

Arthur Newspaper Board Meeting - Minutes

February 15, 2019

Meeting called to order: 5:01PM

Members present:

Max Niehaus (Treasurer)

Janette Platana (member-at-large)

Miranda Rigby (Secretary)

James Kerr (chair) *remote attendance*

Lubna Sadek (co-editor)

Cheyenne Wood

Leina Amatsuji-Berry (co-editor)

Maeve de Savoye (President) *acting chair*

Regrets:

Berfin Aksoy, Jiahe Fan

I. Introductions including pronouns.

- James asked for someone in local attendance to chair the meeting on his behalf, due to hearing issues during the meeting. Maeve agreed to take the responsibility.
- All present gave introductions.
 - Miranda Rigby, she/her
 - Janette Platana, whatever you'd like
 - Shyanne Wood, she/her
 - Maeve, she/her
 - Max, they/them
 - Lubna, she/her
 - Leina, she/her
 - James, he/him
 - Nipiish, dog

II. Approval of previous board meeting minutes from January 30, 2019 & opportunity to suggest additions to the agenda.

- Janette asked we add to the “other business” section of the agenda:
 - Recent developments re: the Head of the English department, a letter of support to be sent to the TCSA
- Miranda asked we add to the “other business” section of the agenda:
 - Staff list in the policies and procedures, suggestions
- Maeve agreed to add these to the agenda.

III. Role appointment of board members

- Leina asked whether the currently present board members who don't have roles would like to be assigned roles
- The Editors suggested that Janette may be most beneficial in the role of “Director of External Affairs”
- Janette agreed
- Miranda motioned to appoint Janette as a member of external affairs
- Max clarified that the official term in bylaws was “External Commissioner”, Board acknowledged this as being correct
- Max seconded, unanimous

IV. Approval of levy policy draft

- Editors inquired whether board members had reviewed the levy policy draft established by the levy policy group
- Maeve stated that it is a better document than was created before, Max agreed
 - Point of information, Miranda: How did the policy change?
 - Leina: fills a gap to explain how the levy group will act and how they will be held accountable
 - Point of information, Miranda: Has anyone looked to see the original document in the TCSA bylaws?
 - Most had reviewed it
 - Maeve: it explains to students how to refund if they don't know and supports them in understanding why not to
- Janette suggested that the document be renamed “Policies and Procedures” instead of “Policies”
- Leina stated that likely would be something reviewed and confirmed by the policy group, during later meetings
 - Point of information: Janette: Is there anything in place that makes it likely to be accepted by the TCSA?

- Lubna: it's to seek approval
- Miranda stated that it would be better to be specific as to who created the document and should add more detail in that regard
 - Maeve agreed
- Point of clarification, Miranda: Could you explain during this meeting who was involved in creating this document and why they decided to create it?
 - Lubna: the Levy Policy Committee decided it because there wasn't a document that existed, at least 15 people were involved in its creation
- Point of clarification, Miranda: Who has been chairing these meetings?
 - Leina: Mostly Sam McAndrew; couldn't find an external chair; writers included: Leina (Arthur), Lindsay Yates, Amy Blithe, Jill Stavely, Rob Hal, Allisa Paxton, and representatives from Trent Vegetable Garden, TISA, and Tegan Moss who helped but didn't do much writing
- Maeve stated it would be important to put names of who made the document
- Max stated that it would be important to amend the proposition for clarification and possibly end the document with a list of groups who contributed to the creation of the document
- Point of clarification, Janette: Are the colleges helping out this process?
 - Leina: the Presidents of Champlain, Gzowski, and OC were involved, and the VP of Lady Eaton
- Point of clarification, Miranda: What is the purpose of the document, considering the upcoming changes in the provincial mandate and TCSA's previous attempts at coordination?
 - Lubna: People [students] can refer to it, for consistency and accountability for the future
 - Point of clarification, Max: 6B4 states that all fees remain equal which could be construed for future leverage
 - Leina: Nona Robinson, VP of Student Affairs says they [Trent U] will support this document
- Point of clarification, Lubna: What benefit would come with adding "Procedures" to the Policy title?
 - Janette: "Policies & Procedures" make the documents easier to file for future use
- Point of clarification, Leina: Why "Procedures"?
 - Janette: It writes it into business language, it allows for it being revisited and updated, and makes it a living document
- Leina explained the part of the policy that describes it as a living document, she stated that a lot of "dilly-dallying bullshit" slowed us down, and some things still need to be added including a terms of reference written by similar people
- Point of clarification, Janette: What timeline was given to TCSA?
 - Max: March 1st, referendums, 6D states that TCSA doesn't exercise authority
- Miranda suggested a timeline for the budget submissions as all levy groups would have different policies for when their budgets need to be formed/updated, etc
 - Leina: Timelines are deeply implied but not explicitly said

- Point of clarification, Janette: Does it mention a definite timeline?
 - Leina: It's unclear around language, "most recent"
- Janette suggested further definitions around what accountability means, operationally define it; not about balancing books but about providing services, trying to move it away from quantity alone
 - Point of clarification, Max: Accountability is mentioned in section 2
 - Janette clarified that it's more about financial accountability, the impact on student experience needs to be acknowledged to be measured using data
- Miranda made a motion to bring forward the following suggestions from the board:
 - Add Procedures
 - Set timelines for budgets in section 7A
 - Explain who made this document in detail, like at the end
 - Amend the definition of financial accountability & impact (the difference between the two, only defining financial accountability)
 - Max seconded the motion, unanimous

IV. Updates from the Contingency Committee

- Miranda read the following document; additions, explanations, and Point of Clarifications added in bullet point form:

I have printed out two copies of the email I sent on February 2nd. For anyone who was in the middle of school work, work-work, etc., please feel free to look at the email. It is the best document, thus far to explain what the plan is for the Contingency Committee.

