

# SAF Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2021

[ONLINE]

**Meeting Time:** 13:00—15:00

**Meeting Facilitator:** Abraham Dawidziak Kiermaier

**Meeting Minute Taker:** Alexia McKindsey

## **Members in attendance:**

Sebastián Di Poi (SAF)

Oliva Champagne (SAF)

Courtney Witter (SAF)

Rebecca Black (SAF)

Dileep Ravi Kodira (CASA/JSMB)

Amy Nguyen (CSU)

Kelley Boileau (ECA)

Brett Cox (SC)

Cassandra Lamontagne (Staff)

Roy Singer-Shay (Student-at-large)

## **Members absent:**

Katherine Parthimos (Community)

Rebecca Tittler (Faculty)

Maddi Berger (FASA)

Jessica Di Bartolomeo (Student-at-large)

## 1. Call to Order & Land Acknowledgement

- *Quorum for this meeting was met at 2:18 pm.*
- In last month's meeting, we left off on a discussion surrounding Roy's prompts about land use, in general and on Concordia grounds.
- Olivia: Something that will affect Indigenous people in Montreal going forward is that there are new powers being given to STM officers. They will be given a sort of constable status which means they can arrest people in public transit. There have been lots of cases of STM brutality in the past. This new power will mean more accountability given to them, but it's also known that BIPOC people will be disproportionately affected by this, making it ultimately not a good move. The local CTV news has put out a good episode on the issue.

- Seb: The Greening Committee is one of the committees born out of the sustainability action plan drafting process which is composed of a collection of people looking at how we can ‘green’ up Concordia. The university is constructing a master plan as to how we interact with the land on campus and how we delegate spaces to different groups. There was missing representation of indigenous groups within this committee so we decided as a group to put a pause on the committee until we can have a more diverse representation of people at the table. [Seb] felt it was a good step to make sure all voices were heard and recognizes that this is a process that needs to go slower so that all can have the chance to voice their opinions.

a. **Sign up for next meeting**

2. **Review and Approval of Minutes**

a. **March 2021 BoD Meeting Minutes**

**Motion** to approve the April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting minutes:

- **Moved by:** Roy
- **Seconded by:** Dileep
  - In favour: Dileep, Amy, Kelley, Brett, Cassandra, Roy
  - Against: None
  - Abstain: None
- *Motion passed;* all approved.

3. **Review and Adoption of Agenda**

**Motion** to adopt the May, 26<sup>th</sup>, 2021 agenda:

- Moved by: Brett
- Seconded by: Roy
  - In favour: Dileep, Amy, Kelley, Brett, Cassandra, Roy
  - Against: None
  - Abstain: None
- *Motion passed;* all approved.

4. **SAF General Updates**

a. **Year end KPI Presentation!**

- The fiscal year ends in June 2020, so this is not a full and final report but we have enough information to determine how the rest of the year will progress.
- 66% projects completed a final report—a record!
- Qualitative Metrics:
  - Funded 93 events.
  - Engaged at least 3,108 students.
  - Engaged at least 5,766 people in total.
  - Engaged at least 139 faculty & 38 administration members.
  - Engaged 62 people per event on average.
    - These are great metrics especially considering these do not include Living Labs project reports.
  - Engagement:
    - 139 artists (76% of those identify as LGBTQIA+ and/or BIPOC)
    - Funded sustainable learning opportunities for 278 students who receive course benefits.
    - 148 volunteer opportunities at a rate of 31.5 hours on average per project.
  - Cost of stakeholder engagement:
    - \$17 to engage students—consistent with previous years.
    - \$380 per faculty—consistent with previous years.
    - \$1,390 per administration staff—big jump from previous years.
      - This number was closer to the faculty number in the past—it could be that administration staff are more difficult to get a hold of in the current times.
- Seb: What do you think about the possibility of breaking these metrics down further? For example, what kind of spending leads to the most engagement? Is funding honoraria reaching more people or something else? Could we tell a story by describing what expenses reach the most people?
  - Olivia: There was a big switch this year from us funding a lot of venues and food—those expenses would typically reach a lot of people because they are typically event-based

projects, but because events are not happening anymore we thought we wouldn't reach a lot of peoples this year, but that's not the case. This is something to consider!

- Global Annual Metrics:

- Faculties of funded projects:

- Fine Arts students funded projects were a majority this year at 52%—a first!
- Engineering (10%) & JMSB (13%) are quite smaller!

- All of these metrics are reported in the project's final reports and not the project applications.

