

SAF Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Thursday, July 30th, 2020

[ONLINE]

Meeting Time: 13:00—15:00

Meeting Facilitator: Timir Baran Roy

Meeting Minute Taker: Alexia McKindsey

Members in attendance:

Sebastián Di Poi (SAF)

Olivia Champagne (SAF)

Rebecca Black (SAF)

Stefan Hodges (Student-at-large)

Brett Cox (SC)

Katherine Parthimos (FASA)

Holly Mark-Hilton (CSU)

Roy Singer-Shay (CSU Council)

Jordan Landers (CASA)

Payton Mitchell (ASFA)

Members absent:

Julien Golbaghi (ECA)

Emma Campbell (Concordia Community)

Krista Jäger (GSA)

Ariel Dabora (SAF)

1. Call to Order & Land Acknowledgement

- Timir reads land acknowledgement.

2. Review and Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve the June 25th, 2020 meeting minutes:

- Moved by: Brett
- Seconded by: Roy
- *Motion passed.*

3. Review and Adoption of Agenda

Motion to approve the July 30th, 2020 agenda:

- Moved by: Stefan
- Seconded by: Jordan
- *Motion passed.*

4. **SAF General Updates**

a. Welcome new Board members!

- We have two new Board of Directors members: Payton, ASFA's Mobilization Coordinator and Holly, the CSU Finance Coordinator.

b. Board resignation

- Based off of Article 4: Directors; 1.4 in our Constitution—Malo has automatically been resigned from the Board of Directors due to his unexplained absence in the last three Board meetings and due to a lack of follow-up when contacted.

c. Re-registration (Student ID's needed)

- SAF has to re-register as a student group and is in need of everyone's student ID's (the SAF contact sheet currently only has Board of Director member's phone numbers).

d. BoD mandate renewal

i. Individual contract to be made in the next month

- We will start planning for our AGM—to be held most likely the first week of October.
- Seb will reach out to the current Board members individually and ask if they would like to extend their term and remain on the Board for the upcoming year.
 - Holly and Payton will be ratified as Board members at the AGM so this doesn't apply to them, but an extension of term will apply to current Board members who have already done a term.

e. Living Lab funding program delay

- The university has scheduled a Board of Directors meeting where they will be finalizing their budget for the year (including funding for the Sustainability Plan that supports our Living Lab program)—the Living Labs program can't be formally planned before that meeting takes place.
- SAF wanted to line it up with the university's Sustainability Plan, but it looks like we won't be starting the Living Labs program until mid-way through the Fall.
- In the grand scheme of things, the amount Concordia is providing towards the Living Labs program is very small and they have already decided that it will be component within their 5 year Sustainability Plan.
 - There is no risk that we will not receive that funding—it just needs to be formally approved and that will happen a little later than we anticipated.

f. Staff vacation

- Seb will be taking time off from August 10th - 16th—will be disconnected for the most part, but he can answer urgent emails.
- Rebecca will be leaving town this Sunday for three weeks—she will continue to do some work and will be reachable.
- Olivia is taking a Monday & Tuesday off two weeks from now—she will be the most reachable of all the staff.

7. Committee Updates

a. HR

i. Hiring for Ariel's position

- Ariel will be leaving his position in the next month and half—he is currently revising his job posting.
- Hiring will go through the HR committee.
- We will also work through specific points addressing employment equity, diversity and inclusion, which will be discussed and finalized with HR.
 - This will be voted in during the next Board meeting.

ii. Hiring policy

- We have been thinking about expanding our Board positions to include faculty/staff/community members.
 - As we expand and gain more support from exterior sources and university faculty and staff, we feel like we need more representation on our Board to speak to these stakeholders.
 - HR committee decided it would be best to expand our Board to encompass these stakeholders in order to sustain these long term Living Lab projects.
- We currently have two spots in mind—one Director pulled from the Concordia community and one Director pulled from staff/faculty.
- This will be formally voted upon at the AGM.

