1. Chair’s Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and informed Council of the election period, noting that the nomination period had closed on January 15, with some positions reopened on January 25. He pointed members to the list of candidates and constituencies that required elections, which was posted on the Office of the Campus Council Website. The Chair reminded members that the voting period would begin on February 9 and end February 19.

The Chair also informed members that the Secretariat had received two speaking requests from non-members regarding Item 4: 2016-17 Operating Plans: UTM Service Ancillaries from Mr. Ebi Agbeyegbe, President, UTM Student Union (UTMSU) and Mr. Abdulla Omari, Director, UTMSU. The Chair granted the requests and advised members they would be able to make remarks following member’s discussion.

2. Report of the Acting Vice-President & Principal

Professor Ulli Krull, Acting Vice-President & Principal, advised members that Professor Deep Saini sent his regrets as he was currently accompanying Premier Kathleen Wynne on a trade mission to India. Professor Krull updated members regarding the university’s potential presence in Brampton. He advised that at the moment there had not been a large groundswell of support among faculty, and that specifics of proposed programming remained unclear in the absence of any detailed information being offered by the Province. He stated however that any presence in Brampton would likely
focus on new undergraduate and graduate programs rather than an extension of existing programs. Professor Krull mentioned that these possibilities included programs that might align with the strong manufacturing sector in Brampton, the presence of the Regional judicial courts and correctional facilities, and health-related programming and research aligned with the ongoing expansion of hospital and social work organizations in Brampton.

Professor Krull spoke about the outcomes of the Academic Budget Review (ABR) process, advising that UTM’s presentation to the Provost and Vice-President, University Operations had been very well received, with many initiatives being described as creative and having potential for strong impact. In these discussions at the beginning of December, the Provost challenged UTM to put forth internal funds to launch some of these initiatives, suggesting that this demonstration of investment would be deemed a significant signal. The decision was made by the UTM administration before the December holiday break to allocate an additional $1 million each year towards the implementation of a number of the priorities that were proposed to the Provost for support by the University Fund. In the Provost’s announcements of University Fund distribution in February, UTM was assigned $1 million in the Vice-Principal Academic & Dean portfolio, with further support of specific proposals that supported positions. The combined investments will support initiatives such as funding for pedagogical research and initiatives, the hiring of more learning specialists associated with the Robert Gillespie Academic Skills Centre, increased funding for support of undergraduate student academic initiatives (course development, instructional resources, seminars and guest speakers, conference travel, etc.), and bridge funding that assists graduate students and faculty in cases where gaps in sponsored research occur. Overall, Professor Krull informed Council that this budget cycle had been more positive for UTM in terms of allocations from the University Fund, compared to last year.

Professor Krull reported that UTM had begun a new initiative to design a system that would allow students to plan and integrate their experiential learning courses into their 4th year, similar to how they planned their regular program course load. This would allow students to create a comprehensive plan for their professional development throughout their entire undergraduate academic career.

Professor Krull reported that the Centre for Cancer Stem Cell Therapeutics, which was funded by the Canada Foundations for Innovation, the Ontario Research Fund and UTM, was working to design new therapeutic compounds, instead of searching for such compounds by sifting through collections of biomolecules found in the environment. He remarked that although the federal government tended to fund undergraduate, rather than graduate or research needs, he hoped that the exciting work done by researchers in the Centre would provide traction for improved science facilities at UTM in the near future.

Professor Krull also informed members that the Campus Linked Accelerator program was currently under review by the government and therefore at the end of the natural life of the program. He stated that most other institutions were looking to fund both operating expenses and positions, whereas UoT was the sole institution looking for operational funding since related positions had become integrated into the base budget.

Professor Krull also noted that UTM would be exploring a partnership with Amgen Inc. for a life science enrichment program at high schools in the GTA, and a partnership with Fielding Chemical Technologies for support of a major and unique sustainability project in Canada associated with development of solvent recovery systems.

In response to a member’s question, Professor Krull advised that UTM had contributed about $17 million to the University Fund in 2015-16. His estimate of the increment of the University Fund that will be received from the Provost is about $1.5 million this year. He noted a personal observation in the context of the current budget framework; in order to reach equilibrium of the University Fund contribution and return in a period of 20 years from the inception of the budget model that came into effect in 2007/8, UTM would need to receive at least $1 million annually as contributions to the base budget, and that this roughly reflects the present financial trajectory that is being experienced by UTM.

