Meeting of RBAC members  
Wednesday, March 25th, 2015  
9:30 am – 10:30 am  
2-04A SAB

ATTENDEES:
Don Hickey, chair (VP F&O), Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services), Susan Cake (GSA VP External), Nicholas Diaz (SU VP Student Life), Robin Everall (Interim VP and Dean of Students)

REGRETS: Mazi Shirvani, Dean of Graduate Students, Hans Albrecht (ASA President), Brock Richardson (Acting Assistant Dean of Students, Residence Life), William Lau (SU President), Nanveet (Incoming SU President), Vivian Kwan (Incoming SU VP Student Life)

GUESTS:

Agenda:

1. Call Meeting to Order – 2:35 pm
2. Review of Agenda
3. Conversion to “All You Care to Eat Meal Plan”
   • Moving from a declining balance plan 9as it has been for the last 30 years) to an All You Care to Eat plan
   • Is more flexible and returns higher satisfaction
   • 2015 is last year for declining balance plan
   • Is not a new concept to UofA – is already being used at Augustana
   • Cost is slightly higher but includes flex money that will allow students to eat elsewhere
4. Potential for a “3-Year Rent Plan”
   • Concern re price certainty over career at UofA.
   • Other institutions have 3-4 year rent plans
   • SU policy has been updated – if there is a reasonable increase in rental rates do not have to vote against it
5. Residence Expansion
   • Target is 25% of FTE’s in residence
   • Desire to have capacity to house all eligible 1st year students (including first year students who are international – we don’t differentiate)
   • Targets are informed by the CIP
6. Funding Strategies for Future Expansion
   • Ancillary Services operates as a business unit (ie, no base funding)
   • RAC looks at the white paper that outlines the funding strategies
• Private market will increase rent until there is ~3-4% vacancy, but Ancillary Services doesn’t have the flexibility

7. Other

• Challenging year coming up. Happy to hear that SU is willing to look at value of increases – will allow for more productive conversations

• Next meetings:
  • Fall is usually pressed for time. What is the availability of the incoming student executives?
    • GSA students are available
    • SU Executives generally have one class but are otherwise available
    • RBAC meetings will start up in May

• “Project list” to be added to next agenda
Meeting of RBAC members  
Tuesday, August 25th, 2015  
1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.  
2-04A South Academic Building (SAB)

 attendeeS:  
Don Hickey, chair (VP F&O),  
Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services),  
Alphonse Ndem Ahola (GSA VP External),  
Nanveet Khinda (SU President),  
Heather Zwicker (Dean, Grad Studies and Research),  
Brock Richardson (for Robin Everall)

regrets:  
Vacant (ASA President)  
Robin Everall (Dean of Students)

Agenda:  
1. Call Meeting to Order  
2. Review of Agenda  
   a. Added "liability insurance"  
3. Review of Notes from March 25, 2015 meeting  
   a. Will cover most of the items in the current agenda  
4. Review Terms of Reference  
   a. This committee discusses agreements, operational costs, financials, capital initiative, etc.  
   b. Is not an operations committee. Those issues are covered at RAC  
   c. Reminder that Ancillary Services operates as a business and as such receives no operating grant funding  
5. All You Care to Eat Meal Program (AYCTE)  
   a. Regarded as a more favorable program; better aligns with a student's lifestyle and needs  
   b. No capital requirement – infrastructure is there  
   c. Student reports come from a trip to Carleton University in the winter of 2014/15 by students and staff  
   d. We are in the last year of the current 3-year depreciating balance plan.  
   e. Intention is to present for approval a 3-year projection plan for AYCTE program  
   f. Cost of plan (ie $4900) includes $300 flex dollars which can be topped up throughout the year for use in other campus Aramark facilities and SUB  
   g. Possible concerns raised: will students feel that they can only eat in Lister? Is it flexible enough?  
      i. Boxed lunches for times when students can’t return to Lister; also have access to the flex dollars to eat elsewhere on campus
6. Current CPI
   a. Current non-tuition CPI is 1.4%
   b. Although it is not the perfect tool, it is what is used as a starting point
   c. A rate sheet will be presented to the committee that outlines current rates and proposed rates for next academic year.
   d. Projects approved by previous RBACs (ie furnishing and refurbishing HUB suites, wifi) will affect rates
   e. Augustana will try to align with our AYCTE program so a $37/month increase is being proposed. Also want to add wifi with an increase of $19/month.

7. Potential 3-Year Rent Proposal
   a. This potential proposal would project rental rates over a 3-year period based on projected CPI and BoG approved proformas.
   b. Intent is to have more information for students budgeting for 3-year tenure.

