looking preparation and is hesitant to fund it.

SAWYER: The Gateway makes a valid point about not having a quiet space for interviews, but the bamboo workstations are pricey, and the rest of their application doesn’t stand out.
GRIFFITHS: Seems to be okay with passing in the first round.

JOHNSON: Accepts the first round.

BOYER: Agrees on passing round 1 but adds that the second round requires a little more attention.

VILLOSO: After entering cycle 2, he says that they wanted to finish the project by the end of August 2022.

FLAMAN: Points that perhaps they don't genuinely need the money if they planned to finish it this year and aren't carrying out this project any further.

STEINBUSCH: Points that they may have discovered alternative funding sources.

BOYER: Wonders if they are taking action to buy products without fertilizers and other additives or if they are only putting words on the application to secure funds.

JOHNSON: Agrees.

COMMITTEE: Decides to return to ask members any questions they might have regarding this proposal. Upon receiving responses from The Gateway, they will decide further.

**2022-02/3b**

SCF Green Fund Application #2

COMMITTEE: Does not pass through the round 1 of adjudication.

**2022-02/3c**

SCF Green Fund Application #3

FLAMAN: Points out that they haven’t tried to find any funding from other sources, even though the Green Fund Application ought to be a last resort and not the only one.

VILLOSO: Clarifies that round 1 of adjudication is based on whether the committee members believe their project proposal would positively influence the campus' sustainability.

COMMITTEE: Passes the application in the first round of adjudication.

VARELA: Concerns about how they are confident of the precise sum of money required for this machine and whether or not they are purchasing the machine's rights.
BOYER: Surprised they're not demanding more money for an engineering project. Also mentions the fact that they are close to finishing, so it would be interesting to take a peek at where they are right now, as the figures might have changed.

JOHNSON: Curious to know if the group has any additional funding sources and, if so, what they are. Asks how, if they have just recently submitted their application, they have a functional prototype. Also, what “partnerships with Frats” entail and whether funds are involved.

COMMITTEE: Decides to resend these questions to the applicant to gain further context and clarity on specific points raised by members.

2022-02/4 INFORMATION ITEMS

2022-02/4a SCF Green Fund Application 2021/2022

2022-02/5 ADJOURNMENT
VILLOSO: ADJOURNED the meeting at 4:55 PM.