



Food Service Committee

Minutes of Meeting

Date: Monday, November 12th, 2012 – 9am
Room: DV3129
Attendees: D. Ball, A. De Vito, P. Donoghue, C. Graham, J. Liao, A. Maughn, B. McFadden,
D. Mullins, C. Thompson, Areej Shah (on behalf of G. Guo)
Regrets: M. Cowan, P. Desrochers, V. Kanelis, J. Stanley

1. INTRODUCTION

To introduce the purpose of the Food Service Committee, Paul indicated that:

- the planned redevelopments of the North Building, the addition of new space in the Kaneff expansion, the proposed addition to Oscar Peterson Hall and the planned redevelopment of the Davis Building Meeting Place for a permanent food service facility make the launch of the campus Food Service Committee very timely
- the purpose of the Food Service Committee is to help the UTM refine the plans for food service development on campus in an informed way

2. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

The Administrative Report included:

- a terms of reference review,
- a review of the context of the food service program,
- a summary of the survey results from:
 - the Spring 2010 residence food service survey and,
 - the Spring 2011 community-wide food service survey,
- a summary of the future food service projects.

Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference for the Food Service Committee were outlined, which are:

- although the Committee will have a formal agenda for every meeting, dialogue and discussion will be more informal to encourage a free flow of ideas

- the Committee will be advisory with respect to the UTM's Food Service Program, with particular focus on food service operations, policy, and budget
- a cross-sectional representation was selected from the UTM Community for Committee membership

Context of the Food Service Program

The context in which UTM operates its food service program was reviewed.

- food service development is following a period of intensive Academic infrastructure development
- UTM has historically been deficient with respect to the space required to operate food service when compared to the Council of Ontario Universities identified requirement. This is not atypical for an emerging and developing campus that is developing the required core teaching infrastructure
- the Food Service Department is focusing on the cost effective implementation of food service infrastructure to provide the diversity, choice and value required on a mid-sized comprehensive campus.
- the Food Service Department operates as an ancillary operation which requires it to meet its own financial commitments and self-fund food service improvements without support from the University Operating budget.

It was stated that significant learning opportunities take place outside of the classroom setting and, consequently, the UTM has a responsibility to provide services and learning environments that help stimulate and perpetuate these opportunities.

It was noted that each individual seeks different products and services from a university food service operation. It was also noted that it is extremely difficult to provide the product and services required to provide value to each community member when there is insufficient food service space. The focus of future developments is to provide the products and services identified as desirable in the UTM community food service surveys.

It was identified that UTM has a distributed food service model – a combination of 'dining' and 'eating' outlets strategically located across campus.

'Dining' outlets are where skilled labour can be massed in an efficient manner to provide comprehensive menus and experiential food service destinations ("bringing the people to the food").

'Eating' outlets are quick service locations that allow customers to refuel and move on with their day ("bringing the food to the people").

In this context, the existing food service outlets were highlighted on the campus map, with special notations identifying the future food service development, which includes:

- North Building Café – Fall 2014
- Kaneff Rotunda Outlet – Fall 2014
- Colman Commons Addition – Pending

- Davis Building Permanent Food Court – Pending
- Davis Building Courtyard Outlet – Pending

Surveys

The Resident Student Food Service Survey from the spring of 2010 was used to:

- generate data based on the opinions from the Resident Community about future food service concepts on campus
 - response rate – 22% of the resident community
 - test survey questions in the preparation of a more comprehensive, campus-wide food service survey

The Community-Wide Food Service Survey from the spring of 2011 was used to:

- generate data based on the opinions from the entire UTM Community about future food service concepts on campus.
- the response rate was 18% of the entire UTM Community.

Responses from both surveys were used to help define the recent food service additions and changes, specifically:

- Instructional Building Café and Lounge
 - Second Cup
 - Panini Fresca
- Meeting Place Redevelopment
 - Existing Tim Hortons expansion
 - Tim Hortons Express
 - Subway
 - Temporary Food Court
Food can only be finished, staged, and served in the TFC due to the prohibitive cost of installing a proper air handling system for a temporary facility – all cooking is completed in the Commissary kitchen
- Sustainability Initiatives
 - Elimination of bottled water and improvement of public drinking water infrastructure
95% of bottled water has been eliminated (only exception is bottled water at Tim Hortons) – ahead of the commitments made in the UTM plan for the elimination of bottled water and improvement of public drinking water
 - Decreased packaging

3. New Business

Members brought forward questions or issues regarding the Food Service program

- Mike's Hot Dog Stand** – clarification of Mike's Dog House's relationship to the campus.