A member asked a question about transit in Brampton and whether improved routes had been announced. Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, advised that UTM had been in discussion with Brampton Transit since last year, and that UTM had put forward a proposal for the start of a pilot project. UTM is expecting to hear back from Brampton Transit within the next several months.
3. Mental Health in Residence: Mr. Chad Nuttall, Director, Student Housing & Residence Life & Ms Heather Burns-Shillington, Personal and Student Family Life Counsellor

The Chair invited Mr. Chad Nuttall, Director, Student Housing & Residence Life & Ms Heather Burns-Shillington, Personal and Student Family Life Counsellor to give their presentation1 on Mental Health in Residence. Mr. Nuttall informed members that Ms Burns-Shillington’s role had been primarily focused on counselling, but had also incorporated preventative measures and initiatives such as workshops, training sessions and mentorship. Ms Burns-Shillington noted that 87 members of the UTM community had been trained on safeTALK and 150 had received ASIST training, both of which were included training on suicide prevention. Ms Burns-Shillington outlined the counselling process, which was available to students 24/7 with a guaranteed response time within 24 hours. She noted that when a student requested an appointment they were automatically also referred to immediate resources for help in crisis or critical situations. She noted that the average wait time for an appointment was 3 days and the average number of sessions per student was also three. Ms Burns-Shillington noted that the majority of students seen by her were women in their upper years and that she would be working towards further engaging first year students. She informed members that the top presenting issues were anxiety, relationships and suicide or depression and that she used a combination of therapeutic approaches. Overall, students were satisfied with their experience and 100 percent of survey respondents would refer a friend to the residence counselor. Ms Burns-Shillington stated that next steps included expanding mental health services through a social work intern, providing counselling in other languages, exploring suicide-safer community designation and hosting a province-wide meeting of residence counsellors for professional development.

A member commended the work done by this office and asked if there were similar programs available for students who did not live on residence and also whether there was continuity of support if the student stopped living on residence. Ms Burns-Shillington advised that students who did not live on residence had access to the Health and Counselling Centre, which had three counselors available. She added that students who moved out of residence would also undergo a transfer of care process, and take part in a circle of care agreement with the new counselor to ensure the smoothest transition possible.

A member asked if there were a maximum number of sessions allowed per student and what would occur if a student required sessions over the long term. Ms Burns-Shillington responded that there was an approximate 5 sessions per semester available to each student; however if the student required weekly visits, she would assist them in finding the appropriate intensive treatment off-campus, as well as supplement that care with sessions on residence.

A member noted that it was peculiar that the month of April, which coincided with the exam period seemed to have the lowest number of counseling sessions. Ms Burns-Shillington advised that most students move out after the exam period ended in mid-April and would pursue sessions earlier in March to address exam-related issues.

4. 2016-17 Operating Plans: UTM Service Ancillaries

The Chair informed members that the Campus Affairs Committee had considered for approval the operating plans for all UTM service ancillaries on an annual basis. These plans included a Management Report that described the proposed services and programs offered within the financial parameters of the University’s operating budget and financial policies set by the Business Board. This year, the plans reported on actual financial results for 2014-15, the forecast for 2015-16 and projections for the five year period, 2016-17 to 2020-21. Only the proposed budget for 2016-17 was presented for approval. The Chair invited Professor Joseph Leydon, Chair, of the CAC to advise members on discussion which occurred on this item at that committee’s meeting held on January 7, 2016. Professor Leydon summarized the discussion at the CAC level, noting questions regarding the demand for parking passes and the consideration of a multi-level parking deck and on future plans for residence and what investments would include. Professor Leydon pointed members to the full report of the meeting, included in the documentation.

1 A copy of this presentation is attached as Attachment A.
The Chair invited Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Chad Nuttall, Director, Student Housing & Residence Life and Ms. Vicky Jezierski, Director, Hospitality & Retail Operations to present the item².

