



University of Toronto

Report of the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus

Final Report – September 7, 2006

Report of the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus
Final Report – September 7, 2006

Office of the Vice Provost, Students
Simcoe Hall, Room 223
27 King's College Circle
Toronto, ON M5S 1A1

Tel: 416.978.3870

Fax: 416.946.0678

Email: viceprovost.students@utoronto.ca

Web: <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca>



Report of the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus University of Toronto

Final Report – September 7, 2006

Contents

Executive Summary	v
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Terms of Reference	1
1.2 Committee Membership.....	2
1.3 Glossary of Terms.....	3
2. Work of the Committee	5
2.1 Committee Meetings.....	5
2.2 Research and Data Collection.....	5
3. Approach to Student Activity Space	7
3.1 Multi-Nodal Model.....	7
3.2 Communication.....	8
4. The Need for an Additional Large Node	10
4.1 A New Node of Student Activity Space.....	10
5. Current Needs	13
5.1 The Expansion of Student Activity Space.....	13
5.2 Current Space Needs.....	13
(a) Food Services.....	13
(b) Meeting and Workshop Spaces.....	14
(c) Lounge Spaces.....	14
(d) Office Space.....	15
(e) Storage Space.....	15
(f) Rehearsal Space.....	16
(g) Large Indoor Campus Event Space.....	16

6. Financing	18
6.1 Financing the Development of an Additional Large Node.....	18
6.2 Financing the Expansion of Existing Space.....	19
6.3 New Capital Projects.....	19
7. Current Use and Allocation of Space	20
Appendices	21
Appendix 1. Summary of University Toronto Facilities Study – Winter 2004....	21
Appendix 2. Summary of Student Activity Space Student Survey – Spring 2006.....	25
Appendix 3. Summary of Student Activity Space Campus Groups Survey – Spring 2006	27
Appendix 4. Submissions.....	28
Appendix 5. Students’ Administrative Council Spring 2005 Referendum Question & Summary of Results.....	29
Appendix 6. Summary of 2001/2002 Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Standards in the ‘Student and Central Services’ Category.....	30



**Report of the Committee to Review Student Activity Space on the St. George Campus
University of Toronto**

Final Report – September 7, 2006

Executive Summary

Committee Recommendations

Approach to Student Activity Space

- Recommendation 1: The Committee recommends that the University reaffirm the multi-nodal approach to student activity space as articulated by the 1999 Task Force on Student Activity Space.....Page 7
- Recommendation 2: The Committee recommends the creation of an on-going network for individuals who are responsible for managing student activity space across the St. George Campus.....Page 9

The Need for an Additional Large Node

- Recommendation 3: The Committee recommends that the University establish a project planning committee and begin a formal planning process, in collaboration with student governments and other key stakeholders, to develop an additional large node of student activity space on the St. George Campus.....Page 12

Current Needs With Respect to the Expansion of Student Activity Space

- Recommendation 4: The Committee recommends that a series of small nodes or “niches” of student activity space be created throughout the campus.....Page 13
- Recommendation 5: The Committee recommends the addition of affordable food services, offering a wide variety of food options, to meet the needs of the University’s diverse student population.....Page 14

- Recommendation 6: The Committee recommends the creation of additional meeting and workshop spaces where students and campus groups can hold meetings, pursue group work, and deliver presentations or workshops.....Page 14
- Recommendation 7: The Committee recommends the development of casual lounge-spaces for students to make use of between classes.....Page 15
- Recommendation 8: The Committee recommends that the University work to address the need for additional office space for campus groups through the creation of “pods” in which four to six groups share facilities and resources.....Page 15
- Recommendation 9: The Committee recommends that the University provide additional storage space for student organizations.....Page 16
- Recommendation 10: The Committee recommends the development of additional rehearsal space for performing arts groups.....Page 16
- Recommendation 11: The Committee recommends the development of additional facilities for large indoor campus events.....Page 17

Financing

- Recommendation 12: The Committee recommends that the University undertake the development of a preliminary business plan for the financing of an additional large node of student activity space on the St. George Campus. This plan should include a variety of mechanisms including: a student levy, matching University funds, and donor contributions.....Page 18
- Recommendation 13: The Committee recommends that if student organizations are successful in seeking student support for a student levy to fund the development of an additional large node of student activity space, the University should provide matching funds of 50 cents for each dollar raised through the levy.....Page 18
- Recommendation 14: The Committee recommends that the University undertake the development of a preliminary business plan for the financing of the expansion of student activity space on the St. George Campus. This plan should include a variety of mechanisms which may include: a student levy, matching University funds, and donor contributionsPage 19
- Recommendation 15: The Committee recommends that the user’s group for each new capital construction project consider including a component of student activity space.....Page 19

Current Use and Allocation of Student Activity Space

- Recommendation 16: The Committee recommends the development of an online interactive map that will assist students in finding student-activity space on-campus. Such a map should include floor plans of buildings and rooms, room capacities, information regarding accessibility and room booking procedures.....Page 20
- Recommendation 17: The Committee recommends that recognized campus groups be given the opportunity to reserve space online.....Page 20
- Recommendation 18: The Committee recommends that campus groups be permitted to identify up to two contact people who are authorized to reserve space.....Page 20
- Recommendation 19: The Committee recommends the facilitation of greater opportunities for advance room booking on the part of student groups.....Page 20

1. Introduction

Providing exceptional facilities, including student activity space, is central to the student experience at the University of Toronto. On the St. George Campus, the University operates under a philosophy that student activity space (broadly defined) is available in many nodes around the campus. There are a number of medium to large nodes (e.g., Hart House, International Student Centre, the Sussex Club House), many small nodes (e.g., lounges), and hundreds of tiny nodes. Each of these nodes, in its own way, provides profound and important opportunities for students to learn and engage in the out of classroom experience of the University.