b. SPC

i. Election of new BoD Member to SPC Committee*

- With Malo now resigned, we need another Board member to join the SPC.
 - SPC reviews applications before they go to the Board of Directors meeting. SPC verifies that project applications are clear and will request additional information if not, they make funding recommendations that will be brought up at the Board meeting and if a project requests \$1,500 or less, the SPC can make a funding decision on it in order to lighten the work load of the whole board when it comes to meetings.
- If someone is more inclined to be on SPC than another committee they are already on, they can switch committees or take on two different committees (although not advisable).
- Olivia can do a callout if no one is immediately interested.
- The work done on this committee is more pressing than other committees—participation is very important.
- Payton would be happy to join this committee!—SPC will bring her in for their next meeting.

c. Fincomm

- No updates to note.

d. Marketing/Outreach

- No updates to note.

e. SDC

- SDC is currently in the analysis phase
- SDC went through SAF's previous Strategic Directions in order to verify which directions would be necessary to keep and which directions we could drop.
- Our last meeting went through the SWOT analysis—allows us to figure out the wording of our new Strategic Directions.

6. **Project Funding Allocation (9)**

~\$111, 200 left to allocate (\$61,936 being requested this month).

Project 1: iGEM

- Requesting \$1,615.
- SPC recommends to fund \$1,415.
- Presented by Jordan.
- Project consists of a a conference addressing synthetic food production and its safety implication environmentally and socially.
- The project's funding request is a fairly small ask—Olivia pointed out in the SPC meeting that this kind of project can have a lower carbon footprint but can be less nutritious.
- Their budget line for Facebook advertisement is a bit high—could be decreased by \$200.
- The project hasn't sought out funding from other funding sources.
- Overall, the SPC thought this was a good project—their recommendation for \$1,415 includes removing \$200 for the Facebook advertising.
- Roy: Thinks it's a good project to fund.
- Brett: Agrees—supports project and the SPC suggestion.
- Katherine: Agrees with removing the \$200 Facebook advertisement.
- Q (Roy): How much money do we have left to allocate? A (Olivia): We restarted our funding with the new fiscal year and some of the previous projects we had allocated funding to got cancelled because of COVID-19.
 - ~\$11,000 reallocated from cancelled projects.

- ~\$60,000 from our project funding budget—equals to about \$5,000 funded per Board of Directors meeting.
- Remaining \$40,000 from the project funding budget will be allocated to the Living Labs program.
- We have a total of ~\$71,000 available for project funding for the year.

Motion to allocate partial funding of \$1,415 to iGEM.

- Moved by: Roy
- Seconded by: Brett
- *Motion passed*; all in favour.

Project 2: VOLTA

- Requesting \$1,750.
- SPC recommends full funding.
- Presented by Seb.
- Project consists of a community fundraiser and online experience dealing with Afro-poetic futurism—event to be held on August 27th.
- SPC had good comments to say about the project, except we didn't have the finalized application draft to review—project was submitted last minute.
- Project has a small funding ask considering their entire budget and they have strong ties to the university.
- Project mainly wanted funding for honoraria (artists, interpreters, translators, etc.)
- Olivia: They are pretty well connected with the community—it is clear the project is run by students.
- Roy: Project looks great—enjoys the effort they put towards accessibility.
- Katherine, Stefan and Payton agrees with fully funding the project.

Motion to allocate full funding of \$1,750 to VOLTA.

- Moved by: Katherine
- Seconded by: Stefan
- *Motion passed*; all in favour.