8. Project List
   a. Annually review what capital projects have been completed. Generally deferred maintenance.
   b. These capital projects affect rent, and keep deferred maintenance in check (as much as possible)
   c. The report offers insight about how facilities are being maintained for future generations of residents.
   d. 3 years ago added $50,000 line item for student requests (ie, carpet repair, painting)

9. Residence Strategy
   a. Objective is to have 25% of full time enrollment in purpose-built student housing
   b. Aids with recruitment, retention, student success, heightened student experience
   c. Reinforces living and learning accommodations
   d. Proposed a 10-year plan in two, five-year parts
   e. Some initiatives are enrollment driven and as such are in the second five-year part.
   f. The strategic plan was accepted by the Bog as the basis for future planning. Phase 1 will proceed to the board for review this fall. (Lister Tower, ECV apartments).
   g. An aside was made to recognize the need for future planning for Michener Park

10. Tenant Liability Insurance
    a. Students are always encouraged to have tenants insurance for their belongings, but liability insurance covers other risks.
    b. Instead of having to approach students to cover our $200,000 deductible in the case of a major incident
    c. Should liability insurance be incorporated into rental costs to ensure that students are protected with the proper insurance in case of damage/loss beyond their personal belongings (ie smoke/fire damage from cooking)
    d. Risk Management is reviewing and RBAC will be kept apprised of updates.
11. Other

a. Future RBAC meeting dates
   i. Meetings are scheduled 3 in Sept, 3 in Oct, 2 in Nov to prepare for submission to Board at the end of November.
   ii. Then there are monthly meetings scheduled until March in case issues arise. Generally cancelled a few days before the meeting if not needed.

b. Please forward any agenda items to Doug or Kezia, at any time

c. Doug is available for meetings outside of the set RBAC meetings

d. Typically, draft budget is ready in Oct/Nov

Future RBAC Meeting Dates:
(All meetings in 2-04A SAB)
- Sept 8, 2:00-3:00
- Sept 15, 3:00-4:00
- Sept 22, 2:00-3:00
- Oct 13, 2:00-3:00
- Oct 20, 3:00-4:00
- Oct 27, 2:00-3:00
- Nov 10, 2:00-3:00
- Nov 25, 3:00-4:00
- Dec 8, 2:00-3:00
- Jan 12, 1:00-2:00
- Feb 16, 3:00-4:00
- Mar 15, 2:00-3:00
ATTENDEES:
Don Hickey, chair (VP F&O),
Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services),
Alphonse Ndemb Ahola (GSA VP External),
Vivian Kwan (SU VP Student Life),
Heather Zwicker (Dean, Grad Studies and Research),
Brock Richardson (for Robin Everall)

REGRETS:
Vacant (ASA President)
Robin Everall (Dean of Students)

Agenda:

1. Call Meeting to Order – 2:05 pm
2. Review of Agenda - approved
3. Review of Notes from August 25\textsuperscript{th}, 2015 meeting - approved
4. Present for discussion, rent proposal
   - Intent is to start with CPI then consider outliers
   - Current rate sheet reflects renovated and furnished Maple and Aspen Houses imbedded in it
   - This project will mean that most units in ECV are new or newly renovated and furnished.
5. Present for discussion, 3-year projection plan for AYCTE program
   - Increases each year based upon projected CPI – Food for Alberta.
   - Will continue to be presented to Board as an information piece only for three years
   - \textbf{ACTION}: B. Richardson will forward information regarding student satisfaction levels with program to Augustana to V. Kwan
   - Hope to finalize by mid-October 2015
   - There won’t be money left over at the end of the year, as it isn’t a declining balance system. Any leftover Flex dollars will be made available on ONEcard
   - \textbf{ACTION}: D. Dawson will clarify if there is a four-month program
6. Other
   - Insurance - no new information at this time.
   - \textbf{ACTION}: Please bring forward any agenda items
ATTENDEES:
Don Hickey, chair (VP F&O),
Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services),
Alphonse Ndem Ahola (GSA VP External),
Nanveet Khinda (SU President),
Heather Zwicker (Dean, Grad Studies and Research),
Brock Richardson (for Robin Everall)

REGRETS:
Vacant (ASA President)
Robin Everall (Dean of Students)

Agenda:

1. Call Meeting to Order
   a. Meeting began at 3:05

2. Review of Agenda (attached)
   a. Don added “meetings with MLA’s” to agenda
   b. Don advised that this meeting includes the presentation of materials as they will go to Board so this is the final opportunity for discussion.