Response: Explained that Mike's Dog House was an independent business with whom Chartwells partnered. It was further noted that Mike's Dog House was an

important part of the community and that its location may change as the campus evolves.

- b. Permanent Food Court** – It was asked if the concepts for the Permanent Davis Building Food Court have been selected yet.

Response: The concepts have not been selected at this time. It is the plan to work with this committee (while referring to the community survey responses) to identify concepts that would be a fit for the permanent food court. Further it was identified that the new food court will most likely be a blend of branded and non-branded concepts to provide as much diversity and flexibility as possible.

- c. Chartwells Contractual Obligation** – Information was sought with respect to clarification of Chartwells Contractual Obligation to the UTM Campus and what the effect to UTM would be if a new vendor was brought in once the Chartwells Contract expired.

Response: It was stated that UTM has structured the operation of the food service ancillary in such a way that allows UTM more control over the food service assets and operations

- UTM completes all the feasibility studies and conducts all the facility planning and design – not the food service contractor
- UTM purchases all the equipment and pays for facility renovations- not the food service contractor
- UTM maintains all the equipment – not the food service contractor
- UTM markets and sells and administers the meal plans
- Although the majority of the branded concept license agreements (ie Tim Hortons license to serve product) are held by Chartwells, a transfer fee can be paid to transfer the license to another operator

Although this food service operating model is quite laborious to operate for UTM (and quite unique in contracted food service operations), it allows UTM more control and flexibility in food service decision making while also reducing disruption should a change in food service operator occur.

- d. New Food Service Survey** – It was suggested that an updated Food Service Survey be performed in 2013.

Response: It was agreed that a new survey would be proposed for committee review prior to launch. The type of survey to be conducted will be determined in consultation with the committed.

- e. Food Service Messaging** – Chris Thompson mentioned that, although he feels that the food service changes that have been made on campus, particularly in regards to the TFC, have been positive, students do not understand why certain food service decisions (e.g. TFC concepts) are being made.

Response: It was highlighted that the selection of concepts was consistent, as much as possible, with the requirements/preferences identified in the community surveys. It was also noted that the TFC does not have an institutional kitchen (and the required exhaust system) and that there were limitations with respect to the type of operation that could be introduced in the space.

Further it was noted that information with regards to the TFC was posted on the food service website for a good portion of the summer and is now posted on digital displays in the TFC. The recent installation of centralized digital signage system across campus will also provide more opportunity to get targeted food service messaging to the UTM community. Bill conceded that, although the Food Services website is the best source for food service information – there is also room for improvement for food service communication.

- f. Services Provided by Chartwells** – Details with respect to what services Chartwells provide to the UTM Community were sought.

Response: Chartwells provide the following services:

- i.** Operates the food service outlets –UTM tries to remove any of the time-consuming tasks that would take the operating focus away from Chartwells
- ii.** Manages/recruits/schedules staff
- iii.** Provides the culinary recipes and nutritional analysis for the non-branded food concepts
- iv.** Uses their national buying power to secure cost effective purchase of food
- v.** Markets the facilities
- vi.** Secure licenses for branded concepts on campus
- vii.** Provides first level maintenance of equipment (primarily cleaning)
- viii.** Provides catering service and menus
- ix.** Provides food service to support the Conference Operation

- g. Other Comments/Suggestions: - Updates provided at next meeting**

- i. Portion-Sizing vs. Price** – Not reflective of value at some outlets
- ii. Flavours** – Some flavours at the International Kitchen and Tandori do not reflect what the dish is supposed to be
- iii. Evenings at TFC** – Long-line and poor staffing levels at TFC during the evenings
- iv. Microwaves** – The UTM Community would like to see more microwave, and placing microwave banks in high traffic food service areas, like the Meeting Place and the TFC, would be an ideal solution
- v. TFC Seating** – although the UTM tried to be cost effective in using the Spigel tables and chairs to populate the TFC seating area, the use of large tables limits the ability for people to find seating that meets their needs (vast majority of the UTM community outside of Residence prefer to sit in groups of 2-4)

- vi. Water Bottle Filling Stations** – The Water Bottle Filling Station program is a joint effort between Hospitality and Retail Services, who provide the reusable water bottles, and Facilities, who replace and maintain the water infrastructure
- vii. Starbucks Lines** – Staff do not appear to be as productive as they could be, resulting in long, slow-moving lines, which should be alleviated due to the recent hire of a new Starbucks Manager
- viii. Second Cup Lines** – Lines at the IB Second Cup seem to move too slow while the lines at the Second Cup in the Davis Building seem to move fairly quickly

4. Next Meeting – Date and Location TBD