Project 3: Information Clinic For Her

- Requesting \$2,050.
- SPC recommends partial funding (~1,500).
- Presented by Olivia.
- Project consists of a collective of students who created an information hotline for women feeling isolated, in marginalized communities, and directly affected by COVID-19 across Montreal (priority on Parc-ex and Montreal-Nord regions).
- Project is placing posters, flyers and sending out mail in order to get the hotline distributed amongst the community.
- Their hotline provides resources in the form of financial support, domestic support, health care, and other essential services.
- SPC loved the initiative but didn't feel comfortable giving it full funding—we don't have too much money to give out in project funding and SPC wanted to consider the impact on Concordia students.
- The \$1,500 funding recommendation is just a ballpark number—not specific.
- Stefan: Likes the idea of the online platform and that they offer three languages—surprised there isn't already organizations in place offering this kind of support in these neighbourhoods.
 - Olivia: Believes they have knowledge of the community landscape through their workers.
- Roy: Supports the cause—feels partial funding is fine given how much we have in project funding allocations and while it may not have the most direct impact on Concordia students, it could have an effect on their families and communities.
 - Katherine & Brett: Agrees.
- Olivia: Initially told the project applicants to talk to SHIFT (they were offering a pandemic relief fund), but they missed the deadline.

Motion to allocate partial funding of \$1,500 to Information Clinic For Her.

- Moved by: Roy
- Seconded by: Katherine
- *Motion passed*; all in favour.

Project 4: Co-op BookStore Web Platform

- Requesting \$3,936.

- SPC recommends partial funding.
- Presented by Jordan.
- Project consists of digital bookstore platform and system in order to give books and course material to faculty, student and community members.
- They are a co-op fee-levy organization and they make revenues through sales—their fee-levy is taken from the Graduate student level and is larger than ours, but they pay rent for their space unlike other co-ops like the Hive.
- SPC liked the project itself, but had concerns over the organization’s questionable past financial decisions.
- Olivia: Feels skeptical about funding them due to some of their governance decisions—their starting wage is \$24 an hour and they recently increased it to \$28 an hour (\$4 jump this year).
 - Their financial statements show that they are now running a deficit.
 - Seems like they need this money because they didn’t plan for the future.
- Seb: They requested funding for the online bookstore platform license—this will be a recurring yearly fee.
 - Olivia: Funding this project could start a precedent where they request yearly funding from us.
- Roy: It might be good to offer partial funding, given they are part of the co-op community. Would like to see them be more successful but after attending their AGM, [Roy] noticed their financial presentation was confusing and sometimes wrong so the concerns brought forward by the SPC are understandable and we shouldn’t set this kind of precedent.
- Q (Katherine): How does this project reflect sustainable activity? A (Payton): Gives students access to affordable textbooks and course material.
 - A (Olivia): Most of the books they provide are specific to Concordia’s departments, except they do not carry material specific to engineering, sciences or JMSB. It’s a great resource but it is also limited. They also don’t profit as much as the corporate bookstore does and they support small publishing companies and make niche, hard-to-find books more accessible.
- Q (Roy): What would we partially fund? A (Olivia): We could fund \$1,312 for their first quarter payments.

Motion to allocate partial funding \$1,312 to Co-op Bookstore Web Platform.

- Moved by: Brett

- Seconded by: Roy
- *Motion passed*; Katherine abstains.

Project 5: School Schmoool

- Requesting \$5,000.
- SPC recommends to reassess with more information.
- Presented by Julien.
- Project consists of an agenda created yearly that centres around including and providing community resources and supporting artists.
- They need funding as they do not include advertisements in the agenda.
- SAF has funded them consistently for the past five years—they ask for \$5,000 each year.
 - We gave them less money last year as we noticed many of the agendas weren't being distributed the previous year—that has happened for the past two years now.
 - The agendas are very thick, heavy and bound in a way that makes them hard to open—could be why people are not readily taking them.
 - They use a sustainable printing company.
- SPC didn't know how they would be distributing these agendas given COVID-19 or why they'd be printing as many copies as they usually do given there will be no one on campus this coming Fall.
- Olivia emailed them about these concerns and they attached a more specific budget breakdown as well.
 - They are asking SAF to fund printing the agendas (1000 agendas at \$4.50 per agenda).
 - In terms of COVID-19 specifics, they are coordinating the project from their respective homes, communicating with the printing company via phone calls, and distributing away from campus at various community locations (Heads & Hands, etc.).
 - They are planning collaborations with community bookstores in order to offer local pickups and delivery at a small fee.
- Olivia: They do ask for a \$5 donation per agenda—this can pose a bit of an issue given we would be paying for the production of the agendas.
- Katherine: Agrees with printing less especially given the campus will be empty and agrees with partial funding to fully cover honorariums—the deduction can come out of the printing cost.