This nodal approach to student activity space was adopted by the Task Force on Student Activity Space chaired by then Vice-Provost, Students Ian Orchard in 1999. The Task Force recommended that a multiple-node-model is best suited for providing additional space for recognized student groups. Although it was not a new concept, it was articulated in this fashion to address the recurring question of whether a new all encompassing facility might address a variety of needs. In fact, the Task Force, which included many students, explicitly abandoned the notion of a new student centre.

In response to recent questions with respect to a need for new student space on the St. George Campus, a committee to review student activity space was established.

1.1 Terms of Reference

The terms of reference of the Committee are as follows:

- 1) To review and make recommendations with respect to the University's current approach to student activity space on the St. George Campus and, specifically, the extent to which the multi-nodal approach to student activity space continues to serve the needs of students on the campus.
- 2) To articulate the extent to which there is a current need for an additional large node of student activity space on the St. George Campus.
- 3) To articulate the current needs with respect to the expansion of student activity space and to recommend the means by which the University might address these needs.
- 4) To evaluate alternative ways of meeting the needs articulated including, but not limited to, the reallocation of existing space, the conversion of existing space, and the construction or acquisition of new space.

- 5) To develop an outline of a financial plan, consistent with existing policy, to meet any new capital and operating costs associated with any new initiatives recommended by the committee.
- 6) To assess the current use and allocation of student activity space.

1.2 Committee Membership

At different points throughout the work of the Committee various people participated including:

David Farrar, Deputy Provost & Vice-Provost, Students (chair)
Susan Addario, Director, Student Affairs
Gage Averill, Dean, Faculty of Music
Ashwin Balamohan, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council
David Bateman, Vice-President, Internal, Graduate Students Union
Blake Chapman, Undergraduate Student, University College
Christopher Collins, Graduate Student, School of Graduate Studies
Monica Contreras, Assistant Dean and Director, Planning and Information Technology, Faculty of Arts & Science
Jim Delaney, Assistant Director, Student Affairs
Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Coralie D'Souza, Undergraduate Student Representative, Governing Council
Davis Elisha, Executive Assistant to the Director, Student Services
Greg Evans, Vice Dean, Undergraduate, Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering
Margaret Hancock, Warden, Hart House
Jen Hassum, President, Students' Administrative Council
Jason Hunter, Dean of Students, Victoria University
Joanna Langille, Undergraduate Student, Member of Board of Stewards, Hart House
Sarah Lipton, Undergraduate Student, Faculty of Nursing
Nabil Mansour, Contact Person, Al-Awda, U of T
Chris Ramsaroop, Representative, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Gabriel Rauterberg, Co-Chair, Committee to Allocate Student Activity Space
Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Space and Facilities Planning
Howard Tam, Alumnus and Representative, Friends of the Student Centre
Estefania Toledo, Vice-President, University Affairs, Students' Administrative Council
Marilyn Van Norman, Director, Student Services
Charles Waldheim, Associate Dean, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design
Melinda Scott, Student Affairs (Secretary)

1.3 Glossary of Terms

The following terms and conventions are used in this report:

APUS	Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students
CASAS	Committee for the Allocation of Student Activity Space
CIUT – FM	CIUT-FM, University of Toronto Community Radio Inc.
COU	Council of Ontario Universities
Division	Any faculty within the University, any College within the Faculty of Arts and Science, or any other academic unit which functions at a similar level.
GSU	Graduate Students' Union
OPIRG	Ontario Public Interest Research Group
OSM	Office of Space Management
Recognized Campus Groups	Voluntary organizations which are "recognized" by the Office of Student Affairs under the University's Policy on the Recognition of Campus Groups.
SAC	Students' Administrative Council
SCSU	Scarborough Campus Students' Union
SEC	Sexual Education Centre
Student Governments	The four representative student governments at the University of Toronto – SAC, APUS, GSU, SCSU. These organizations are sometimes referred to as student unions.

Student Societies

Organizations on whose behalf the University collects a compulsory non-academic incidental fee, in which membership is automatic and determined by registration in one or more divisions of the University (or in the case of a residence council, residency in a particular building).

UTM

University of Toronto at Mississauga

UTSC

University of Toronto at Scarborough

2. Work of the Committee

2.1 Committee Meetings

As a group, the Committee met five times between July 2005 and June 2006. Topics covered included: identification of the most pressing needs for student activity space on the St. George Campus, examination of the extent to which existing facilities are under-utilized, discussion of how existing spaces could be expanded, a review of existing student activity spaces at this institution and elsewhere, the creation of survey instruments to assess the needs of individual students and campus groups, and an examination of survey results. The Committee viewed presentations from CIUT-FM, the Programming Unit of the Office of Student Affairs, and SAC – and solicited submissions from recognized student societies. Finally, the task force prepared its recommendations as documented in this report.

2.2 Research and Data Collection

Existing Facilities: An inventory of existing student space was conducted in the summer of 2005. This process involved gathering information with regard to locker services, parking services, storage facilities, multi-faith prayer space, computer services, group study spaces, and food facilities on the St. George Campus.

Student Surveys: Surveys of students on the St. George Campus were conducted in the winter of 2004 and spring of 2006. The objectives of the 2004 survey were to assess the usage of recreational facilities on the St. George Campus and to determine support for funding alternatives for new facilities. 44, 118 invitations to participate in this online survey were sent out and 7, 967 responses were received. A summary of the results of this survey are included in Appendix 1.