- The university’s four financial objectives for service ancillaries: operate without subsidy; provide for capital renewal; maintain a 10 percent operating reserve; and, having achieved all of these objectives, to contribute to the operating budget.
- Prior to being submitted to the Campus Affairs Committee and then Campus Council, a number of bodies were consulted and provided input into the budgets, which included the review of Residence and Meal plans, Food Services and Parking with their respective advisory committees;
- Key ancillary budget drivers included operating cost estimates, extraordinary expenses such as major maintenance or capital expenses, borrowing requirements and debt retirement, service demand, revenue projections and market price comparisons;
- Residence ancillary would experience a positive fund balance for the first time since 1999, which would be focused on reinvestment in aging infrastructure;
- Residence ancillary proposed a blended residence rate, where previously separate, additional charges such as laundry, RezNet and the First Year Experience fees were being added to the residence rate, which would result in an “all-in” blended rate. Mr. Nuttall explained that this was in response to student feedback to minimize confusion on financial accounts;
- Market comparison indicated that UTM residence rates were below average when compared to other Ontario universities, and competitive with local, off-campus housing, which although comparable, did not offer the many services offered by Residence;
- Regarding the Conference Services Ancillary, challenges for the ancillary included the loss of rental space to academic-related programs, major growth in general summer enrolments and limited space for hosting larger groups;
- The Food Services ancillary included the coverage of depreciation costs for some food outlets. However, the new food services contract included a negotiated 0% increase on all non-branded outlets and for all meal plans;
- Ms Jezierski noted that UTM was at or below midpoint in a university market comparison of food service prices (UTM had a weighted score of 0.40, where 0.5 was the average);
- Regarding the Parking ancillary, it was reported that lot utilization often exceeded industry norms especially during peak season in the months of September and October. Lot 1 would close in January 2016 in preparation for phase 2 of the North Building reconstruction, and the planned construction start for parking deck 2 would be March, 2016.

A member asked if the Chair would extend speaking rights to all non-member students and faculty present. The Chair reminded members of the process to grant speaking rights to non-members and that he had granted speaking rights to two student non-members and no speaking rights had been requested from faculty members.

In response to a member’s question, Mr. Nuttall explained that the proposed blended rate was created in response to feedback from the Student Housing Advisory Committee (SHAC) and based on the types of queries at their Help Desk, which largely centred around confusion on the existing rate structure appearing on financial accounts. A member asked if the students who were on the SHAC had been elected and whether they had been involved in discussions regarding the proposed residence ancillary rates. Mr. Nuttall confirmed that students were elected and that the SHAC had diligently engaged in very detailed discussions spanning four meetings, were in support of the proposal and that this feedback was included in the proposed rate changes.

A member posed a question to Mr. Donoghue, asking whether he believed that consultation at the Parking and Transportation Committee meetings had gone well and how it could improve in the future. Mr. Donoghue stated that the discussions at the Committee level had been very valuable and it had led to exploring different avenues for possible improvements in parking services, such as smart parking retrofits or varied distribution of parking rates. He noted that the length of the loan repayment period for the parking deck had also been discussed, and based on the feedback from the Committee, the decision was made to pay the loan over a 6 year period rather than the original 10 year period. He

² A copy of this Presentation is attached as Attachment B.
stated that overall he believed discussions had gone well, however the proposed rate was not unreasonable or unwarranted and there had been no other alternatives proposed that would suit the current needs of the campus.

A member inquired into the lower meal plan values that were offered at a few other comparative Universities. Mr. Donoghue advised that lower value meal plans often resulted in students returning before the end of the first semester in order to add additional funds to their account as the lower amount was insufficient.

The Chair invited Mr. Ebi Agbeyegbe, President, UTMSU to speak to the item. Mr. Agbeyegbe informed members he had experienced the process a number of different times and understood the way in which the ancillary budgets were formed and that he had been involved in consultation for parking rates. He noted that the Union was very satisfied that there had been no increase in food prices. Mr. Agbeyegbe noted that when they speak to other students, rising student tuition fees and fees such as parking add a negative connotation to the student experience. He stated that the UTMSU would like to be able to revisit the process so that students would not have to pay for these fees and that although there was no solution they could propose, they would be willing to sit down with senior administration to find a way to ensure students would not pay for these fees.

The Chair then invited Mr. Abdulla Omari, Director Division III, UTMSU to speak to the item. Mr. Omari noted that since he was not personally negatively impacted by rising tuition costs, he was here to provide a different perspective on the matter. He advised members that the way in which the word consultation was used was not fitting, and that UTM senior administration made most decisions with Campus Council being a filter body rather than a decision making body. He asked that consultation be done differently, noting that questions that may seem obvious could produce useful answers.