3. Present rent proposal
   a. D. Dawson reviewed the Outline of Issue that will recommended for approval through the Board cycle
   b. Rent increase is that which has been discussed in previous meetings
   c. As stated and discussed in previous meetings, there are some anomalies
   d. Any questions please get in touch with D. Hickey or D. Dawson

4. Present 3-year projection plan for AYCTE program
   a. D. Dawson reviewed the Outline of Issue that will recommended for approval through the Board cycle
   b. SU voiced concern that not all students at Lister had been consulted. D. Dawson reviewed focus groups that have been created over the past number of years for consultation.
   c. SU requested info regarding possibility of a student being able to change the ratio of flex to non-flex dollars in the plan or opt out of flex dollars entirely.

5. Other
   a. Meetings with MLA’s: D. Hickey has been meeting with MLA’s and bringing forward the White Paper on Student Housing. Would like to suggest that RBAC continue to meet for the remainder of 2015 and focus on it?
   b. Lister: future discussions about Lister may be continued at RAC.
   c. Michener Park – brief discussion about challenges presented by Michener Park. D. Dawson will send a breakdown of population of Grad students in the different residence communities.
MINUTES

Meeting of RBAC members
Tuesday, October 27th, 2015
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
2-04A South Academic Building (SAB)

ATTENDEES:
Doug Dawson (Executive Director, Ancillary Services)
Alphonse Ndem Ahola (GSA VP External)
Nanveet Khinda (SU President)
Vivian Kwan (SU VP Student Life)
Sarah Wolegmuth (for Robin Everall)

REGRETS:
Don Hickey, chair (VP F&O)
Vacant (ASA President)
Heather Zwicker (Dean, Grad Studies and Research)

Review of AYCTE program:

- D. Dawson revisited consultation process, purpose of consultation, trending information to date
  - RBAC and RAC were created, at the request of students for better consultation, to replace ad-hoc consultative committees
  - RBAC is a consultative group, recognized by the government
  - As it relates to the matter at hand (AYCTE program), the group discussed how information and data was gathered over the previous year including site visits to schools that have implemented AYCTE programs.
  - It was agreed that consultation regarding the AYCTE program has occurred and continues to occur through RBAC.

- S. Wogelmuth reviewed statistics garnered from the 2015 EBI benchmarking tool (attached). The EBI tool is used yearly to attain comparative data, year over year which illustrates changes at UofA, and how UofA compares to other similar institutions. Slides presented supported information previously provided to the committee:
  - Overall Satisfaction: Dining Services
  - Overall Satisfaction Based on Residence Hall
  - Satisfaction (with Dining Services) Based on Year-of-Study
  - Satisfaction (with Dining Services) Over Time: 2015 vs. Previous Year
  - Dining Environment
  - Variety of Meal Plan Options
  - Value (of Dining Services)
  - EBI survey data re: Satisfaction: Dining Services at Carleton University

- Conclusions
  - Overall satisfaction is improving over time, however
  - Overall satisfaction remains low compared to other indicators of satisfaction
  - Value of the Dining Plan has the lowest rating – price is only one indicator of “value”
  - Satisfaction diminishes with year-of-study even though the “program” even though the program has remained the same.
Students participating in the AYCTE program at Carleton University rank their satisfaction significantly higher than University of Alberta students participating in a declining balance program.

Students at Augustana who have an AYCTE program are more satisfied with their program than students living in Lister Hall participating in a declining balance program.

Improvements to the environment have been acknowledged by students and satisfaction in this area is ranked high.

The AYCTE program (Fresh Food Company) features completely different menu specification (recipes) than the current program in Lister Hall.

Purpose of the new program is to:

- offer better quality, improved variety and longer hours of operation at a fixed price.
- ensure students do not run out of money and have to unexpectedly add funds by providing “price certainty” to students and their families before they arrive. (D. Dawson reported that over the last three years, between 21% and 33% of Lister students must add money to their accounts to make it through the year. This does not account for additional money some students would be spending on groceries).
- ensure students have nutritional, high quality food available when they want it
- reduce stress

N. Khinda identified the biggest concerns that came out of the October 2015 Google survey sent out by the SU (attached), which were:

- Perceived lack of increase in value for students
- Ability for students to eat elsewhere in addition to Lister, and
- Food quality

D. Dawson acknowledged these findings and pointed out that many of the issues that were highlighted in the SU’s Google survey reinforce the findings of the EBI surveys and form the basis for recommending the proposed change.

D. Dawson also pointed to the EBI survey as being an important indicator of how students rank the overall value of the program inasmuch as the EBI survey was administered to students who are currently participating in AYCTE programs AND students in declining balance programs at several universities.