In the spring of 2006 a second survey was designed in an effort to determine student opinion with regard to the University's current use of space and approach to providing student activity space, the extent to which additional space is required, and how a need for additional space might be addressed. Invitations to participate were sent to 22, 914 St. George Campus students. Undergraduate, graduate, full-time, and part-time students were all included in the sample. Appendix 2 includes a summary of the responses from this survey.

Campus Groups Survey: Recognized campus groups were also invited to participate in a survey in the spring of 2006 in an effort to identify the needs of campus groups with regard to student activity space. A summary of the results of this survey is included in Appendix 3.

Submissions: The Committee received submissions from a number of campus groups and administrative units. These submissions provided valuable insight into the existing space challenges and offered numerous suggestions which the Committee found very useful in developing its final report. Appendix 4 includes a list of submissions received by the Committee.

3. Approach to Student Activity Space

3.1 Multi-Nodal Model

The University of Toronto currently operates under a philosophy that student activity space is available in many nodes throughout the St. George Campus. This approach was adopted as a result of the 1999 Task Force on Student Activity Space, chaired by then Vice-Provost, Students Ian Orchard. In an effort to address recurring questions with regard to the need for an all-encompassing facility that might address a variety of needs, the Task Force recommended that “a multiple ‘node’ model is the best suited for providing additional space for recognized student groups” and explicitly abandoned the notion of a new student centre.

In 1971, the Students’ Administrative Council (SAC) also rejected the idea of a single student centre, stating that “all of the efforts which would have been aimed at getting a campus centre or campus centres erected should be oriented instead at making the campuses pleasurable, gratifying, comfortable and instructive environments”.

The multi-nodal model is considered a progressive approach for large campuses, and it has been accepted on the St. George Campus. Currently there are numerous excellent multi-node facilities in existence – each with a variant on their focus and how they serve the student body – which recognize the unique nature of the St. George Campus and the diverse nature of its many student communities.

Some of the most notable nodes in place or in development include:

- Hart House – cultural, intellectual, recreational, social, multipurpose space
- Sussex Club House – club offices, limited multipurpose space
- Multifaith Centre – prayer and meditation space (in development)
- International Student Centre – club offices, cultural
- Bancroft – First Nations House, Women’s Centre, OPIRG, GSU
- Athletic Centre – recreational

The success of the multi-nodal model at the University of Toronto supports its continuance. However, the Committee noted that there are currently space demands which are not being addressed, and discussed the need to create an additional large node to meet these needs.

Recommendation 1: The Committee recommends that the University reaffirm the multi-nodal approach to student activity space as articulated by the 1999 Task Force on Student Activity Space.

3.2 Communication

Committee members identified a desire for increased communication among those responsible for managing all forms of student activity space across the St. George Campus in an effort to ensure that the University is maximizing the effectiveness of the multi-nodal approach. It was also noted that in recent years there has been increasing interest in the issue of student activity space; however, the University lacks an on-going structure for the regular monitoring of student activity space needs and the development of solutions.

Committee members agreed that the creation of an on-going network for individuals responsible for student activity space across the campus could provide a coordinated, but still decentralized, setting where issues and ideas could be considered in a comprehensive manner. Similar to the University of Toronto Arts Council and Food Network, a Council on Student Activity Space, convened by the Vice-Provost, Students or a designate, would provide an opportunity for the development of broad strategies to meet student needs, making use of existing resources wherever possible.

The membership of such a council may include, but is not limited to: staff from Colleges and buildings on campus such as 89 Chestnut, Sir Sanford Fleming and the Bahen Centre which have space used by student groups, representatives from Hart House, OSM, the Athletics Centre, Student Affairs, SAC, GSU, APUS, and the International Student's Centre. In addition, it was suggested that representatives of student centres on all three campuses could meet regularly as a subset of this network to promote tri-campus communication and collaboration.

The Terms of Reference of such a council should include the following:

- To provide a forum for communication among administrative units and student groups responsible for managing all forms of student activity space on the St. George Campus.
- To increase awareness of the impact of student activity space on student's on-campus experiences as well as the wide range of activities for which these spaces are used.
- To develop common policies, guidelines and practices as appropriate for the management of student activity space across the St. George Campus.
- To monitor student activity space needs and develop strategies by which the University might address these needs.
- To advise the Vice-President and Provost on issues affecting student activity space on the St. George Campus.

Recommendation 2: **The Committee recommends the creation of an on-going network for individuals who are responsible for managing student activity space across the St. George Campus.**

4. The Need for an Additional Large Node

4.1 A New Node of Student Activity Space

There was consensus among Committee members that there is currently a critical shortage of student activity space on the St. George Campus, and the addition of more student space would serve to enhance the on-campus student experience. Submissions received by the Committee, results of the student and campus groups surveys, and the experiences of Committee members all served to highlight a number of areas in which there is a significant need for additional student activity space. In particular, the Committee recognized the experiences of the many students who commute to the campus each day, and who need more suitable spaces in which to study, meet friends, read, or pursue group work.

The University has reached a point where existing nodes such as the Sussex Club House, International Student Centre and Hart House, are facing serious space constraints which threaten their ability to meet the needs of the over 300 recognized campus groups on the St. George Campus. Each year the Committee for the Allocation of Student Activity Space (CASAS) receives far more applications for office space than can be accommodated; generally less than half of the campus groups who apply are granted space. As the university increases its efforts to enhance the student experience, it is expected that demand for these spaces will only continue to increase.

The Council of Ontario Universities (COU) has established standards with regard to the amount of student activity space available. An analysis of the data from the 2001/2002 COU submission suggests that although the St. George Campus is above the system average, it is below COU's recommended range in the 'Student and Central Services' category as well as the 'Common Use and Student Activity Space' sub-category. In addition, 2001/2002 projections indicated that although new facilities were being added in some sub-categories, the university would fall behind because of increases in the student population. Appendix 6 includes a summary of the COU Student Activity Space comparative data.