- Faculties collaboration of projects:

- Lots more collaboration this year than usual.
- Arts & Sciences and Fine Arts tended to be more independent.
- JMSB and Engineering tended to be more multi-faculty collaborations.

- Total requested by project theme:

- Fair distribution.
- 'Waste' was higher this year.
- 'Energy, resources & technology' was lower this year.

- Total allocated by project theme:

- Themes of 'Health & Wellbeing' and 'Energy, Resources & Technology' were allocated slightly less this year—a deviation from what we normally see.
- Themes of 'Waste', 'Community', 'Education & Research' and 'Social Justice' were allocated slightly more this year.

- Multi-Trend Metric Analysis:

- Total allocated vs. total projects funded:

- 2018 - 2019: 55 projects funded
- This year: 27 projects funded

- Big deviation, but the total amount allocated was a lot more than the previous 6 years—not too much of a concern.
- 2016 - 2017: Big year for projects .
- 2015 - 2016: Similar to 2020 - 2021 but we allocated more money this year.
- Quantity of applications:
  - 2018 - 2019 & 2019 - 2020: Over 60 applications.
  - 2020 - 2021: 41 applications—this year is more in line to what we saw 3 - 5 years ago.
- Funding gap year over year:
  - Spike in 2016 - 2017 with over \$250,000 requested and in 2018 - 2019 with \$300,000 requested.
  - This year is much less with ~\$225,000.
  - We funded a record breaking amount on average: \$4,507 per project.
    - Usually this amount is \$2,500 per project.
    - We had a lot of big projects which caused a big spike!
  - When excluding the Living Lab projects from the average calculation, we are in line with the year-over-year trend.
  - The average amount funded per project has always been a consistent downward trend.

**b. Budget review \*Vote\***

i. [2020/21 Draft Budget](#)

- Seb: We can go through the budget in this meeting, have everyone ask the questions they need to ask and then proceed to an online vote.
- We went over the current operating draft budget with the finance committee and sent it to the Board members.
- The boxes highlighted red indicate pending amounts.
- Everything is similar to previous years and any expected changes are noted in the draft budget sheet.

- 

- Funding:

- An increase in enrolment and increase in opt-outs is still being projected.
- Funding for the Research Awards is pending.
- The second part of the two-year contract for the Living Labs will be coming through.
- This is the final year of our partnership with Bâtiment 7.
- We are seeing a continued low interest rate with a slight increase midway through 2022—this is not a lot and is different from the previous year.
- The boxes highlighted blue indicate a new budget line added for funding:
  - CCSL funding for the workshop series.
  - Canada Summer Jobs.
  - Lump sum donations for the Living Labs at \$50,000–10% is going to operating costs and the rest will go to funding.
- These added funding lines are the main cause of our jump in income.

- 

- Expenses:

- There is an added line in the budget for the workshop series.
- The project funding from our internal funding will stay the same.
- Living Labs is increased due to the lump sum donation.
- The internal projects event line will stay consistent.
- Everything else is consistent.
- Community contributions went down again given it went down last year as well.
- Total expenses were 58% last year and 63% this year.
- Payroll expenses:
  - Summer interns.
  - Projecting a 6% staff member increase (the maximum for each year).
  - We projected 33% for payroll this year, the actual number was 35%.
- Other expenses:
  - New budget line for the employee health insurance—\$315 per 3 employees per year.
  - We budgeted less for office expenses this year as we purchased lots of home office equipment last year due to COVID-19, so this year we will not need as much office equipment.

- Seb: The insurance amount is closer to \$415 - \$580—[Seb] spoke to the CSU insurance representatives and confirmed the increase.
  - Slight increase for health & wellbeing.
  - There is a discrepancy in the professional development line—we did not use this line as much this year due to COVID-19, but we decided to keep it as an expense as we anticipate staff will incorporate this more going forward.
- Slight deficit planned: \$7,000
  - This number is similar to last year and [Courtney] doesn't anticipate it will be that high once everything is finalized.
- 
- Q (Roy): Why are the phone and internet charges lower this year? Were we subsidizing these things this year?
  - A (Courtney): This will increase shortly as not all the staff have submitted their reimbursements for these items yet. We did start subsidizing internet and phone plans this year.
  - Seb: The university said we didn't have to say for these items anymore when the pandemic started.
- Q (Roy): Why are the expenses for the minute taking increased this year compared to what is projected?
  - A (Seb): There was an increase in Alexia's honorarium that was part of the contract update. The contract covers meetings and AGMs, as well as there was an additional 6 strategic meetings she took minutes for last year.
- No one expresses any more questions or concerns.
- If there are any other questions before the online vote is conducted reach out to Courtney!
- 
- *The vote was conducted at 2:27 pm.*
- Cassandra: Was not present for the budget presentation. [Cassandra] took a quick look at the budget prior and feels like the reasonable thing to do would be to abstain from the vote.