Thus far, we have two members for the contingency committee: Lubna & myself. Technically, this fulfills the criteria for Policy 5.2.2, as the paid staff member is Lubna and I'm an active member of the board. I've written this update based on the assumption that the editors have been busy working on production and haven't been able to fulfill the requests I initially made, but later in my update I welcome their input in case any of the requests have been fulfilled or are in the process of fulfillment.

Since we are in the process of accumulating members, we have not had an official meeting of the Contingency Committee. Discussions were in the works about an informal meeting last week, but it did not happen due to poor weather conditions and scheduling.

With the assistance of the Editors and the Chair, we were able to draft a mandate for the Contingency Committee. All board members had access to make comments on the Google Doc I sent out last Friday, February 8th. All edits were made on the first day the document was sent out and I want to thank James and the editors for all the assistance they gave in creating a more politically minded and official document.

I have sent emails to both Dwayne Collins and CUP. Dwayne did reply about an interest in helping Arthur. He has explained that he is still in the process of handling Arthur's archives in his current position (with the Trent Archives). I haven't had time to meet with Dwayne yet. CUP hasn't responded to my email.

- Point of Clarification, Maeve: What is CUP?
 - Max: "Canadian University Press"

I have spent a fair amount of time researching grants that might be applicable to *Arthur*. Most of the time spent was in weeding out those grants which are for "for profit"-based organizations and focused most of my time on Media based grant opportunities. A few examples of the grants I looked at are:

1. **"Canada Media Fund"** (specific to tv and digital media), closed for applications
2. **"Aid to Publishers", Canadian Periodical Fund** (specific to print media but only with a 12 month regular publishing schedule), closed
3. **Canada Council for the Arts**, not applicable because their funding is mandated to go to profit-based models with a minimum revenue of \$50,000 (har har)
4. **Ontario Trillium Fund***, we fit well [within their mandates](#), but no grants are currently open, *we should register ASAP* so that when grants do open, *we can apply*

Some of the general issues I had in finding grants for not-for profit newspapers:

A lot of media funding is specific to “digital media” and magazines, very few funding channels for newspaper (ex, Ontario Creates). One future solution might be to hire more staff based around online and digital content, so that we can access this funding. However, this likely would mean that we would need to adapt our policies and do this in consultation with the membership.

The Ontario Trillium Fund is the most optimistic option in regards to potential funding. We fit under four of their six investment categories: “Connected People” (inclusivity and community engagement), “Inspired People” (arts, culture and heritage), “Promising Young People” (engaging youth in community), and “Prosperous People” (focus is on staying employed and economically vulnerable people). We could even argue for the last two (active people and green people). Since our mandate is similar, I think we should start the registration process if the board is satisfied with this. We also may choose to table it, if the board wishes to look into the organization, however from initial glance I don’t see any issues with these grants, re: taking control from the members/editors of Arthur.

Re: our task list: for the email I sent out last week:

Number 2 (adding an Editor to the committee) and Number 3 (creating a mandate) has been completed! This a few tasks which hopefully the Editors can update us on, *right now!* :)

For speed of process and to assure we go through this meeting with relative ease, I ask that you simply state: 1. Not started, 2. In progress (and where), 3. Completed:

1. Budgets from the last 3-4 years, including actuals - *completed and to be forwarded*
2. Publication of the mandate and request for members (*Did not publish in the paper, but has been sent out to staff*)
3. Advertising actuals for this year (completed and to be forwarded)
4. Cost of publication per page set: 8, 12, 16, 20 (in process + where in process - *in the process, we have completed a cost per page based on a 16 page issue, which is the usual*

number of pages, we had 3 issues of a 12 page paper. We will forward the cost per page when completed for 1, 12, and 20 in the future.

- Point of information, Miranda: Do we pay a separate charge for colour?
 - Leina: Colour is included and can be utilized for four pages, per paper.
- 5. Update of interest in contingency committee membership, re: last story meeting - *so far we have interest from our business manager who worked on the cost per page, and actual costs thus far*
- 6. Specific to Lubna, future meeting time of Contingency Committee? (after story meeting? before story meeting? after board meeting? a completely different time?) *Now that we technically have three members with the interest of the business manager Dominic, we can meet at a different time this week due to reading break, and after reading break we can schedule it according to availability and if we have more members on board from our staff/collective, we can schedule committee meetings around story meetings or any other weekly arthur meeting to ensure maximum attendance*

You might notice that in our task list, I have not added a section for future hiring models.