Surveys of students and campus groups conducted in the winter of 2004 and the spring of 2006 provide support for the addition of a large node of student activity space on the St. George Campus. In 2004, 48% of students who responded to the survey felt that a new facility for social and cultural activities was required. The results of the spring 2006 survey revealed that 59% of students and 83% of campus groups indicate a need for an additional central space for students to congregate.

The Students' Administrative Council (SAC) has indicated that they are strongly in support of the development of an additional large node of student activity

space and they are comfortable with the creation of a levy to help finance this new space. In March of 2005, SAC held a non-binding plebiscite on the issue of building a new student owned and operated student centre on the St. George Campus. SAC's members were specifically asked if they would be willing to pay a compulsory levy to support such a building. 2,619 students voted in the plebiscite and the proposal received 57% support. Appendix 5 includes the SAC referendum question and a summary of the results. There was consensus among Committee members that the governance structure for an additional large node should be negotiated as part of the planning process – prior to construction.

The Committee recognized that in addition to student activity space, in the coming years the University may require additional facilities to accommodate a variety of needs including: academic space, daycare facilities, study space, student services, CIUT-FM, the Sexual Education Centre (SEC), and the Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students (APUS). The creation of a new large node offers the opportunity to purposefully develop a facility which is designed to significantly increase the amount of student activity space on the St. George Campus while also accommodating a number of other complementary services and groups.

The development of an additional large node of student activity space has the potential to significantly impact the daily on-campus experiences of U of T students. The Committee envisions another dynamic facility in which community is intentionally built and supported among students, faculty and staff.

As they enter, students would be greeted by a reception-like hub that provides a directory of all activities taking place in the building as well as in other nodes across campus, encourages students to become involved in the community, and supports student groups in planning and promoting events and activities. Flexible social spaces would provide a welcoming environment where students from across divisions could meet and interact in small and large groups and where individual students could spend time between classes studying, eating, or socializing. Such a space could also allow students who commute to campus the opportunity to extend their day and travel at off-peak times so they might attend an evening event on-campus.

Open congregational space would provide an additional place for campus groups to hold cultural events, offer open forums, promote events and activities, and engage in outreach. Through collaboration with campus groups, student societies, and administrative units – and engaging in intentional programming – this space could become a dynamic hub of activity on-campus where students, faculty, and staff come to connect.

The inclusion of an anchor tenant with a long established history at the University could serve to further develop a feeling of community – acting as an animator for the space. Examples of possible anchor tenants might include, but are not

limited to: student governments, campus media outlets, SEC, or OPIRG. Central office space for student unions as well as clusters of offices for student groups with shared meeting rooms, computers, and storage facilities would provide much needed additional office space while also creating an environment conducive to communication and collaboration across campus groups and student societies. The incorporation of a major student media outlet – such as CIUT-FM – would complement these clusters, providing a good flow of information between campus groups and media.

Carefully crafted, a new large node of student activity space could create an additional communal space on the St. George Campus – providing another home away from home upon which students can rely 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Recommendation 3: The Committee recommends that the University establish a project planning committee and begin a formal planning process, in collaboration with student governments and other key stakeholders, to develop an additional large node of student activity space on the St. George Campus.

5. Current Needs

5.1 The Expansion of Student Activity Space

The Committee identified numerous space needs with respect to the expansion of student activity space and discussed several options for how these needs might be addressed. It was noted that classes and co-curricular activities are spread throughout the campus, and students express a desire to be able to readily access student activity space during breaks between classes or other on-campus activities. Results of the spring 2006 student survey indicate that 71% of respondents believe there is a need for additional spaces for students to “hang-out” between classes. Although the addition of a large node will serve to address many of the space needs that have been identified – due to time constraints associated with traveling across campus – on its own a new node may not adequately provide opportunities for students to congregate before and after class.

Smaller nodes, sometimes referred to as “niches”, offer the opportunity to develop casual lounge spaces spread throughout the campus for students to make use of between classes. See below for detail regarding services that should be considered for inclusion in such lounge spaces.

Recommendation 4: The Committee recommends that a series of smaller nodes or “niches” of student activity space be created throughout the campus.

5.2 Current Space Needs

(a) Food Services

Results of surveys of students and campus groups indicate that students feel strongly that there is a need for additional affordable food services and cafeterias on the St. George Campus. Students express a desire for affordable meals and a wider variety of food options which reflect the diverse needs of our student population (e.g. Vegan, Kosher, Halal, etc).

Some members of the Committee expressed concern that the survey results may represent a lack of awareness of the various food services offered throughout the campus, rather than a true lack of options. The Committee recognized that limitations of the student and campus groups surveys include the lack of a definition of the term “affordable” and a failure to specifically identify where additional food services are required. Given that the campus Food Committee has undertaken a review of cross-campus food needs, they were identified as a potential resource in implementing recommendations with regard to food services.

Recommendation 5: The Committee recommends the addition of affordable food services, offering a wide variety of food options, to meet the needs of the University's diverse student population.

(b) Meeting and Workshop Spaces

For many campus groups, holding regular meetings and presenting workshops is an important part of their mandate; however, campus groups report that there is a critical shortage of space in which they can pursue these activities. The constraints of classroom furniture often make it very difficult for groups to hold meetings or workshops. In addition, many group activities take place during evenings and weekends, and access to space during these times is limited.