Mr. Donoghue commented that he appreciated the change in quality of conversation during the consultation process, which occurred over the last three years. He noted however that alternatives were limited in this context, and looking to other universities as examples, any price freeze would unfortunately result in a reduction of services. He added that although UTM had been run as a rather lean organization, reducing services or staffing levels could be implemented, but would be detrimental to the effort that had been made towards significantly increasing the standard of service over the last few years. Mr. Donoghue advised members that without the proposed rate increases in the two ancillary services, hours of operation and staffing levels would need to be reduced, older residences would have to delay maintenance and investments required to keep residences safe. A member clarified that as a member of the Transportation and Parking Committee, the smart parking retrofit he had suggested would require displays, and not mobile apps and this would reduce the environmental impact from cars driving through parking lots looking for spaces. He also noted that although UTM uses the industry standard of 80% parking lot utilization as full capacity, in South Africa, 100% lot utilization was considered full capacity. He also added that better planning was needed in order to avoid the destruction of existing lots, in order to put up new buildings which resulted in the creation of new replacement lots.

A member added that he was thankful for the respectful tone in which non-members had addressed the Council and that though members of Council did not have expertise on operational matters, they were accountable. He thanked Mr. Agbeyegbe and Mr. Omari for their leadership and pressed on them to continue working with senior administration to work on a formula that would be advantageous for all parties involved.

A member noted that he had reviewed the handout that was provided by the UTMSU and though he empathized with their concerns regarding increase in fees, there was no information provided by the Union that indicated that the campus’ administration was mishandling any aspect of the operations. He noted that instead, evidence showed that the campus was managed well and that students were satisfied with the services provided, but were not supportive of the fees associated with those services.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RESOLVED

3 Please see Attachment __ for a copy of the handout.
THAT, the proposed 2016-17 Operating Plans and Budgets for the UTM Service Ancillaries, as summarized in Schedule 1, the service ancillary capital budgets as summarized in Schedule 5, and the rates and fees in Schedule 6, as recommended by Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, in the proposal dated November 25, 2015 be approved, effective May 1, 2016.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and that Item 7 - Report of the Previous Meeting, be approved.

5. **Report on UTM Capital Projects** – as at January 29, 2016 (for information)

6. **Reports for Information**
   a. Report 15 of the Agenda Committee (January 20, 2016)
   b. Report 14 of the Campus Affairs Committee (January 7, 2016)
   c. Report 13 of the Campus Affairs Committee (January 6, 2016)


8. **Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

9. **Date of the Next Meeting** – March 3, 2016 at 4:10 p.m.

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Council was scheduled for Thursday, March 3, 2016 at 4:10 p.m. at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, William G. Davis Building.

10. **Question Period**

There were no questions.

11. **Other Business**

There were no other items of business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

_________________________________________   _______________________
Secretary                                       Chair
February 10, 2016


Mental Health in Residence

February 4, 2016

“The Residence Counsellor was something I had needed without even knowing. It truly helped me through the rest of the year”

Residence Counsellor

- Individual & group counselling
- Crisis intervention
- Programs, workshops & events
- Training Sessions
- Campus & community partnerships
- Mentorship
Mental Wellness Week

Training Session Impact

| Number of staff & students trained in 2015 | 87 | 150 |
Lunch n’ Learn Sessions

**LUNCH n LEARN**

**Addictions**
Wednesday, January 21
12pm-1pm
OHR seminar room (2nd floor)
The chance to learn more about addiction abuse and how to help someone who may be struggling with it. Nontoxic region, just bring your lunch! Coffee and snacks will be provided.

**LUNCH n LEARN**

**Radicalization**
Wednesday, February 25
12pm-1pm
OHR seminar room (2nd floor)
Psychology and Dr. David Naccache will be hosting this month’s session on radicalization. Come out to hear more about how young people are radicalized into religious extremism, with lots of time for discussion.
No need to register just bring your lunch! Coffee and snacks will be provided.

**LUNCH n LEARN**

**Mental Health**
Hong Fook Mental Health Association
Friday, April 24
12pm-1pm
OHR seminar room (2nd floor)
Come learn about an excellent mental health resource in our community! They work to address mental health concerns in the East & Southeast Asian communities.
Open to all students! Snacks and coffee provided, bring your lunch.