Although, I do think it is a priority to look through 3.1 (Forms of Employment) in our P&P document, I had noted in my previous email that it's ultimately not up the Board as to whom should be hired. This is a priority, but not on our current task list. We can open up the floor for suggestions, which I will gladly record. I've brought copies of section 3.1 for interested parties, but specifically not included this during our update for timing reasons.

I (Lubna) agree with this, perhaps in our first official committee meeting we can start drafting different hiring models to accommodate new budgets

- Lubna also stated that the editors would appreciate in addition to this, a hiring structure that allows for a 50% and 25% budget, so that we know when the paper cannot be produced
- Max added that we need to know the minimum budget and process for reorganization
 - Point of clarification, Miranda: Since the budgets are created in the beginning of the year, we'd likely only need a process for alterations mid-semester/mid-term in case what was budgeted is no longer affordable

- Janette added that some funding might be available from the New Seniors Grant, utilizing the Trent Centre for Aging, this grant has a June deadline; West End Phoenix [a community paper in Toronto] was able to secure some funding through this route
- Max also found some funding from the Government of Canada for Community Support, Multi-culturism, and Anti-Racism initiatives
 - Miranda recommend Max send the grants found

V. Any other business

Janette brought up the Canada Summer Job applications:

- Update: We applied for funding for archivist positions and other funding for the summer, Lubna and Janette worked 2-8 hours over two days because they were rushed to finish before the day of the deadline. They needed to improvise for some aspects. Committed to 3-4 events in the summer, to publish once over the summer month (Issue zero).
- Funding for two “coordinators” and 6 “writing interns” (one could be archivist), working for public writing related events, generating content, covering literary events, putting out a publication.
- Allows for an earlier start time for the editors, have content, production, possible for staff to get content ready for a “levy edition” for Issue Zero
 - Lubna added that it would utilize content from the levy group meetings and it would facilitate outreach and communicate functions of levies
- Max brought up Young Canada Works for possible funding/sponsorship, because they offer money for internships and jobs
- Point of clarification, Miranda: Likely what will have to happen in reference to these jobs is that we’d have to write new policy. If we want to have summer jobs, we have to realize the editorship finishes by May. Anything published in the summer could be up for further scrutiny and we wouldn’t have our policies backing us if the position titles didn’t follow the ones we have in the fall/winter term. It’s important that we follow our bylaws/policies or create new policies about summer funding, so that we don’t seem like we are creating jobs for ourselves or harming the ability for other editors to run.
- Janette mentioned that it wouldn’t be a fully operational paper, as there would be no editors; the summer months would mostly entail festival appearance
- Lubna stated if the funding was achieved that hopefully the loophole would be the title of “coordinators”
- Maeve suggested that once elections happen, no matter if the editors are new/old, it would be those editors who take over the paper for the summer
- Lubna stated that she 100% agree that we shouldn’t encourage favouritism; she said it would be great to be re-elected and to collect content in the summer
- Maeve stated for timing reasons we should table this issue for later discussion; first step, application is completed, second step is if we get the funding, and third step is that we can talk about policies and procedure later; this is all we can do right now

Janette brought up a discussion that was recently had with the department heads (English Lit first, Cultural Studies possibly later):

- Janette explained that collegeheads/principals are trying to figure out how to retain funding and have decided that “academic support” is the golden ticket; if the writers and the editors agree, we may have the opportunity to acquire a plan where the writers and editors get credits toward their degree, either through running Arthur for the year or writing for Arthur, likely developing their thesis over the summer or working on research creation for their masters in English (public texts)
- Point of information, Maeve: If students get academic credits, does that still make us not-for-profit?
 - Lubna: I don’t know, I don’t think it’d be a problem, but we’ll have to look into it
- Janette explained that this would be a formal agreement, not an internship; we would be an experiential learning site, with a supervisor and a core supervisor
- Maeve expressed that it would be beneficial for the writers to accumulate grades for their writing
- Leina brought up the agreement that was made this year with a second-year Cultural Studies course; students were asked to attend meetings and write an article for an assignment worth 10% of their final grade; Liam Mitchell, the chair of CUST also stated he’d do whatever he can
- Janette stated so will English
- Maeve stated we need to outline whether it would be an assignment or credit
- Janette said there would be a lot of trade off and cross listing, discussed motioning to say to ENG that we were open to being a for-credit listing in the realm of experiential learning
 - Leina, Point of Information: what needs to happen to pursue this further?
- Janette said that Brandon has asked for confirmation of Arthur being for-credit for English undergrads
 - Cheyanne, Point of Information: Only open to English Students?
 - Janette stated no, it’s likely to be listed as creative non-fiction and open to English, Cultural Studies
- Max stated pending a thorough overview they’d be in favour
- Janette motioned to describe Arthur as an alternative placement site for experiential learning in undergraduate/graduate English credits for students pending a mutual agreement of course descriptions by Arthur and the English Department, in order to provide academic support for Trent students
 - Max seconded

VI. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 6:58PM
 - Motion made by Max, seconded by Janette