Committee members agreed that ideally campus groups should have access to flexible rooms which can accommodate 15 to 50 people. These spaces should be furnished in such a way that the furniture can be arranged to accommodate boardroom, workshop, or classroom activities, and should include audio-visual equipment such as white boards and data projectors. These spaces should be considered for inclusion in a new large node of student activity space and existing spaces should be evaluated for their potential for conversion.

Recommendation 6: The Committee recommends the creation of additional meeting and workshop spaces where campus groups can hold meetings, pursue group work, and deliver presentations and workshops.

(c) Lounge Spaces

Students who commute to the campus each day articulate the need for lounge spaces to make use of between classes. Casual spaces that provide a relaxed and welcoming atmosphere that is conducive to conversation and impromptu meetings is critically important to developing student life and a sense of community on-campus. Although there are lounge spaces located throughout the campus in the colleges, departments, and professional faculties – there is a perception that these spaces are not welcoming to students from other divisions.

Students express a need for spaces to “hang-out” in which students from across divisions can feel comfortable. Food services, microwaves, recreational games, televisions, wireless connections, ATM machines, courtesy phones, and comfortable couches and chairs should all be considered for inclusion in the development or expansion of such spaces.

The Committee also recognized the possibility that casual lounge spaces could be designed in such a way that they could be utilized for large indoor events after-hours.

Recommendation 7: The Committee recommends the development of casual lounge spaces for students to make use of between classes.

(d) Office Space

Campus groups indicate a need for additional office space. At this time the Sussex Club House and International Student Centre can only accommodate approximately one third of the groups who apply for space, and these existing facilities are not fully accessible. 87% of respondents to the campus groups survey agreed that there is a need for additional office space for campus groups.

Although the Sussex Club House plays an important role in providing office space for campus groups, and Committee members agreed that it should continue to fulfill this role, its design is not ideal in that there are long corridors, no windows into offices and no reception area. In addition, the location of the Sussex Club House is not a high traffic area which hinders the ability of campus groups to conduct outreach activities.

There was consensus among Committee members that additional office space for campus groups should be considered for inclusion in a new large node of student activity space. The design of this space should be conducive to communication between groups and the sharing of resources, and these spaces should be centrally located to assist groups in their outreach efforts. These needs could be met through the creation of “pods” in which four to six groups share meeting facilities, computers, bulletin boards, filing cabinets and storage lockers.

Recommendation 8: The Committee recommends that the University work to address the need for additional office space for campus groups through the creation of “pods” in which four to six groups share facilities and resources.

(e) Storage Space

The Committee identified a need for additional storage space for student organizations to accommodate items such as outreach materials, display boards, banners and props – which are often not easily or safely stored in offices. 67% of campus groups who responded to the spring 2006 survey indicated a need for additional storage space.

The Committee recognized that with the creation of additional storage space comes the need for the development of a process by which this space is allocated to student groups. The existing structure of the Committee for the Allocation of Student Activity Space (CASAS), which currently assigns office

space to student groups, provides a useful framework that would also be appropriate for the allocation of storage space.

Recommendation 9: The Committee recommends that the University provide additional storage space for student organizations.

(f) Rehearsal Space

The needs of performing arts groups are distinct and the current availability of on-campus rehearsal space for these groups is extremely limited. Typically these groups require space daily for an intense period of time leading up to a performance; however, booking policies prevent groups from reserving multiple hours and they are unable to rehearse in theatres due to prohibitive technical charges. Due to the nature of their activities, the issue of sound travel can be problematic in many buildings, and liabilities associated with dance are causing concern for those who host them.

In addition to space that is conducive to rehearsal, performing arts groups also require spaces in which to build sets and props and to be able to store them until the performance. Other campus groups who require workspace in which to construct projects such as solar cars, floats, canoes, etc. could also make use of this space.

Although Committee members acknowledged the importance of the development of additional rehearsal space for performing arts groups, the Committee recognized its limitations with regard to the identification of specific locations for such spaces. Rehearsal space could be considered for inclusion in a new large node of student activity space; the creation of additional spaces could also be encouraged at a divisional level.

Recommendation 10: The Committee recommends the development of additional rehearsal space for performing arts groups.

(g) Large Indoor Campus Event Space

At this time there are very few spaces available on the St. George Campus that are conducive to holding large scale indoor events. Although spaces exist within the Colleges, these are only available for use by College groups. This presents a major challenge for cross-divisional activities – including those planned by most cultural groups who are generally organized campus-wide. Existing spaces are often prohibitively expensive and features such as round tables, sound systems, dance floors, food services and licensed service are uncommon. Many groups are forced to hold events such as volunteer fairs, clubs days, parties, fundraisers,

fashion shows and performances off campus due to a lack of appropriate space at the University.

In the development of large indoor campus event space there is the opportunity for the creation of mixed-use spaces that could be used for a variety of purposes. However, the Committee recognized the challenges associated with developing multi-use spaces that effectively fulfill all of the roles assigned to them and suggested that defining spaces with a limited number of purposes might be helpful.

Recommendation 11: The Committee recommends the development of additional facilities for large indoor campus events.

6. Financing

6.1 Financing the Development of an Additional Large Node

The development of an additional large node of student activity space will require new sources of funding. Student centers built at UTM and UTSC were funded through an approved student levy matched by the University at 50 cents for every dollar. SAC has indicated that they are strongly in support of the creation of an additional node of student activity space and they are comfortable with the establishment of a levy to help finance this new space. If such a levy were to be introduced SAC, GSU and APUS would need to provide direction with regard to the magnitude of levy that might be possible.

In March of 2005 SAC held a non-binding plebiscite on the issue of building a new student owned and operated student centre on the St. George Campus. SAC's members were specifically asked if they would be willing to pay a compulsory levy to support such a building. 2,619 students voted in the plebiscite – 57% supported the proposal and 36% rejected it.