While few of the current students in Lister Hall will still be in Lister Hall next year when the program is proposed to be implemented, D. Dawson committed to the following activities roll-out over the coming months:

- All RA’s will be provided with accurate information regarding the proposed new plan
- Dining Services and ARAMARK will prepare at least one demonstration opportunity designed to high-light the qualitative changes students will see should the AYCTE program be implemented.
- The target audience for these demonstrations will be prospective students and their families, returning students (RA’s) and student leaders.

N. Kindha not sure of support as we move forward, but is not a definite “no”.

A. Ahola indicated that he supported the proposed change if it the new program delivers higher overall value to students.

D. Dawson cautioned the committee with respect to limiting the discussion to price alone indicating that continuing with the declining balance program for one or two more years would not necessarily be cheaper for students inasmuch as the commitment levels for the declining balance program could increase to the point where they are close to the proposed rate for the AYCTE plan and we would still have to deal with less-than-optimal satisfaction among students.

A. Ndem Ahola stated that if things continue this way he can’t foresee a problem going ahead
• From now on, we should be able to move forward via email, and no further meetings will be required.

Attachments
  EBI survey results
  SU Draft Report: Resident Feedback on Meal Plan
The Educational Benchmarking Inc. (EBI) survey is administered annually in March to residence students to measure levels of satisfaction, learning, and overall program effectiveness. The following data was collected from Lister and Augustana students in March, 2015 specific to dining services satisfaction. The blue vertical line set at 5.5 (on the 7.0 scale) represents our institutional set goal. N = the number of respondents.

Overall Satisfaction 2015:

**Satisfaction: Dining Services**

*Population: University of Alberta (Number Responding = 2198)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q060. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the Dining environment</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q059. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the Cleanliness of dining area</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q061. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the Service provided by dining service staff</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q062. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the Dining service hours</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q064. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the Quality of food</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q065. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the Variety of the dining plan options</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q064. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the Value of your dining plan</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Green = Your institution has a higher mean than the goal (5.5).
- Yellow = Your institution is within .25 of the goal (5.5).
- Red = Your institution has a lower mean than the goal (5.5) by more than .25.

...
Overall Satisfaction Based on Residence Hall 2015:

Satisfaction: Dining Services for U2. Hall

Population: University of Alberta (Number Responding = 2199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustana Ravine Complex</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana First Year Complex</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Hall</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henday Hall</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Hall</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaffer Hall</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction Based on Year of Study:

Q058. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the: Quality of food for D005. Demographics: What is your current academic class standing?

Population: University of Alberta > U1. Area > Classic Lister (Number Responding = 574)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman/First-year</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore/2nd year</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior/3rd year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/4th year *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/professional student *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree or other *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satisfaction Over Time: 2015 vs. Previous Years

**Satisfaction: Dining Services**

Population: University of Alberta (Number Responding = 2199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Difference in Satisfaction: 2015 vs. previous year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q060. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the: Dining environment for U2. Hall

Population: University of Alberta (Number Responding = 2199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustana Ravine Complex</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana First Year Complex</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Hall</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheffer Hall</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henday Hall</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Hall</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variety of the Dining Plan Options:

Q063. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the: Variety of the dining plan options for U2. Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustana First Year Complex</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana Ravine Complex</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henday Hall</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Hall</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaffer Hall</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Hall</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value:

Q064. Dining Services - How satisfied are you with the: Value of your dining plan for U2. Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustana Ravine Complex</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana First Year Complex</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie Hall</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henday Hall</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Hall</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaffer Hall</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resident Feedback on the Proposed AYCTE Meal Plan
Prepared on October 26, 2015

After seeking the input of students on the proposed All You Care to Eat (AYCTE) meal plan at Lister Hall, the Students’ Union (SU) is unable to support this initiative in its current form. While the reasons for the proposed changes (i.e. convenience, value, nutrition, etc.) have some validity, there has been insufficient consultation with students, and the actual cost and structure of the program itself is problematic. If the University of Alberta wishes to operate a successful residence program, and possibly expand Lister Hall, more must be done to ensure that there is sufficient student buy-in, and that the cost of living in Lister Hall does not become prohibitively high. The SU realizes the tremendous inherent value of a successful residence program, and wishes to cooperate with the University of Alberta moving forward to ensure that students’ opinions are properly represented on related initiatives. The Students’ Union President created and shared a Google Survey with students, as well as elicited feedback on the proposal on social media. A summary of this feedback is provided below.

Survey responses were collected via Google Forms, which auto-populated a spreadsheet from which the data was analyzed. At the time of analysis, we had received 422 responses; after cleaning the data, there were 377 complete responses (n=377). The data below represents the results of a self-selected sample, and thus gives rise for some potential biases. However, given that the current student population of Lister Hall is approximately between 1400 and 1500 (i.e. based on current occupancy) undergraduate students and the response rate to our survey was relatively high, we remain confident that the information presented below is generally representative of students’ opinions.

