Food System SPF Policy -- in collaboration with the Sustainability Action Fund

Context

In 2013 and 2014, the CSU ran two referendum questions about food systems development on campus. The first asked students if they want students to support the new student run food system projects on campus, and the second asked students if they approve of the use of the *Student Space, Accessible Education & Legal Contingency Fund* to fund student-run food-systems projects.

Both referendums received a resounding yes, and so this policy has been drafted to help facilitate the growth of a student-run community food-system on campus.

Definition of a sustainable community food-system:

A sustainable community food system is a collaborative network that integrates sustainable food production, processing, distribution, consumption and waste management in order to enhance the environmental, economic and social health of a particular place. (UC Berkley)
www.sarep.ucdavis.edu/sfs/def

Comprehensive Process for an applicant to follow:

i.   Set up a meeting with the CEO of the Sustainability Action Fund (SAF), and proceed to the next phase if the CEO considers the project to be a sustainable food-system project.

ii. Set up a meeting with the VP sustainability to determine whether or not the project fits within the framework of eligibility for the CSU's regulations. The VP may defer to another team member or staff member). Proceed only if the application has potential.

iii. Develop a plan of action in consultation with the CSU and the CEO of the Sustainability Action Fund. Once there is a suitable plan of action proceed to the next step.

iv. Present the plan of action to the Sustainability committee of the CSU, and the finance committee if requested by the Sustainability committee.

v.   Apply to SAF for funding. Proceed if funding, or conditional funding, is approved by SAF.

vi. Apply to the CSU for funding for approval. A reporting mechanism between the applicant and the CSU is to be set up if funding is accepted, and funding is contingent on a sufficient reporting mechanism.

vii. Receive funding.

viii. Report progress to the CSU/SAF as requested and established during the approval period.

ix. Receive additional funding if needed and approved by the CSU.

To be understood by the applicant:

i. The applicant is expected to take on the bulk of the work associated with any project that will operate independently of the CSU and SAF.

ii. SAF is a partner and will participate according to their own desires and capacity, but is a collaborator with the CSU on this ongoing granting process.

iii. The CSU is there to offer support in the form of information, guidance, and funding.

iv. The CSU may offer additional support (like developing financial infrastructure) if possible, but this is purely at the discretion of the executive team in office at the time.

v. The CSU is there to ensure that these funds will be foremost to the benefit of CSU members. It is encouraged that projects, where possible, also benefit the community-at-large.The benefits to the community-at-large can come in the form of access to the service, but are also expected to come from the sustainability practices of the food-service (sourcing, environmental impact, considerations for marginalized groups, etc.).

vi. Sustainability technologies used are expected to be at the cutting-edge, in order to help push innovation forward.

vii. It is expected that additional sources of revenue and funding will be vigorously sought out by the applicant, subject to the limitations of the resources of the applying organization.

viii. That it is beneficial for the project to involve multiple partners. Partners can also be passive supporters. It is best if the supporters are campus-based, though the CSU is not blind to that fact that we live in an interconnected society & planet, and thus welcomes and in some cases encourages external supporters on a case by case basis.

ix. Any expenses from the fund are subject to a 2/3rds vote of CSU council and a 4/5ths vote from the Fund Committee, as per the *Special Bylaws I and J*, as well as any relevant bylaws, regulations, position, and/or resolutions passed at a duly held General Assembly, Special General Assembly, or referendum.

x. Funding depends on a clearly established promoter group that the CSU can reasonably be confident will follow the project to completion, assuming early surveys and studies show the project to be worth completing.

xi. This fund is meant to act as a grant that would replace the need for organizations to rely heavily (or even at all) on loans from third parties.

Eligible applicants are:

i. Groups that are predominantly student-run this can mean that their membership is predominantly student, or that the board is predominantly student-run, or both. It is expected that as a minimum a majority of staff will also be students, and if they are not then it is expected that a clear emphasis on student involvement can be demonstrated.

ii. Groups that will remain student-run, or overtly Concordia student-focused overtime.

iii. They understand and agree with the stipulations outlined in the *to be understood by the applicant* section.

Introduction Phase
i. consultation with the executive (and or staff) and SAF -- this is primarily the purview of the VP sustainability (step 1).

ii. Limitations/guidelines are to be preliminarily set at this time based on the CSU's plans for the funds at that given time (they may vary depending on the year/needs of the CSU and it's membership as well as the influx of applications from Concordia student groups).
    i. limitations can include an absolute maximum of total funding that the CSU will be able to provide to a given project.

Role of the CSU in introduction phase:

The executive is there to work with the applicant to ensure that the project is ready to be considered by council. If the executive has deemed the project to be within the limitations of the regulations set out in this document, and the general by-laws/regulations of the CSU, then the executive will make recommendations to the applicant.

These recommendations could include, but are not limited to, that the applicant:

i. must return with additional information.
ii. must seek out additional funders.
iii. should seek out additional campus or external support and/or endorsements
iv. is ready for the consideration of CSU committee(s) and council.

Required sustainability components

i. educates the community about food justice, food politics, and the issues and weakness of our current food system.

ii.   ability to sustain student representation (must be demonstrated through support from key stakeholders at a minimum, and through a clearly established promoter(s) or promoter group).

iii.   must factor in environmental, social, and economic sustainability.

iv.   involving/inviting of the concordia community and community-at-large with specific emphasis on the community that geographically surrounds the local.

v.   be as accessible to students and community members as possible.

vi.   focus on the well being of students, rather than the generating of financial profit

Special considerations (and potentially additional funding) will be made for projects that have social considerations, such as:

i.   wheelchair accessibility

ii.   sliding-scale pricing, or considerations for those who are financially overburdened

iii.   support for student-parents

iv.   anti-oppressive mandates

Start-up support

Start-up support if approved can be expected in the following ways, though it is not limited to this:

- Preliminary funding (studies/surveys/etc.)
- Construction costs
- Long-term operational support (ex: 3-year decreasing funding cushion; 50 000, 35 000, 20 000, as needed)
- Access to our financial office for support (if available)