Results of the student survey of student activity space indicate that 58% of respondents believe that the cost of University facilities should be funded entirely from sources other than student fees, and 38% support an increase in student fees to fund a portion of the cost of new facilities. When ranking space needs in terms of their priority to receive funding, affordable food services and spaces for students to “hang-out” were ranked first most often and facilities licensed to serve alcohol was ranked last most often.

The Committee noted that donor contributions as a result of the identification of the development of additional student activity space as a major Fund Raising Initiative have the potential to make a significant impact on such a project – however, they cannot be guaranteed.

Recommendation 12: The Committee recommends that the University undertake the development of a preliminary business plan for the financing of an additional large node of student activity space on the St. George Campus. This plan should include a variety of mechanisms including: a student levy, matching University funds, and donor contributions.

Recommendation 13: The Committee recommends that if student organizations are successful in seeking student support for a student levy to fund the development of an additional large node of student activity space, the University should provide matching funds of 50 cents for each dollar raised through the levy.

6.2 Financing the Expansion of Existing Student Activity Space

Throughout the work of the Committee there were discussions with regard to the possible expansion of existing student activity space. Although the Committee recognized its limitations with regard to the identification of specific spaces, members believed that there may be opportunities for expansion which could be identified at a divisional level.

Similarly to the addition of a new large node, the expansion of existing student activity space will require new sources of funding.

Recommendation 14: The Committee recommends that the University undertake the development of a preliminary business plan for the financing of the expansion of student activity space on the St. George Campus. This plan should include a variety of mechanisms which may include: a student levy, matching University funds, and donor contributions.

6.3 New Capital Projects

In an effort to increase the amount of space available for student groups on the St. George Campus, the final report of the 1999 Task Force on Student Activity Space recommended that the user's group for each new capital construction project consider including a component of student activity space. There was consensus among Committee members that the Committee should reaffirm this recommendation.

Recommendation 15: The Committee recommends that the user's group for each new capital construction project consider including a component of student activity space.

7. Current Use and Allocation of Space

The Committee has identified a critical shortage of student activity space on the St. George Campus; however, there is also evidence to suggest that many of the spaces already in existence are being under-utilized. Students and campus groups report difficulties in identifying student activity space across the campus and finding information with regard to floor plans and room capacities.

Once space is found, campus groups express frustration with room booking procedures. In particular, the lack of ability to reserve space online, identify more than one contact person who is authorized to reserve space, or book rooms in advance have been identified as significant barriers.

In the course of its work the Committee consulted with the Office of Space Management and other units which reserve space (e.g. Hart House). Committee members recognized the importance of ensuring that academic activities (i.e. lectures, seminars, etc.) have priority for room bookings. However, there was consensus that opportunities exist to facilitate greater ease for students in the room booking process.

Recommendation 16: The Committee recommends the development of an online interactive map that will assist students in finding student-activity space on-campus. Such a map should include floor plans of buildings, room capacities, information regarding accessibility and room booking procedures.

Recommendation 17: The Committee recommends that recognized campus groups be given the opportunity to reserve space online.

Recommendation 18: The Committee recommends that campus groups be permitted to identify up to two contact people who are authorized to reserve space.

Recommendation 19: The Committee recommends the facilitation of greater opportunities for advance room booking on the part of student groups.

Appendices

Appendix 1. Summary of University of Toronto Facilities Study – Winter 2004

Overview & Methodology

- Online survey February 24, 2004 – March 10, 2004
- Conducted by Customer Relationship index (CRI)
- 44, 118 invitations sent; 3, 793 bouncebacks
- 7, 967 responses from 37, 691 surveys: 21.3% response rate
- Objectives: (1) to assess usage of recreation facilities on the St. George Campus; (2) to determine support for funding alternatives for new facilities

For the purpose of this summary, data collected related to athletics facilities, food services, and informal use is not reported. For the complete report, contact the Office of Student Affairs. This summary includes data collected related to social, cultural and club facilities and does not include programming activities.

Support for New Student Centre

Rating	Need New Centre	Support Fee Increase
Strongly Disagree	4%	32%
Disagree	12%	27%
Neutral	36%	21%
Agree	36%	16%
Strongly Agree	12%	4%
Total Agree	48%	20%

Support for Fee Increase to Fund New Student Centre by Proximity to School

Fee Increase?	All	Residence	<15 min	15-45 min	>45 min
Strongly Disagree	32%	30%	28%	31%	35%
Disagree	27%	27%	27%	27%	28%
Neutral	21%	22%	21%	21%	20%
Agree	16%	16%	19%	17%	14%
Strongly Agree	4%	5%	5%	4%	3%

Willingness to Pay: Support for Alternatives

Solutions For Shortage of Facilities	Will Pay More	Willing to Pay Some	Would Like, But Not Willing to Pay	Would Not Pay
Space for faith-based observances	5%	8%	26%	61%
Space for meetings and club offices	6%	16%	38%	40%
Space for classes like aerobics	8%	18%	36%	38%
Playing areas for recreational and intramural activities	9%	18%	36%	36%
Space for big events	11%	21%	34%	34%
Space for cultural events	12%	23%	36%	30%
Space to socialize with friends	12%	23%	36%	29%
More places to eat	14%	22%	34%	29%
More athletic space and equipment for all	13%	23%	36%	28%

Relationship Between Involvement in Extra-Curricular Activities and Support for Student Centre