Counselling Process

- Web Form
- Confirm residence
- Contact within 24 business hours
- Student checks-in at residence desk
- Notes added to medical chart
Counselling Caseload (Winter & Fall 2015)

New clients by month (n=105)

Number of appointments/month

Number of individual sessions
Wait times & number of sessions

- Average wait time for an initial appointment: 3 days
- Average number of sessions: 3

Number of sessions attended

Client Demographics

- **Year of study**
  - Upper (62%)
  - 1st (38%)

- **Gender**
  - Female (79%)
  - Male (21%)

- **Student Mix**
  - International (32%)
  - Domestic (68%)
Top Presenting Issues

1. Anxiety
2. Relationships (family, friends, romantic)
3. Suicide / Depression

Therapeutic approaches

- Narrative, CBT, solution-focused, mindfulness, arts-based, pet therapy

“The residence counsellor (was) someone who I could talk to that gave me an unbiased opinion and helped me realize that thoughts are just thoughts.”
Satisfaction with...

- Level of confidentiality
- Frequency of follow-up appointment
- Timeliness of 1st appointment
- Process for booking appointment

The Residence Counsellor...

- Helped me make progress on my goals
- Worked on what I wanted to work on
- Heard, understood, respected
- Welcome & safe, inclusive space

"The residence counsellor really helped me feel more comfortable and safe on campus and made me feel like a stronger person"
What (if anything) improved after seeing the residence counsellor?

1. Sadness
2. Worry / Anxiety
3. Overall wellbeing
4. Connection to Residence / Campus

100% of respondents said they would refer a friend to the residence counsellor if their friend had a similar concern

“She provided an awesome experience.....I would definitely recommend this service to other people”
Next steps

- Expand mental health services (Social Work intern, counselling in other languages)
- Suicide-Safer Community Designation
- Hosting province-wide meeting of residence counsellors
- Residence Process Mapping, Systems for Managing
Objective | Residence | Food Services | Conference Services | Parking
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Operate without subsidy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes
Provide for capital renewal | Yes | Yes | n/a | Yes
10% operating reserve | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes
Contribute to operating | No | No | No | No

### UofT Financial Objectives/Requirements for All Ancillary Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Food Services</th>
<th>Conference Services</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary Ancillary Budgets (2016-17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Ancillary</th>
<th>Revenue (000s)</th>
<th>Expense (000s)</th>
<th>Net Income/(Loss) before Transfers (000s)</th>
<th>Net Income/(Loss) after Transfers 2017 (000s)</th>
<th>Net Income/(Loss) after Transfers 2016 (000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>13,059</td>
<td>12,160</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>4,063</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>(1,454)</td>
<td>(709)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,163</td>
<td>18,310</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>(326)</td>
<td>8,377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Ancillary Budget Drivers

- Operating Cost Estimates
- Extra-ordinary Expenses (major maintenance/capital)
- Borrowing Requirements & Debt Retirement
- Service Demand & Revenue Projections
- Market Price Comparisons
Ancillary Budget Consultation Process

- Transportation and Parking Advisory Committee
  October 14th
  November 4th
- Food Services Advisory Committee
  October 20th
  November 30th
- Resident Student Dining Committee
  October 8th
  October 23rd
- Student Housing Advisory Committee
  September 30th
  October 7th
  October 21st
  October 28th

Student Housing & Residence Life
1,536 beds
- 1,471 fee-paying beds
- Mix of styles, sizes

Student Housing Advisory Committee (SHAC) Membership (2015-16)

- Two (2) Graduate Student Representatives within Residence
  [Elected by a majority of completed ballots from graduate students living in residence]
  Vacant
- One (1) Family Representative within Residence
  [Elected by a majority of completed ballots from family households]
  Vacant
- Three (3) Undergraduate Representatives within Residence Council
  Manuel Valverde
  Jenny Trinh
  Charmaine Rodrigues
- Two (2) UTM First Year Residence Community Representatives
  Maria Beck
  Yuchen (Jenny) Liu
- One (1) UTM Upper Year Residence Community Representatives
  Annette Yuen On Yen
- One (1) Residence Life Don
  Karl Rein
- One (1) Residence Experience Coach
  Sara Chen
- One (1) Residence Service Desk Staff
  Cassie Madill

