The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students' Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwacîwâskahiken (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></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige Boyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Burnstick</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Choi</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leena El Jirari</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi Flaman</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himasha Rao</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pien Stienbusch</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Varela Del Rio</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Sawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES (SCFC-2022-06)

2022-06/1 INTRODUCTION

2022-06/1a Call to Order

VILLOSO called the meeting for order at 11:05 A.M.

2022-06/1b Approval of Agenda

TABLED

2022-06/1c Approval of Minutes #4

TABLED

2022-06/1d Chair’s Business

2022-06/2 QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2022-06/3 COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2022-06/3a SCF Green Fund Application #4 & #7 Approval

2022-06/3b SCF Green Fund Application #5

VILLOSO: Aspects of environmental sustainability were rated. Waste reduction (0, 0, 3, 3); average score of 1.5. Other aspects were reviewed, such as waste diversion (3, 3, 2, 1), water efficiency (1, 0, 1, 1), energy efficiency (0, 0, 1, 2), clean energy production (0, 0, 0, 0), reduced use of nonrenewable energy (0, 0, 1, 2), biodiversity (1, 1, 2, 1), carbon sequestering (3, 3, 1, 3).

For social sustainability, the following aspects were reviewed and rated: physical accessibility (1, 0, 3, 3), cultural and language accessibility (0, 2, 2, 1), the aim of reconciliation (0, 0, 0, 0), protects human or labour rights (0, 0, 0, 0), financial accessibility (3, 3, 3, 3), wellness air (1, 1, 3, 2), wellness water (0, 1, 0, 0), wellness nourishment (3, 3, 3, 2), wellness light (0, 0, 0, 0), wellness movement (1, 0, 0, 0), comfort (1, 0, 0, 0), wellness sound (0, 0, 0, 0), wellness mind (1, 2, 1, 3), wellness community (1, 3, 3, 3).

2022-06/3c SCF Green Fund Application #6

VILLOSO: Aspects of environmental sustainability were rated: waste reduction (0, 0, 1), waste diversion (3, 3, 2), water efficiency (0, 0, 0), energy efficiency (0, 0, 0, 0), clean energy production (0, 0, 0, 0), reduced use of
nonrenewable energy (0, 0, 0, 3), biodiversity (0, 0, 0, 0), carbon sequestering (0, 0, 0, 0).

For social sustainability the following aspects were reviewed and rated: physical accessibility (2, 0, 1, 1), cultural and language accessibility (0, 0, 0, 0), the aim of reconciliation (0, 0, 0, 0), protects human or labour rights (0, 0, 0, 0), financial accessibility (3, 0, 0, 0), wellness air (2, 2, 0, 0), wellness water (0, 0, 0, 0), wellness nourishment (0, 0, 0, 0), wellness light (0, 0, 0, 0), wellness movement (0, 0, 0, 0), comfort (0, 0, 0, 0), wellness sound (0, 0, 0, 0), wellness mind (1, 0, 0, 0), wellness community (1, 0, 0, 0).

2022-06/4

INFORMATION ITEMS

GRIFFITHS: Wants a better way to evaluate projects, as the current rating system is rigid and usually results in low scores. Could instead discuss if the project would be beneficial.

FLAMAN: Could also have aspects of how many people will be impacted and how much. No objective way to grade scores, even with the current system, and an ideal grading method would remove biases.

JOHNSON: Finds it helpful to see how much funding the project will require. If the budget breakdown is analyzed, certain aspects of the project can be funded, and the basis for finding a better solution next year is created.

VILLOSO: One suggestion is to see whether the idea is thought out and if the project is a good venture for the fund to support. How much money should be awarded based on the score needs to be decided. A threshold pass/fail system with the committee voting could be a more expedient and accessible way to provide funding.

GRIFFITHS: The threshold for approval should be low, at around 50-65%.

2022-06/4a

All SCF Green Fund Applications

2022-06/5

ADJOURNMENT

VILLOSO adjourned the meeting at 11:57 A.M.