**Motion** to approve the 2020/2021 budget:

- **Moved by:** Roy
- **Seconded by:** Dileep
  - In favour: Dileep, Amy, Kelley, Brett, Roy
  - Against: None

- Abstain: Cassandra
- Motion passed; all approved.

## 5. Committee Updates

### a. **HR/Governance**

#### i. Recommendation to board re: staff term limits

##### 1. HR Meeting Minutes

###### a. Staff input

- Seb: The HR committee met a week ago and spoke more about the position term limits, not just for for the executive director position but potentially for all staff.
- The recommendation put forward by the HR committee was that all positions have five-year term limits. At that point the position would be opened up to the public for people to apply to the positions.
- The executive director position could be a four-year term +1 year for extenuating circumstances or a five-year term +1 year for extenuating circumstances. The HR committee decided to leave that decision up to the Board.
- Normally for part-time and full-time staff, the opportunity to potentially reapply to their position would apply.
  - As a staff we discussed it and felt okay with not having that possibility for reapplication. There is the possibility of issues occurring in that situation—it could put the staff member reapplying at an advantage, could be unfair to other applicants applying for the position and for the hiring committee conducting the hiring.
  - Therefore, once the mandate of a position is up, there would be no possibility for reapplication and there would instead be new people coming into the positions.
- The HR committee felt that we could get the Board's input into how everyone feels about this—no decision will be made this meeting, we just want to have a discussion about this.
- Roy: Thinks the five-year term limit is good, but is unsure which option would be best for the executive director position.
- Courtney: Included a link to the gross salary differences and costs associated with these term-limits in the Fincomm update point in the agenda. This sheet includes the full starting salary with the annual percentage increases.



- Included notes associated for the different options.
  - Included the calculations and differences for years 1 - 6.
  - The max additional cost for a 6% increase is \$8,594 for a 6 year term and \$5,561 for a 5 year term.
  - The minimum additional cost for a 2% increase is \$2,550 for a 6 year term and \$1,683 for a 5 year term.
- Seb: The one year added for extenuating circumstances wouldn't mean having to reapply for the position. The procedure is written out in the governance handbook and describes something along the lines of 6 months prior to the term ending, the executive director would have to give rationale as to why they should stay on, citing clear reasons such as partnership that needs to be seen to the end, designing strategic directions, etc. The Board would then have to approve the additional year.
    - Roy: Enjoys that process more.
  - Seb: Those examples are actual scenarios currently listed as reasons for the rationale in the governance handbook.
  - Q (Dileep): Would a new person coming into the executive director position be given a lower pay rate?
    - A (Seb): The way we've moved forward in the past is that if [Seb] leaves the position for example and was making a certain amount based on elevations, the next person coming into the position wouldn't start at the exact amount [Seb] started at, but would start somewhat a bit higher. This is also something that can be discussed at a later time. When considering inflation, a pay someone was given five years may no longer be appropriate for someone coming into the position.
  - Rebecca Black: We are constantly reevaluating this—what Seb is getting paid now wouldn't be what the next person gets. It's hard to say what that amount would exactly be, but we make those adjustments.
  - Dileep: Doesn't see a huge difference in the costs determined by Courtney's calculations.
  - Q (Dileep): When considering the term options, should we discuss this now or when we have quorum?
    - A (Seb): We can't vote on anything today, but [Seb] would like to hear what people feel comfortable with, that we can have a discussion around this change and come to a consensus.

- Brett: Is leaning towards the five-year term + 1 year option—in the situation that the executive director is starting at the same time as a part-time staff member, both of the staff members can leave at the same time and can help the onboarding process of new staff. Doesn't feel like there is a huge difference with both options.
  - Rebecca: All the staff members are pretty staggered at this point but there could always be a circumstance where staff members could come on all at the same time.
  - Seb: That was the third item in the rationale examples for the executive director staying on for an additional year: Many other staff have turned over at the same time and the stability of the organization is at risk.
- Roy: Whether we choose the four or five-year term option, the executive director should have that optional 1 year available.
- Kelley: Agrees with everything that has been said. Having that flexibility is important in the case that things do overlap and to ensure stability within the organization.
- Dileep: Also agrees with everything that has been said.
- Q (Abraham): Are we leaning towards the four or five-year term option?
  - Brett: The five-year term option.
- No motion is necessary for this at the moment and there is no rush to do an online vote. The discussion and consensus reached is appreciated. We'll hold on to this discussion and talk about it more at the next Board meeting and make a decision at that point.