Extra-Curricular Activity	% Part.	In Favour	Neutral	Strongly Disagree	% Swing
Socialize in common spaces	80	85	80	74	14
Informal athletics	67	69	69	63	9
Campus pubs, dances, etc.	53	61	54	46	28
Organized athletics	46	50	48	42	17
Art	41	48	42	36	29
Performance arts	37	46	39	31	41
Volunteer Organization	35	43	35	30	37
Activity-based clubs	30	37	32	24	43
Media organizations	26	34	28	22	46
Ethno-cultural groups	23	25	24	22	13
Student government	20	27	20	17	50
Advocacy/social justice	18	26	18	15	61
Faith-based groups	14	17	14	12	36
Political groups	7	11	7	5	86

Hart House: Social, Cultural & Club Facilities

- 28% report usage**: n=2270; percentages may be less than 100 due to “no response”

	Poor	Fair	Accept-able	Good	Excel-lent
Range of specialized equipment	1%	5%	32%	50%	9%
Quantity of equipment	1%	6%	35%	48%	7%
Quality of equipment	1%	6%	32%	50%	8%
Size/capacity of facility	2%	7%	26%	48%	14%
Accessibility	4%	8%	26%	44%	17%
Available when I want to use it	3%	10%	28%	42%	14%
General cleaning & maintenance	1%	4%	20%	53%	21%
Overall physical condition	1%	4%	22%	54%	18%

** Additional data with respect to Hart House was collected in 2000 and 2004 reflecting the full range of programming and activities (i.e., not limited to social, cultural and club facilities). In the 2004 survey 70% of respondents indicated that Hart House overall is “an excellent resource for extra-curricular activities.” Nearly 70% would recommend the House to others. To access these results please contact Hart House.

International Student Centre

- 13% report use: n=1072; percentages may be less than 100 due to “no response”

	Poor	Fair	Accept-able	Good	Excel-lent
Range of specialized equipment	6%	14%	38%	30%	4%
Quantity of equipment	6%	18%	40%	28%	3%
Quality of equipment	6%	17%	39%	29%	3%
Size/capacity of facility	11%	19%	34%	28%	3%
Accessibility	5%	12%	32%	36%	9%
Available when I want to use it	6%	13%	34%	34%	8%
General cleaning & maintenance	5%	12%	31%	39%	9%
Overall physical condition	6%	13%	35%	37%	5%

Sussex Club House

- 4% report use: n=306; percentages may be less than 100 due to “no response”

	Poor	Fair	Accept-able	Good	Excel-lent
Range of specialized equipment	10%	15%	41%	22%	1%
Quantity of equipment	10%	19%	42%	20%	1%
Quality of equipment	11%	17%	42%	20%	1%
Size/capacity of facility	19%	24%	26%	20%	3%
Accessibility	10%	20%	26%	31%	5%
Available when I want to use it	6%	11%	27%	34%	14%
General cleaning & maintenance	6%	15%	28%	37%	7%
Overall physical condition	9%	17%	35%	28%	2%

Attitude Statements

	Strong Disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strong Agree
Would get more involved if more/better equipped facilities	5%	19%	42%	26%	8%
Extra-curricular activities key to getting full benefit of university	1%	6%	18%	45%	30%
Leave campus directly after class; no interest in extra-cur.	17%	37%	22%	18%	6%
Getting resources for an activity/club is easy	6%	19%	66%	8%	1%
Urgent need for faith-based facilities	16%	20%	50%	10%	5%
Food facilities/space meet expectations	14%	31%	21%	30%	4%
Urgent need for space for large events	4%	13%	40%	30%	14%
Urgent need for space for student activities	2%	10%	49%	28%	11%
Athletics & recreational facilities meet expectations	4%	14%	31%	43%	8%
Cultural & social facilities meet expectations	3%	13%	50%	31%	3%

Appendix 2. Summary of Student Activity Space Student Survey – Spring 2006

Overview & Methodology

- Online survey March 27, 2006 – April 28, 2006
- Conducted by StudentVoice
- 22, 914 invitations sent to undergraduate and graduate / part-time and full-time students.
- 4,135 responses
- To view the full results of the survey please contact the Office of Student Affairs

Student Activity Space Needs

Need	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
Affordable food services & cafeterias	54%	28%	11%	4%	0%
Access to an online interactive map	34%	46%	14%	4%	0%
Meeting / group work space	27%	47%	20%	4%	0%
Spaces for students to hang-out	33%	37%	20%	7%	1%
Dedicated space for students who live off campus	36%	33%	23%	5%	1%
Group study space	32%	37%	22%	6%	1%
Individual study space	30%	37%	20%	9%	1%
Social & recreational spaces	26%	40%	26%	6%	1%
Central space for students to congregate	19%	39%	32%	7%	1%
Space for large indoor events	17%	28%	40%	11%	2%
Facilities licensed to serve alcohol	22%	20%	40%	11%	2%
Lockers	18%	24%	43%	11%	2%
Barrier – free activity space	12%	26%	55%	2%	1%
Performance space	8%	19%	60%	8%	2%
Rehearsal / practice space	8%	18%	61%	8%	2%
Prayer / meditation space	8%	12%	52%	14%	11%

Attitude Statements

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
Non-academic facilities have a significant impact on the out-of-classroom experiences of students at U of T	30%	48%	15%	4%	1%
Having greater access to social & recreational spaces would increase my feeling of connection to the university	32%	46%	15%	4%	0%
Taking part in extra-cur. activities is key to getting the full benefit of university	33%	40%	19%	5%	0%
Clubs & other campus organizations have a significant impact on the out-of-classroom experiences of students at U of T	27%	46%	19%	5%	1%
Knowing that a facility is student owned & operated enhances its value to me	23%	34%	28%	10%	3%
I would get more involved if there were more / better-equipped facilities	13%	27%	37%	18%	2%
I leave campus directly after class & have no interest in extra-cur. activities	8%	20%	20%	33%	17%
Overall, the facilities for non-athletic, cultural & social activities fully meet my expectations	3%	20%	39%	30%	6%