- Roy: Artists need money especially with recent resource limitations, but doesn't think 1000 agendas need to be printed—they won't be distributed.
- Olivia: They are only asking us to fund the printing.
- Q (Stefan): Didn't they mention distributing the agendas at various locations in the city, or providing it online? A (Olivia): They didn't mention placing the resources online and the email didn't further clarify.
- Rebecca: The project mentioned they would be tailoring their resources to focus on COVID-19. [Rebecca] loves the excerpts and materials in School Schmool—wondering if we can just fund a certain amount of agendas with the justification that they won't be as in demand as usual.
 - Olivia: Last year's decision was to fund half the agendas they would normally print and if they needed to print more copies, they could reapply for funding—although we still ended up seeing a bunch of their agendas sitting around on campus.
- Stefan: The agenda is not simply an agenda, it also has content. That content resonates with our sustainability mandate. While agendas can be disposable and devalued upon distribution, something like this can be important given the resources and content they contain.
- Olivia: Doesn't think SAF not funding them will inhibit their existence.
- Stefan: Concerned that we would be their biggest funder.
 - Olivia: We've always funded them for \$5,000 in past years, but given our directions changing (due to Living Labs), we can't really afford it anymore.
- Q (Payton): Can we distribute them in Frosh bags or reach out to other student organizations to distribute them? A (Olivia): They are against Frosh.
 - Payton: Frosh is happening online this year and they're mailing out bags of goods.
- Katherine: We could fund the printing of 100 agendas and ask them to reapply if they need to print more copies like last year?
- Olivia: This project is also in equal collaboration with McGill, but McGill doesn't fund them.
- Stefan: Concerned that they are involved with both universities but SAF would be funding most of the project.
- Q (Olivia): Do we want to give them partial funding because no one wants to deny them? A (Stefan): Sees it as being a valuable project.

- Rebecca: Wonders if we can have them put some of the agenda’s content online—we asked them this last year as well. The resources are what makes this project important and it would be nice to have them online.
- Seb: We could consider Katherine’s suggestion to fund the printing of 100 copies and ask them to apply for more funding if they need it—100 units would cost \$530.
 - Roy: Feels unsure about that possibility—if they decide to reapply asking us to fund online resources, would we feel more comfortable funding those? Could we fund 100 copies as well as ask them to reapply for funding the online resources? Would we be comfortable funding both suggestions?
- Holly: Enjoys the project, but is concerned about funding the printing if the agendas won’t be used to their full potential—would feel more comfortable with them reapplying with the incentive that they will put those resources online.
 - Payton: Agrees.
- Katherine: If an online option is not in their plan, we may not be able to tailor their application/project to encompass that.
 - Stefan: Agrees.
- Olivia: Looked up QPIRG, who is in partnership with them—no mention of the project on their website; McGill mentions them but the last mention was in 2015.
 - Their financial statements also haven’t been updated since 2015, in which they had a surplus of \$40,000 that year.
- Holly: We could find out how many people would want an agenda from them and go off that.

Motion to have School Schmoool reapply with the recommendation that they look into online option for diffusing the material found in the agenda, as well as suggest that they have people pre-order or request copies of the agenda rather printing an initial bulk amount in order to gage the number of agendas that they will distribute.