Benefits of Residence
- More likely to participate in extracurricular activities
- Report more positive perceptions of campus life
- More satisfied with their University experience
- Report more growth and personal development
- Engage in more interactions with peers and faculty
- More likely to persist to graduation
Residence Highlights & Challenges

- Occupancy rate of 96%
- Positive Fund Balance by 2016-17 – first time since 1999.
- Now that Fund Balance is positive – focus on reinvestment in older phases.
- '100 beds in Erindale Hall are being used as temporary swing space for 2014 to August 2018

New “all-in” blended residence fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>Admin Fees 16-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Oscar Peterson Hall</td>
<td>7,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Year</td>
<td>Oscar Peterson Hall</td>
<td>7,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New “all-in” blended residence fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>2016-17 Bill History</th>
<th>2016-17 Blended Billing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Peterson</td>
<td>Total: $8,690.04</td>
<td>Total: $8,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>$8,224 Room Charge</td>
<td>$8,690 All-In Blended Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$112 Laundry Card</td>
<td>$195 First Year Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$159.04 RezNet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Residence Rate Change

- 5% rate increase for 2016-17
- New “all-in” blended residence fees for 2016-17
- Undergrad Fall/Winter price ranges from $6,867 to $9,639
- Family & Graduate from $902 to $1,588 per month
Market Comparison

- Lowest among 8 other U of T residences
  - < Ryerson, all St. George Colleges
  - > McMaster, Brock, York, Guelph
- "All-in" pricing competitive with local, off-campus alternatives (CHMC data for 2014)

Residence Summary Statement of Operating Results ($000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15 Actual</th>
<th>2015-16 Forecast</th>
<th>2016-17 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>11,942</td>
<td>12,680</td>
<td>13,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>11,328</td>
<td>12,238</td>
<td>12,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Results before Transfers</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conference Services

Conference Highlights & Challenges

- Limited Space for large-group
- Accommodation Limits
  - Residence repairs/maintenance during summer
  - Residence use for Academic Culture & English (ACE) & other programs
- Meetings and other activities space
- Continued growth in summer enrolments
Conference
Summary Statement of Operating Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15 Actual</th>
<th>2015-16 Forecast</th>
<th>2016-17 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>644</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong></td>
<td>669</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Results before Transfers</strong></td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Services

Vicky Jezierski (Chair)
Ebi Agbeyegbe
Daniel Ball
Lee Bailey
Luke Barber
Sabrina Coccagna
Pierre Desrochers
Andrea De Vito
Paul Donoghue
Alice Li
Chad Nuttall
Beth Spilchuk

Food Services Advisory Committee Membership (2015-16)

Resident Student Dining Committee Membership (2015-16)

Vicky Jezierski (Chair)
Andrea De Vito
Beth Spilchuk
Emily Kim
Jessica Latocha
Alice Li
Gordon Tian
Regan Trotter
Marissa Uli

Vicky Jezierski (Chair)
Andrea De Vito
Beth Spilchuk
Emily Kim
Jessica Latocha
Alice Li
Gordon Tian
Regan Trotter
Marissa Uli

Staff
U/G Student - UTMSU
Graduate Student - UTMAGS
Faculty
Staff
Faculty
Staff
Staff
U/G Student
Staff
Food

Highlights & Challenges

• Depreciation Cost
  – North Side Bistro, Innovation Centre Café, and Colman Commons Renovation/Expansion

• New Food Services contract
  – 0% price increase on all non-branded outlets and for all meal plans

• Food Service Development
  – 2017 – Davis Building Food Court
  – 2018 – North Building Phase II
  – 2017 – Starbucks 10-Year Facelift
  – 2018 - New Transaction System

## Retail Food Pricing

University Market Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Average Price Rank</th>
<th>Ranking of Items in Category</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot Beverages</td>
<td>5 lowest out of 22 schools</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Beverages</td>
<td>10 lowest out of 19 schools</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Items</td>
<td>11 lowest out of 23 schools</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deli Sandwiches</td>
<td>11 lowest out of 22 schools</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baked Goods</td>
<td>14 lowest out of 24 schools</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup &amp; Salad</td>
<td>13 lowest out of 23 schools</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasta &amp; Pizza</td>
<td>5 lowest out of 19 schools</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Entrees</td>
<td>5 lowest out of 18 schools</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a score 0.50 is the average price among Canadian Universities, then UTM food and beverage prices are, in general, below average, or a score of 0.40