Resident awareness of proposed meal plan consultation:

Survey participants were asked about their awareness of the existing consultations regarding the proposed meal plan between the University of Alberta and Lister Hall residents.

69 percent of students are, on some level, aware of the proposed meal plan and the related consultations. However, their responses indicate that many students were aware of the consultations only
through word-of-mouth, rather than being directly engaged and consulted. If the University is intending to implement this program successfully, ensuring that students feel adequately consulted will be crucial.

**Attitude toward AYCTE Meal Plan:**

The survey collected participants’ views on the proposed meal plan. Survey participants were overwhelming opposed to the new meal plan; only 9 percent agreed with the proposal in its current form. Additionally, the survey asked participants the likelihood of opting to live in Lister Hall should the meal plan be mandatory. To this, 84 percent participants indicated that they were not likely to choose Lister Hall. As mentioned above, if the university intends to expand and improve upon its residence program, it is crucial that any new initiatives have the support of students. While living in residence offers a unique and high-value experience to students, if the University decided to unilaterally introduce programs, which are unpopular with students, it is probable that demand for residency in Lister Hall will fall, and fewer students will be willing and/or able to live in Lister. In addition, as Edmonton and the University area continues to grow and evolve, there are an increasingly number of housing options available to students.
Current Meal Plan Spending Patterns:

The survey asked students about their current spending patterns with regards to meal plan. Of the 377 respondents, 156 (41%) have opted for the Tier 3 ($3227) meal plan. Additionally, 211 (56%) spent between $3227 and $4500 and only 10 (3%) spent upwards of $4500. Hence, the vast majority of survey participants indicated that they currently spent substantially less than $4900, the cost of the proposed AYCTE meal plan. Similarly, only 43 students who responded to the survey currently subscribe to the Tier 1 ($4379) meal plan, which raises some questions about the actual vs. perceived demand for a program like the AYCTE meal plan.

The most significant issue with the AYCTE meal plan, particularly due to the proposal to make it mandatory for students living in Lister Hall, is value. While the nominal cost of the program is high, respondents repeatedly mentioned that they were concerned with the present quality of food in Lister, and the lack of adequate “flex dollars” in the new program.

Taken together, the lack of adequate consultation, perceived lack of value and impact this plan may have on students’ willingness to live in Lister suggests that it is untenable in its current form and the Students’ Union cannot support it.
Additional Comments

The survey allowed participants to provide additional open-ended comments about the proposed AYCTE meal plan. A summary of some of the main themes that emerged in analysing the open-ended responses is indicated below, along with verbatim comments from students.

Dissatisfaction with quality and variety of food options: Majority of the comments indicated a general overall dissatisfaction with the quality of food currently available in Lister, including a strong dislike given the lack of adequate nutritious options. Some, with dietary restrictions, observed insufficient choice of meal options. Many participants expressed obesity and other related health concerns given the quality of food currently available in Lister. Additionally, they indicated that quality concerns and limited dietary options often lead them to venture outside Lister Hall to purchase groceries and meals from vendors elsewhere on campus or off campus. Additionally, participants also noted that they generally consumed their mid-day meal on campus (as opposed to returning to Lister physically, between class times), where they would spend additional money to purchase food. Hence, while some participants liked the option of “flex-dollars” being introduced as part of the proposed AYCTE meal plan, they viewed its 300-dollar limit as insufficient (over the span of eight months) to meet their food consumption needs on campus.

- I am not opposed to the idea of an AYCTE meal plan, it's been very successful at the Augustana Campus but I am very opposed to the way it has been proposed to work in Lister. The reason the AYCTE has been so successful in Augustana is because the quality of the food there is better, and it's an easily accessible option for Residents since their campus is smaller and has less dining options. The quality of Aramark food is poor, I personally have had problems keeping on weight, and have struggled with anemia while living in Lister because I often prefer to skip meals than eat the awful food, and I know I'm not the only person who does this. The food is not appetizing, well made, healthy, nutritious, or prepared properly or safely. I know many people who don't eat from the Cafeteria, they only cook for themselves often because they have dietary restrictions such as veganism/vegetarianism, Celiac disease, religious restrictions such as halal/kosher, or they just want to eat healthy which isn't possible with the amount of grease and salt in everything, or because the food is just gross and often improperly prepared.