- Moved by: Holly
 - Seconded by: Roy
 - *Motion passed*; Katherine against; Stefan against.
- Olivia: If they have preset orders, they can also ask who has the capacity to pay the \$5 donation—SAF can fund those who don’t have the capacity to pay for the agenda.
 - Roy & Brett like the idea—Olivia will suggest it to them.

Project 6: Drink Happy

- Requesting \$5,105.
- SPC recommends partial funding (~1,000).
- Presented by Jordan.
- Resubmitted from last month—project consists of compostable bubble tea straws.
- Project addressed the concerns brought up in last month’s meeting:
 - The PLA material they are using for the straws are safe.
 - They are in the process of securing intellectual property for the product.
- SPC was unsure about how this project contributes to a culture of sustainability at Concordia but they wanted to support in some way.
- Seb: Important to mention—these straws are their first product but they want to create other products that also support sustainable living.
- Olivia: They are also planning on being a workers co-op.
- Q (Payton): What is the material? A (Olivia): PLA—a kind of starch that has a plastic texture. It is more durable than paper straws, which disintegrates when consuming drinks.
- Katherine: Doesn’t support project—doesn’t feel the creation of a product to sell to retailers should be financially supported by SAF.
 - Seb: SPC was also thinking about the project’s ties to Concordia—the project is run by students and the product distribution does tie into the downtown area surrounding Concordia, but we were concerned about the scope of the project.
- Olivia: The way the product would be distributed is that the customer would opt-in to getting the straw—when paying for their bubble tea, the customer would have the option to choose a regular plastic straw or to buy their compostable straw for \$0.25. It is a partnership, they are not selling to retailers.
- Q (Payton): Are the straws manufactured in Canada? A (Seb): Believes they are made in Ontario.
- Rebecca: This feels like kind of project that distracts from the real issues of sustainability.
 - Katherine: Agrees, they profiting off of selling these straws to clients—\$1,000 can be spent on something that affects a larger community.
 - Stefan: Agrees.
- Olivia: SPC’s rationale in the funding recommendation was to throw them a bone so that they don’t get discouraged.

- Rebecca: Feels like this kind of thing happens a lot with SAF now—are we funding projects just to support a student’s venture?
- Q (Roy): If our focus is on them developing into a co-op, would another student-worker’s co-op contribute to a culture of sustainability at Concordia? A (Olivia): Having students engage with building co-ops is in itself building a culture of sustainability at Concordia—it exposes students to work methods that are non-capitalistic and co-ops directly support students.
- Stefan: Thinks there are better projects that we could fund.
- Katherine: Thinks this project will only benefit the larger Concordia community if these straws were to be placed on and around campus, without asking for the \$0.25 fee to buy them.
- Roy: Even if they were to form a co-op, how many people would they be able to employ? What would be that impact? If we fund them, we could be funding a co-op that employs 5-10 people, as opposed to investing that same \$1,000 in a project that could potentially reach hundreds of students.
- Q (Seb): Are they in talks with District 3 or SHIFT? Feels like the project would fit within their scope. A (Olivia): They are communicating with District 3, but not SHIFT.

Motion to deny funding to Drink Happy.

- Moved by: Roy
- Seconded by: Katherine
- *Motion passed*; Jordan, Payton and Holly abstain.

Project 7: CEED

- Requesting \$7,480.
- SPC recommends to reassess with more information.
- Presented by Seb.
- Project consists of creating a documentary from start to finish with the topic being to analyze, challenge and critique the narrative surrounding Black lives and communities across Montreal and Canada in order to offer a candid view into the lives and communities of Black people.
- SPC mentioned that SAF has been funding a lot of CEED projects—they are a good team of people and they are quickly expanding.
- Seems like a large funding request, but when considering the grand scheme of making a documentary, it’s not that much—we have precedent through funding Cinemapolitica on similar projects.