## **b. SPC**

### i. Moving forward with amount guideline recommendation

#### 1. [See document here](#)

- We had a discussion about the funding amount guidelines—we will be putting new guidelines on the SAF website.
- This was something suggested for the Living Labs projects and was something we used to have on the website.
  - The guidelines suggest that Living Labs projects requesting \$10,000 or more have 50% of their total project expenses funded by another funding source.
- These guidelines are not harsh rules but the point of them is to encourage applicants to look for other sources of funding instead of looking to fund their projects completely with the SAF.

- The guidelines also give examples of projects we typically see and the funding amounts they request—short-term projects and one-time events are usually projects that request \$1,500 in funding for example.
- These guidelines will be on the website in next couple months!
- Roy: Thinks this is great! Doesn't enjoy seeing projects ask for funding solely from the SAF—there are lots of great funding sources available on campus to apply to.

### c. Fincomm

- i. [See above budget](#)
- ii. [Meeting highlights here](#)

- These are the notes from the Fincomm meeting.

- iii. [Extended term limit costs](#)

- This link includes the costs associated with the term limits

### d. Marketing/Outreach

- i. [Instagram takeover](#)

- The instagram takeovers are doing good—follow us on Instagram!
- The Mango Lemon Soda film is coming up—they are filming and will show behind the scenes of the process.
- Mind.heart.mouth. will take over the instagram next month.

### 6. [Project Funding Allocation \(4\)](#)

#### a. **General Project Funding Budget:** [amount missing]

- \$5,790 being requested this month.

#### b. **Living Labs Project Funding Budget:** [amount missing]

- \$0 is being requested this month.

## Project 1: JMSBG (Updated)

- Requesting \$160 (amount increase to \$225).
- SPC approved funding.
- Olivia: The original amount of \$160 was approved by the SPC but the item we will be funding (the case for the competition) was increased to \$225 last minute. Just as we made the decision at the SPC meeting, the project applicants sent us an email saying they changed the budget. Instead of having them submit a project revision request, we thought we'd have it re-approved in this meeting.
- Seb: They are just asking for an additional \$60—typically with that amount [Seb] or Olivia would approve it.

**Motion** to allocate an additional funding of \$60 to JMSBG.

- **Moved by:** Roy
- **Seconded by:** Brett
  - In favour: Amy, Kelley, Brett, Roy
  - Against: None
  - Abstain: Dileep
- **Motion passed;** all approved.

## Project 2: Education for Social Justice

- Requesting \$900.
- SPC rejected funding.
- Olivia: This project is being conducted by a gender and sexuality student who is teaching cuisine at a high school. The class will consist of making pies and will include a social justice educational component. This project seemed like it had potential, but the SPC felt like there was a disconnection between the act of making pies and teaching social justice topics. The pies are also going to be sold, as opposed to making the pies for sustenance and giving it to people in need. The high school is a private school located at the base of Mount-royal and the SPC didn't feel they needed our money.
- Roy: This project doesn't feel like a SAF funded project.

## Project 3: Urban Sprawl Map

- Requesting \$4,665.
- SPC recommends to re-evaluate with more information.
- Presented by Brett.
- This project consists of creating a digital map based on surveys taken from students to showcase urban sprawl in Montreal with the hopes that students and teachers will engage with map, see the effects of urban sprawl and take that knowledge to use it throughout their life when thinking about their living choices.
- Concerns expressed by the SPC:
  - Connection to Concordia students beyond the map—didn't see this as being super useful for students
  - Students are not known for being the cause of urban sprawl and a lot of the time student's living situations are temporary.
  - SPC also wanted to have a breakdown of the honoraria requested and how they arrived at those estimations.
- Overall, the SPC enjoys the project, thinks it is a good initiative and a good opportunity to educate students about such topics that they may not already be knowledgeable about.
- We sent back a request asking about the educational components of the website that will teach Concordia students about urban sprawl as opposed to just sharing statistics as well as a more in-depth breakdown of the honoraria.
- The response the project applicant sent:
  - They are planning on including a slider to show how urban sprawl has developed over the years in Montreal from 1950 onwards.
  - Data on socio-demographic variables will be included to offer users a better understanding about why urban sprawl occurs and to help students make decisions about how and where to live sustainably.
  - The map will identify transit-accessible areas compared to areas only accessible by car, services, grocery stores, etc.
  - This map will also be included in a Concordia seminar course that has 70-80 students per year. A lecture and assignments given by the course will require students to use this map.
    - Brett: This is a huge reach and answers a lot of concerns in terms of the educational components.