- I do not consume enough food for this meal plan to be worth it to me. As it is, I have money left over from the smallest meal plan. It's not fair to make people with small appetites pay the same amount as those with very large appetites who eat a lot. Plus those with dietary restrictions that can't eat most foods in the cafe should not be forced to pay this flat rate if they don't get the same options as everyone else.

- The plan itself is not a bad idea; I like the concept of flexibility with the All You Care To Eat. However, being on campus for a majority of my day, $300 for the entire year is not nearly enough. Also, the AYCTE plan has me concerned that Aramark and whatever
people in Residence Services who overlook Aramark will raise prices in the Marina and Lister Market in order to compensate this new plan, when prices are already ridiculously high.

- This all-you-care-to-eat meal plan is extremely restricting for students who cannot afford that much and for students with dietary restrictions. The cross contamination in the Market would mean that students with dietary restrictions, whether they be personal choices or health related, could not eat there, which means that nearly $5,000 (or over $5,000 according to the projected cost increases) has been spent for no reason. For example, at Lister Market meat and vegetarian options are cooked on the same grill top, and gluten containing foods and gluten free foods are cooked together defeating the purpose of having vegetarian/gluten free options and presenting serious health risks for students. I know I chose the second tier meal plan because I really could not afford to get the biggest one, if I had to pay that much for my meal plan I probably would have chosen to stay at a different residence.

- Considering students spend around half their time on campus, a meal plan that does not provide money for lunches is a very poor idea. The amount of "flex funds" required for use on campus yearly would likely be around $1000. Especially considering that the places you can use the current meal plan on campus offer better food at better prices than the Lister dining hall currently, as someone who never ate at the Lister dining hall because of the cost/small portion size, this change is still unreasonable. Consider a year of lunches: $8*26weeks*5days/week, or $1040. I would consider this to be the minimum acceptable amount of flex-funds available in this plan. As someone who eats a lot (varsity athlete), and lived in Lister for the past 3 years, I can say that my average lunch is around $10 in SUB, or $1300 in lunches over the year. I am going to take a moment here to mention how forcing people into a single-supplier mandatory meal plan is perhaps not good for a great many people with dietary restrictions.

- From a personal standpoint I feel that this is a outrageous money grab by the university to force students into paying even more for overpriced food and limiting their options. The limited options will affect students’ health not just physically but mentally as well. As the university's priority should be the physical and mental health of its students their meal plan policies should reflect these values. This proposed meal plan blatantly reduces the variety of students’ diets while forcing them to pay for services they will not use and do not want to use. I would not be returning to Lister if this plan was instated, as I along with everyone I know would not fully use this plan. In addition I would go out of my way to tell others not to live in Lister. This would be solely based on the new meal plan as I feel that Lister is an amazing community that all university students should have the chance to be a part of.
Cost Concerns and Likelihood of Living in Residences: Participants also expressed mixed reactions to the proposed AYCTE meal plan, which the University of Alberta intends to make mandatory, replacing the three options (Tier 1, 2 and 3 meal plans) currently available to students. The vast majority of participants expressed straight-up affordability concerns related to the proposed meal plan, which would cost them $4900 over an eight-month period. Many participants, currently on Tier 2 ($3724) and Tier 3 ($3227) meal plans, noted that they generally had unused funds at the end of the year. Since they could not redeem this elsewhere, it led to monetary waste. Moreover, they expressed concerns at being required to purchase a $4900 meal plan for living in Lister Hall and suggested the likelihood of not living in Lister and making similar recommendations to their peers.

A small proportion of participants indicated that the mandatory implementation of the proposed meal plan would not have any impact on their likelihood of living in Lister Hall. However, this opinion seemed to follow from the fact that their current meal plans were insufficient to match their consumption needs given that food options available in Lister Hall were considered “overpriced” for the quality and quantity. In other words, the preference for the more expensive proposed AYCTE meal plan might be indicative of lower value-for-money offered by current options, rather than greater consumption needs.

- If the AYCTE meal plan is implemented I will not be returning to Lister Hall. I am a student, not a sack of money.
- This meal plan is very expensive considering rent to live in Lister is a large investment in itself. I think this new meal plan should be added to the current ones as a fourth tier because some people simply cannot afford it.
- Forcing people to pay nearly 5 thousand dollars to eat at one specific source is absurd. If this applied to all of campus, that would still be unreasonable, but having it restricted to only the Lister Cafeteria makes no sense at all. Most people in Lister eat either in the Marina or elsewhere on campus once they have inevitably become tired of the cafeteria food. In addition, I know that I could not afford to spend such an exorbitant amount of money on overpriced food. If I were living on my own, I’d be spending much less for a larger variety. Even proposing this feels like outright disrespect to those of us that choose to live on campus. We are already spending unjustifiable amounts of money on small living quarters, laundry, utilities, and our current meal plan. $5000$ for just food is ridiculous with everything else on top of it.
- I would not want to live exclusively on Aramark’s food. Frankly, the quality of food we receive for the price we pay is already abysmal. Had I chose to live on Aramark alone, I would have gained a very significant amount of weight. In addition, there is no accommodation for those with food related allergies, intolerances and medical conditions (Celiac Disease for example). Those students are forced to cook for themselves because of the lack of accommodation, as well as forced to pay for a meal
plan they cannot use and cannot be reimbursed for in the end. It is an absolutely ridiculous requirement. In addition, what would be done with money left over from meal plan this year? There is no mention of that anywhere in the proposal.