- Olivia will follow-up with their honoraria breakdown—their application was submitted last minute and Olivia wasn't able to ask for feedback yet.
- Olivia gave them budget examples and breakdowns—their interns will be paid \$13.33/hour based off of a total of 120 hours for a 3 credit course; totals to \$1,600 per intern.
 - CEED has quite a bit of financial surplus—they may not need this money.
 - Their financial statements from last year showed that they have a larger fee-levy than SAF and that in 2019 they had a \$64,000 surplus.
- Q (Seb): Did they speak to that surplus or what they have been putting that into? A (Olivia): No, them having a surplus didn't come up at the SPC meeting.
 - Seb: Wonders what that surplus would be allocated towards to given they are expanding.
 - Mutual concern amongst Board members over them having too large of a surplus.
- Roy: Seems like a good project to fund but if they are able to fund it themselves, why are they asking us to fund it? Should we be funding them if they can fund the project themselves?
 - Seb: They are allocating \$2,400 from their own budget to fund the project—they are asking us for triple that amount.
 - Roy: Would be more comfortable with partial funding.
- Olivia: Their credited-internship opportunity would fit into our Living Lab structure—but since that isn't being launched until October, that wouldn't be an option right away.
- Olivia: We do have a strong relationship with CEED—doesn't think that relationship would be damaged by us not funding them this time. We also funded two of their projects last year.
- Q (Payton): Do we think the project would still happen and the internship opportunities would still exist if we don't fund the entire amount? A (Stefan): In their application, they mentioned that if SAF doesn't fund them, they would get that same funding elsewhere—that probably means they will be tapping into their own budget.
- Katherine: Would be okay with passing up funding on this project given everything we've funded today—we can't say yes to everything.

Motion to request more information from CEED before making a funding decision.

- Moved by: Stefan
- Seconded by: Jordan
- *Motion passed*; Roy abstains.

Project 8: CATSOCAA

- Requesting \$10,000.
- SPC recommends partial funding (\$3,000/matching).
- Presented by Olivia.
- Project consists of an eight-part online events series put on by the Arts Therapy department that will consist of BIPOC speakers tackling topics pertaining to systemic racism, mental health and creative arts therapies in order to facilitate discourse around diversity, inclusion and mental health in the department.
- Project is asking us to fund the speaker's honoraria.
- Stefan: The honoraria consists of \$1,000 per speaker for a two hour talk (per event).
 - Olivia: This amount is very generous—some events ask for \$2,000 because there are two speakers.
- Q (Roy): We funded a panel put on by them last year, does anyone know how much the honorariums were for that panel? A (Seb): \$150 per local panelist; \$250 per international panelist—these honorariums are significantly higher.
- Seb: Remote work should be taken into consideration—why is the honorarium so high?
- Stefan: The honorarium amount seems like more of a contracted work salary—they are allocating much more than a typical honorarium would.
- Roy: Could be due to the fact that they are professional speakers.
 - Stefan: Most professionals have established jobs and getting paid that amount for a zoom meeting is a bit much.
- Reb: Agrees that the honorarium is a high amount—wonders if their rationale for it is coming out of this movement to pay BIPOC the right amount for educating the public? Wonders if they are overdoing that sentiment and how they got to that number? Was this amount what the professionals have been paid before?
- Katherine: Doesn't think it's feasible for the SAF to afford all the honoraria which is unfortunate—would it be appropriate for us to suggest a lower honorarium fee?
 - Roy: Thinks we can offer them partial funding and they can choose to do what they want with it—this is a really important project and SAF should fund it.
 - Katherine: Agrees
- Payton: Wonders how much prior work the speakers are being asked to do or if they'll be providing materials during the event series—that could factor into the \$1,000 honorarium.

- Seb: They are also submitting to other funding sources—they haven't submitted to them yet, so they can adjust the requested amounts if necessary.

Motion to allocate partial funding \$3,000 to CATSOCAA.

- Moved by: Roy
- Seconded by: Katherine
- *Motion passed*; all in favour.