## Meal Plan Rates

University Market Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Increase from 2014-15 Minimum Meal Plan Rate</th>
<th>2015-16 Minimum Meal Plan Rate</th>
<th>Estimated (or Actual) Increase from 2015-16 Minimum Meal Plan Rate</th>
<th>Proposed 2016-17 Minimum Meal Plan Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$2,625</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>$3,270</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$3,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ryerson</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$3,402</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>$3,685</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$3,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$3,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>$3,699</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$3,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>$4,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>$4,150</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$4,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>$4,248</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$4,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$4,340</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>$4,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Food

Summary Statement of Operating Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15 Actual</th>
<th>2015-16 Forecast</th>
<th>2016-17 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>9,256</td>
<td>10,602</td>
<td>10,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Sales &amp; Service</td>
<td>7,318</td>
<td>8,542</td>
<td>8,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Margin-Net Revenue</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Results before Transfers</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking Ancillary Services

Transportation & Parking Advisory Committee Membership & Attendees (2015-16)

Scott Prosser (Chair) Faculty
Ebi Agbeyegbe U/G Student – UTMSU
Megan Alekson Staff
Arthur Birkenbergs Staff
Sonia Borg Staff
Christine Capewell Staff
Paul Donoghue Staff
Paul Goldsmith Staff
Paige Homme Graduate student - UTMAGS
Rob Messacar Staff
Amir Moazzami U/G Student – UTMSU
Nour Alideeb U/G Student – UTMSU
Mark Overton Staff

Parking utilization - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>September average</th>
<th>September peak</th>
<th>October average</th>
<th>October peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lot utilization exceeding 80% is highlighted

Parking Lot Map
Parking Deck #2:
- Deck #2:
  - planned construction start – March 2016
  - planned construction completion – August 2016
- Lot 1 (73 spaces in total, 63 available to general public) will close by January 2016, in preparation for phase 2 of the North Building reconstruction.

Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Operating Results Before Transfers</th>
<th>Operating Loan Repayment, not included in Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>3,423,116</td>
<td>2,977,882</td>
<td>445,234</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>3,847,097</td>
<td>2,858,216</td>
<td>988,881</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>3,617,250</td>
<td>2,714,488</td>
<td>902,762</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>143,728</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,454,325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Results Before Transfers:
- 2015-16: (229,847)
- 2016-17: 745,022

Operating Loan Repayment:
- 2016-17: 1,454,325
Rates: Price increases for 2016-17

- Regular Annual Reserved, Premium Unreserved and Unreserved permit prices increase 3%, as planned

- Pay & Display price no increase, as planned (daily maximum)

- Semester pass (available to students only)

- price increase for 2016-17 = 11 cents per normal operating day (excluding weekends and holidays)

UTM Parking Services Comparison Rates (2015-16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UTM</th>
<th>UTSC</th>
<th>St. George</th>
<th>York</th>
<th>McMaster</th>
<th>Credit Valley Hospital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most expensive</td>
<td>990.82</td>
<td>943.60</td>
<td>3,120.00</td>
<td>1,212.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least expensive</td>
<td>990.82</td>
<td>861.01</td>
<td>2,340.00</td>
<td>1,170.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreserved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most expensive</td>
<td>707.13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,380.00</td>
<td>1,453.63</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>948.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least expensive</td>
<td>684.20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,380.00</td>
<td>1,065.82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>948.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | ubmb |      |            |      |          |                        |

MOTION

Be It Resolved,

THAT, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee,

THAT, the proposed 2016-17 Operating Plans and Budgets for the UTM Service Ancillaries, as summarized in Schedule 1, the service ancillary capital budgets as summarized in Schedule 5, and the rates and fees in Schedule 6, as recommended by Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, in the proposal dated November 25, 2015 be approved, effective May 1, 2016.
### Schedule 5

**University of Toronto Mississauga**

Service Attributes - 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>5,016</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,333</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,159</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to p. 27 (p. 51 in Diligent)

### Schedule 6

**University of Toronto Mississauga**

Schedule of 2016-17 Ancillary Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Type</th>
<th>2016-17 Rate</th>
<th>Increase $</th>
<th>Increase %</th>
<th>Year Rate Changed %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room and Board</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Room and Board</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Room and Board</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Room</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Room</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,588</strong></td>
<td><strong>-112</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please refer to p. 28 (p. 52 in Diligent)