- The project applicant made some mistakes in terms of the honoraria—\$6,500 will be more appropriate instead of the original \$6,430 amount. This is based on the minimum wage of \$19/h.

*Cassandra joins meeting at 2:18 pm—quorum has been met.*

- The project applicant created an interactive web map for a previous course—this honorarium amount is based on the amount of time taken for that previous experience, though more time has been added to compensate for exploration of the tools and coding needed to fulfill the project.
  - Is expecting more time needed for this project than the previous assignment.
  - The project applicant will ask other team members for advice.
- The project application is unsure if they've given themselves too much time or too little time for the project, but after discussion with other coders, they came to the conclusion that it was a good time frame.
- Allocated under 2 weeks for data preparation—wanted to give themselves enough time to configure out the best way to incorporate this data.
  - Will collaborate with other team members for this component
- 180 hours of part-time work will be allocated for the coding process.
- The project applicant will be taking a week off from June 28 - July 2 because they are moving.
- Two weeks at 40 hours will be allocated for the web map launch and will include fixing bugs, figuring out platform and uploading the map.
- 20 hours will be allocated to preparing for the web map launch event and to make sure everything is running smoothly.
- The project applicant attached an updated version of the budget with more details and a letter from the professor who will be incorporating the map into the course with plans as to how they will use the map for the course and lecture.
- Dileep: Everything seems pretty clear now and the time allocated is reasonable—this is a super detailed response!
- Roy: Cleared up every concern [Roy] previously had with the application— a very thorough response!

- Brett: Clears up concerns [Brett] had also has as an SPC member.

**Motion** to allocate full funding of \$4,665 to Urban Sprawl Map.

- **Moved by:** Roy
- **Seconded by:** Dileep
  - In favour: Dileep, Amy, Kelley, Brett, Cassandra, Roy
  - Against: None
  - Abstain: None
- **Motion passed;** all approved.

**Funded \$4,725 worth of general projects this month—[amount missing] remaining in the allocations budget.**

**Funded \$0 worth of Living Labs projects this month—[amount missing] remaining in the allocations budget.**

- Now that we have made quorum, we will go back and approve the previous motions.
- Abraham: Will it be a good idea to approve the budget?
  - Seb: Thinks it will be okay to approve, Courtney had sent the budget out to all the Board members a week ago, so everyone has had an opportunity to look at what was presented and all questions asked in this meeting were answered.

7. **Community Announcements & Ancillary Items**

a. **SC Event (workshop) happening tonight! - [Planting Seeds of Equity: Uprooting Injustices](#)**

- This is a workshop happening tonight with the purpose of focusing on micro-aggressions, racial gaslighting and how it leads to race-based trauma.
- We will explore these topics and how they manifest in our lives, develop a shared understanding and be introduced to skills required to work towards an equitable and anti-racist worldview.

b. **CEED X JSEC Social Economy Entrepreneurship pitch contest/mentorship**

- i. [Details here](#)

- CEED and JSEC are putting on a pitch competition to win mentorship opportunities and resources to help develop projects. Olivia will be attending as a judge. It is not too late to apply—if you know anyone who is starting a project in social economy, tell them to apply!
  - Rebecca Black: The deadline to apply was May 23.
- Abraham: Some key points that stood out in the land acknowledgement today dealt with the STM gaining new power and impact that will have on the homeless community, as well as the Concordia greening committee and how it wants to involve more indigenous student voices.
- Cassandra: In terms of campus space, [Cassandra] wanted to report back on what the greening committee was up to and present a territorial acknowledgement through the lens of sustainable land use. [Cassandra] doesn't have anything specific to say about Concordia land use except the greening committee, which there has been discussion on this meeting.
  - Abraham: We will kick off the next meeting with that discussion.

## 8. Adjournment

**Motion** to adjourn the May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting.

- **Moved by:** Dileep
- **Seconded by:** Roy
- *Meeting adjourned at 2:34 pm.*