Project 9: Land as our Teacher

- Requesting \$25,000.
- SPC recommends to wait until Living Lab project funding is launched.
- Presented by Seb.
- Project consists of a five year research project started last May with the idea to explore land-based pedagogy for Indigenous youth.
- Project has three main objectives: knowledge generation, mobilization and translation.
- Seb: We thought this would be a strong project for the Living Labs structure.
 - They are asking for a lot of money—more than the project funding can support.
 - They have a lot of stakeholders in the University.
 - Living Labs is made for more robust projects like this one.
- Due to our being limited by the University's budget restrictions, we cannot decide on funding this project as a Living Lab until the program can be confirmed (October).
 - They would also have to submit to the Living Labs application, so our funding them for that program wouldn't be confirmed.
- They received funding from the SSHRC grant—\$330,000.
 - SSHRC is federal funding—only a faculty member is allowed to apply for that.
 - They have a Ministry of Education grant pending as well.
- This project will happen regardless of our support.
- Seb: Would be nice for us to show that we would support them for the Living Labs program—we can ask them to apply for that.
 - Doesn't feel like us not funding them now would derail the project.
- Roy: Thinks it's a phenomenal project and feels like SAF should be partnering with them. They fit in perfectly with the Living Labs program and [Roy] would love to give them an immediate yes for that.

- Seb: Their short-term goals are to recruit Indigenous youth to help develop the programming and take over the project in a medium/long-term period. Their long-term goals are to create a stable partnership with the University.
- Q (Katherine): Should we wait until the Living Labs funding gets approved or would we like to offer them some funding right now from our project fund?
 - Seb: Also wondering what would be a good option to take right now, as it is important for us to support this project. We could give them support now and greater support later, but if us funding right now won't affect them as much, we could just ask them to apply for the Living Labs.
 - Seb: It is important to consider that we have about \$5,000 to allocate towards project funding each month.
- Q (Stefan): Could this project fall under our Research Awards? Could we support them under that as a symbolic gesture in the meantime? A (Seb): Agrees, but the Research Awards for this year have ended and they won't open back up until November.
- Q (Katherine): Would it be a possibility to offer them money from the project fund right now, and then transfer that amount back from the Living Lab's fund in October? A (Seb): Could be risky and we don't want to start that precedent, as doing something like that could hinder us down the line—our funding is locked up for the Living Labs program.
- Q (Roy): How best can we let them know that we support their project and want to continue working with them? A (Olivia): They are looking for a partnership, we could let them know that this is unprecedented for SAF and we may required more relationship building initially.
 - Olivia can let them know that we love the project and that we are waiting to fund it.
- Q (Rebecca): Is there anything they need immediate funding for? A (Olivia): The project officially starts in September.
 - Stefan: They are asking for us to fund them for four years— a month or so may not affect how the project goes.
 - Olivia: Living Labs will start up in October or November.
- Seb: We could offer them partial funding as a way to show that we support them, as well as let them know that we want them to apply for the Living Labs program.
- Roy: They state in their application that they are doing online programming for now with the possibility of doing in-person gatherings in late 2020. Retreats are planned for 2021/2022.

- Stefan: These kinds of projects are usually slow to get going—doesn't think a few months without funding would hinder them. [Stefan] loves the project but doesn't think SAF will miss the opportunity to fund them in a couple months.
- Katherine: Thinks offering the possibility of being supported by the Living Labs is the appropriate thing to do—doesn't think it's necessary to offer a small amount of funding at this moment.
 - Stefan: agrees

Motion to table Land As Our Teacher until the Living Labs program starts, but let them know they have SAF's support in the meantime.

- Moved by: Roy
- Seconded by: Katherine
- *Motion passed; all in favour.*

Funded \$8,977 worth of projects this month—\$102,223 remaining in allocations budget.

7. Community Announcements & Ancillary Items

- No updates or announcements.

8. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the July 30th, 2020 meeting.

- Moved by: Roy
- Seconded by: Holly
- *Meeting adjourned at 2:55 pm*