The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students’ Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwacisâwâskahikan (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, Haundenosaunee 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Griffiths</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Lam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Martel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishaan Meena</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn Thornley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon Atwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Fotang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karina Afonya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Call to Order

GRIFFITHS called the meeting to order at 2:06 PM

Approval of Agenda

CARRIED, Unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

SUSC-2023-02-M

ATWOOD/THORNLEY MOVE TO approve the minutes. CARRIED, Unanimously.

Chair’s Business

QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

New Rubric Approved!

Committee discusses the newly approved SCF / Green Fund Adjudication Rubric.

GRIFFITHS: Mentions the incorporation of the UN sustainable development goals as well as adding weights on each criterion.

Green Fund Applications

GRIFFITHS: Mentions that there are 5 Green Fund applications that the committee needs to review. Asks if the committee wants to discuss the applications together in a meeting or independently evaluate each application in their own time, submit the scores and then evaluate via e-vote.
Adds that when adjudicating the applications, the committee should be approving either the full amount in full or not approving the application at all.

ATWOOD: Asks about the scoring method the committee should follow in the rubric.

MARTEL: Suggests going through the applications in their own time unless the committee can find time to discuss the matter together.

LAM: Agrees with how the committee will proceed with the review of the applications.

THORNLEY: Agrees to review the applications independently online, unless the committee can find some time during the exam break.

FOTANG: Agrees to do the review online.

AFONYA: Agrees with the online option.

MARTEL: Suggests dividing the rubric into 5 sections where each member will send in their total percentages.

GRIFFITHS: Mentions adding a commentary with the scoring.

JONES: Suggests using Google Forms.

ATWOOD: Mentions that using a communal form can provide aggregate results that the committee can use for adjudicating the applications together.

GRIFFITHS: Asks the committee if it should provide written feedback on the applications before or after seeing the aggregate scores.

Adds that he will put together all the discussed points in a form including the timeline in an email. Reminds the committee to use the rubric for their adjudications including adding qualitative responses. The deadline is set at 8 AM Monday morning, December 11th for the first form, the 13th for everything else, the 18th to provide feedback and to vote between the 20th and the 22nd.
Next meeting: Lettucemeet to come out in January.