- I want to be an RA in Lister next year, but if the $4900 meal plan becomes mandatory I will not be living here again. Thanks for asking for students' opinions; I hope you'll take mine into account!

- This is an absolutely ridiculous amount to expect students to pay. I have lived in Lister the previous 2 years and have taken the level 3 meal plan each time. Each year I have eaten all that I desired and STILL have been left with $300-500 on my meal plan. It is ludicrous to ask students to pay $400 a month for food when many students already find Lister to be out of their price range. If this change does go through I will be recommending my younger siblings not to live in Lister.

- The prices at the Mar and the Cafe is so outrageously expensive. Students can buy the same products at the Mac's across the street for less. If this new proposed plan is approved, I wouldn't have to worry about budgeting and I could just eat what I want which is what it should be like.

- The food prices in Lister are very over inflated and I think unlimited would help fix that.

- I believe the problem of students running out of meal plan money is not because of the system, it is because of the high food prices set by Aramark yet poor quantity and quality that does not meet the price level. As a large eater, I spent a 1000 extra last year on top of my medium plan, but did not change my plan this year because of the lack of fresh, healthy food. I'm an avid fruit/vegetable/healthy eater and fresh fruit other than the occasional bananas and apples are almost non-existent in Lister. I believe a new all you can eat plan would not help since the quality of food would not improve. For this plan to be welcomed by residents, I believe a positive change in the prices, quantity, and quality in food must be made first before setting up a new plan which will increase the cost of living in Lister.

**Post-secondary Affordability concerns:** Barring concerns indicated above, some survey participants indicated apprehensions about their ability to afford post-secondary education should they choose to live in Lister next year. The financial burden created by the proposed mandatory meal plan would translate into additional funds they would need to arrange but be unable to given the $15,000 cap on the maximum allowable borrowing amount. If the proposed meal plan were to be implemented, a typical undergraduate student living in Lister Hall would spend one-third of their borrowing limit on food available in Lister alone (for eight months of the year) not counting food and groceries purchased at retailers across campus or off campus and various other expenses (such as tuition and other fees, academic material costs, residence and so on) they must undertake during their time at university.
This plan is extremely disrespectful to the students of the University of Alberta. To those who take out loans, it is simply not realistic. The government only offers you fifteen thousand dollars at most for the duration of the academic year. The rent goes up nearly every year and with this meal plan the amount of money Residence would cost will equal to over ten thousand dollars a year, tuition is approximately six-seven thousand. I personally myself would not be able to afford school.

The max allowable student loans is $15000 per year, with tuition, rent, and an increased meal plan of $4900, students who support themselves financially are now unable to afford both their education, and a place to live.

The university should not be an environment where it acts like a corporate business, where they are hogging all of their consumers' money, but instead act in a setting where it is a learning environment similar to a public school. If they are going to introduce this system, then they should also consider the students who cannot afford to pay close to $5000 just for food, with residence and tuition included.

Why in God's name would you claim that "[the AYCTE plan] will significantly reduce stress for students because they will no longer have to worry about running out of money, getting enough to eat, or searching for healthy options." What you are doing is ensuring that a significant majority of students will instead run out of money for school expenses (!!) long BEFORE their AYCTE plan is extinguished. It is absolutely inane to think that increasing the meal plan to such a high amount, will not drastically affect the ability to pay for concurrent costs of going to school (textbooks, tuition, other basic necessities for University students). You cannot tell me you have the best interests of one of the largest residence communities in Western Canada in mind, and then decide that solving the meal plan issues is worth sacrificing many students' ability to stay in Lister (and enjoy all that it has to offer). The AYCTE plan is a good idea with horrible execution. Never mind the continued blood feud with the LHSA. Make your AYCTE plan at least somewhat reasonable, by increasing the Flex Dollars to more than the price of a top quality hockey stick. Lastly, I really do not give a rat's ass about the comparable meal plans at other Universities. As a Business student, it pains me to see the information bias that is occurring here. By providing statistics on other meal plans, there is little room for affected parties (students and their parents) to go and research just how unhealthy, bland, and similar the food choices are. Do not think that simply providing these statistics will help your cause, and allow the powers that be to maintain at least a shred of positive news. What you seem to have done is provided these stats in the hope that it will help everyone reach a proper conclusion, when the only feedback you really need to see is the anger and frustration of an already inflamed Lister residence.
Comments about AYCTE meal plans at other campuses: Few participants refuted the observations made about attitude toward AYCTE meal plan by students at Augustana and Carleton University in the publicly circulated document (included with the survey). In relation to Augustana, students noted two reasons why residents were satisfied with the meal plan: significantly higher quality of food and limited convenient options available on or off campus given Augustana’s location.