Funding

Support an increase in student fees to fund <u>the entire cost</u> of new facilities for out-of-classroom activities & purposes	3%
Support an increase in student fees to fund <u>a portion of the cost</u> of new facilities for out-of-classroom activities and purposes	38%
Believe that the cost of University facilities should be funded entirely from sources other than student fees	58%

Proposed Fee	Level of Student Support
\$0	24%
\$1-10	23%
\$11-20	17%

\$21-30	10%
\$31-40	3%
\$41-50	11%
\$51-75	3%
\$76-100	3%
\$101-200	2%
>\$200	1%

Appendix 3. Summary of Student Activity Space Campus Groups Survey – Spring 2006

Overview & Methodology

- Online survey March 27, 2006 – April 28, 2006
- Conducted by StudentVoice
- 360 invitations sent to recognized campus groups
- 70 responses
- To view the full results of the survey please contact the Office of Student Affairs

Student Activity Space Needs

Need	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
Office space for student organizations	60%	27%	11%	0%	1%
Social & recreational spaces	55%	37%	4%	1%	1%
Affordable food services & cafeterias	50%	31%	10%	7%	1%
Access to an online interactive map	52%	32%	10%	2%	1%
Central space for students to congregate	41%	42%	8%	4%	2%
Meeting / group work space	51%	28%	12%	5%	1%
Lounge or casual meeting space	38%	39%	11%	7%	2%
Spaces for small meetings (<15)	42%	21%	24%	8%	2%
Storage space	48%	18%	27%	4%	1%
Spaces for large meetings (>15)	37%	22%	25%	11%	2%
Space for large indoor events	40%	31%	22%	2%	2%
Facilities licensed to serve alcohol	20%	17%	32%	17%	12%
Barrier – free activity space	19%	26%	17%	36%	19%
Performance space	25%	25%	38%	8%	2%
Rehearsal / practice space	32%	23%	36%	5%	1%
Prayer / meditation space	29%	14%	39%	5%	10%

Attitude Statements

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
-----------	----------------	-------	---------	-----------	-------------------

Clubs & other campus organizations have a significant impact on the out-of-classroom experiences of students at U of T	64%	27%	7%	0%	0%
Getting space or resources for a club or activity on campus is easy	5%	19%	17%	33%	25%
Overall, the facilities for non-athletic, cultural & social activities fully meet the needs of my group	2%	23%	17%	36%	19%

Appendix 4. Submissions

Written submissions to the Committee were provided by the following:

CIUT – FM

The Programming Unit of the Office of Student Affairs

The Victoria University Students' Administrative Council (VUSAC)

The University of Toronto Engineering Society

The Students' Administrative Council (SAC)

To view submissions please contact the Office of Student Affairs at (416) 978-5536 or student.affairs@utoronto.ca.

Appendix 5. Students' Administrative Council Spring 2005 Referendum Question & Summary of Results

Campaign Period: Monday March 14th – Thursday March 24th, 2005

Voting Period: Wednesday March 23rd – Thursday March 24th, 2005

All voting took place on ROSI

St. George Student Centre

Preamble:

The St. George Campus has been in direct need of a central student centre for many years now. Such a centre (a fixture on many campuses in Canada) is envisioned to house more club space, student meeting rooms, lounge space, study space, a community kitchen, large multi-purpose space for performances or licensed formal events, a wider variety of food services, and serve as a "Meeting Place", especially for the thousands of commuter student on campus. The centre would be student owned and operated, open 365 days a year. The Students' Administrative Council has been in discussions for the past year with the administration to build a Student Centre on the St. George Campus.

However, the administration has not committed yet to a location, nor a timetable for getting the project off the ground. SAC is seeking the support of its members so that we may show the university that we are fully committed to paying for a part of its construction (with the remainder coming from fundraising and a commitment from the university). This would allow students to come to the table with more leverage to secure the best location and funding model possible for the Student Centre. Currently it is estimated that students would pay in the range of \$45/academic year for the student centre – such a levy is comparable to Student Centre levies at UTSC (\$63/year) and UTM (\$52/year).

Question:

Are you in favour of possibly paying a levy to support a St. George Student Centre? (Such a levy would only be charged to St. George Students and by voting “yes” to this question you will not be voting for any fee increases right now; a subsequent referendum will be held before students are obliged to pay anything.) yes/no.

Results:

- 2, 619 students voted in the plebiscite (6.6% voter turnout)
- 1, 485 (57%) supported the proposal
- 944 (36%) rejected the proposal
- 190 abstained

Appendix 6. Summary of 2001/2002 Council of Ontario Universities (COU) Space Standards in the ‘Student and Central Services’ Category

Food services, bookstore and other merchandising facilities, audio-visual/television facilities, central services, health service facilities, common use and student activity space, and assembly and exhibition facilities have been combined in to Student and Central Services for the purpose of calculating space entitlement. This allows an institution to trade off a need for facilities in one area with those in a related category.

Formula

$$\text{FTE} \times 2.0 \text{ nasm}$$

The following range of values are suggested for each category, which reflect the use of space in the Ontario universities.

Category	Category Name	NASM per FTE Student
Category 7	Food Service	0.50 to 0.70
Category 8	Bookstore & Other Merchandising Facilities	0.10 to 0.20
Category 11	Audio Visual / Television Facilities	0.05 to 0.10
Category 12	Central Services	0.10 to 0.30
Category 13	Health Service Facilities	0.03 to 0.05
Category 14	Student Activity Space	0.50 to 0.70
Category 15	Assembly and Exhibition Facilities	0.15 to 0.40