– I worked at the food services at the Augustana Campus in Camrose and they used a nearly identical system with huge support from the students and the food services itself. Although this was on a much smaller scale, on a larger scale like North Campus I’m not sure how well this would run, $300 isn’t much if you’re trying to get lunch quickly while running from ETLC to Humanities all year.
– I just transferred from Augustana Campus where their meal plan is formatted like this and it was fantastic. There is no added stress of budgeting your eating habits. Guaranteed 3 meals a day is a great stress relief.
– I experienced an all you can eat option in Augustana campus and did not find it was beneficial to me. It limits options and raises costs because I don’t eat as much as the average person. I will not live in Lister if this plan is implemented.
– Lived on the campus of Carleton University for one week, and the food there was absolutely poor; there was no variety in their food, and the quality and quantity that they provided me was not reasonable for the price I paid. While here at the University of Alberta, implementing the AYCTE program would be a disastrous idea for the same reasons.

Need for greater consultation: Some survey participants indicated dissatisfaction at not being informed and / or consulted by the university prior to proposing this new meal plan. They cited the absence of Lister Hall Student Association as a barrier to being represented in consultation about the proposed meal plan. Furthermore, the resident assistant who was sent to Carleton University by University of Alberta’s Residence Service unit to complete the survey and report on student satisfaction made the following observation on social media (in response to peer observations about quality of food) that her outreach (via the Food Committee): “only surveyed ~ 15 students while at Carleton, half of whom were indifferent with their all you can eat options, a third of whom enjoyed it, and 1/6 of whom felt the same way as you did. What I did notice was parent satisfaction was quite high at Carleton, as they did not have to worry about their children”. In other words, the report titled “A review of Carleton University’s ALL-You-Care-To-Eat-Program” presented by Residence Service administrators lacks representative sampling and fails to support the claim that AYCTE meal plan at Carleton has backing from Carleton students.
I would be very interested in knowing or it being made public what the University's process for consulting the residents of Lister was, especially in terms of actual responses and gathered data.

First of all, as far as I have heard there has been no mention of this proposed change within Lister and I have certainly not been consulted about it. In fact, aside from Chitter (a social media app!!) this survey shared via Facebook by a former LHSA VP (another social media app!!!) was the only mention of it so far. Anyways, I think this new change is absolutely absurd and should not be considered at all. It doesn't allow for a cheaper alternative and is, ironically, extremely 'uninclusive' towards residents who prefer to make their own food. Or students who are not in Lister very often and simply don't have time to commute back to Lister to eat for every meal (i.e. nurses during clinical sessions). It seems like a huge money-grab on behalf of the university because the amount of students who would actually be able to capitalize on its benefits are far outnumbered by the students it would take advantage of. Even with the absurd prices at the Lister Market it would be tough to eat more than $4900 worth of food within Lister (and the variety is nowhere near enough to even want to try).

No LHSA, things like this happen. The food will be overpriced and terrible, with little selection, i.e. as bad as it is now. However, knowing how things go, the food will probably get worse. Also, the cap on how much you can spend outside lister is a hilariously terrible attempt to further capitalize at the expense of students, by basically restricting students to only give the money to Aramark. These sort of decisions are what will inevitably kill residence in the short term future, since talking to people on my floor and around Lister, it sounds as if fewer and fewer people are going to be coming to Lister. In addition there will be not a chance of convincing current residents to return, because it is far cheaper to get an apartment or house and buy your own meals with some variety, as opposed to consuming vile matter for thousands of dollars. Whoever makes these decisions makes me wonder how removed they are from life in Lister, and how little they care about the health and economic wellbeing of students.

Well the University has never consulted with the Lister residents about the meal plan, so I don't know where the SU is getting this information. Also the University never consults us Lister students at all and just make decisions, such as turning Schäffer Hall into a first year residence, without getting the input of Lister students since there is no one anymore that represents us