Report of the Faculty Committee on Campus Planning

April 20, 2016

The Faculty Committee on Campus Planning was established a year and half ago with a general responsibility to consider campus planning. The context of its formation was one of concern around the expansion of campus, the Kendall Square area in particular (see attached 2013 Faculty Newsletter editorial “MITIMCo Petition Goes Forward Without Faculty Assessment: Places Commercial Real Estate Before Housing and Research Needs”) and, more generally, what the voice of faculty can and should be as we engage in what is probably the largest expansion of campus since our arrival in Cambridge 100 years ago.

Our remit was intentionally loose, and one of our first tasks was to establish the work of the committee in a manner that reflected sound principles, was adapted to institutional realities and aspirations and, finally, was concretely useful to shaping policy and its execution. Given the above, we first embarked upon an outward-facing campaign of fact-finding of the current state of campus planning at the Institute, both near and long term, along with an inward exercise in establishing our role.

The most important exercise, that of reflecting upon the role that our committee wished to establish for itself, was informed by our fact-finding, which we shall detail later, but required considerable internal discussion and examination. As the first Faculty Committee on Campus Planning, we were aware that our actions in this matter would impact the work of our successors. We distilled our mission to: “Fostering a healthy and vibrant living and learning community through the guiding principles of a campus that is attractive, affordable and sustainable, and that provides sufficient space for community housing, childcare and interaction.” To enable the above, our committee’s role is two-fold. The first is to encourage a form of governance and project development that can explicitly follow our guiding principles. The second is to ensure informed, continuous and structured input from faculty on an all-campus plan.

**Principles**
- Create a healthy and vibrant living and learning community
- Create a campus that is attractive and affordable and that provides sufficient space for community housing, childcare and interaction
- Ensure informed, continuous and structured input from faculty on campus planning
- Place sustainability as a key input in campus planning
- Create appropriate academic space to satisfy current needs, foster interaction across departments and anticipate future requirements

**Goals**
- Identify and communicate principles to the Faculty and to committees involved with planning decisions
- Be a voice to represent and instantiate these principles in all relevant fora on
Our fact-finding brought us to connect with many of the numerous entities and people that shape the planning and building of our campus. These interface in a variety of fashions and respond to different, occasionally seemingly disparate, needs. The Building Committee deals with issues ranging from considering detail of plans to financing issues closely related to development. It works most closely with the Department of Facilities and the Provost's Office, and touches upon almost all aspects of MIT's administration. The MIT Investment Management Company (MITIMCo) manages MIT's real estate portfolio, with a view to provide the Institute with resources to advance its educational mission, and, particularly, to render financially possible the considerable maintenance and upgrades required by our buildings. The Institute Campus Planning Committee, formed about the same time as our committee, is constituted of colleagues in fields cognate to the task of planning, primarily Architecture and Urban Planning. They generously donate their time and specialized expertise to the Institute, support the Building Committee and serve at the discretion of the President. Their role is consultative and ad hoc.

At our inception, campus planning was in transition. Under the long, dynamic and influential leadership of Robert Simha, the Office of Campus Planning (OCP) had an operational and strategic role that led the development of many of our campus's major projects. In February 2015, OCP was restructured with the hiring of Dennis Swinford. The role of OCP is to “examine how MIT's physical spaces can best support the academic goals and community life of the Institute” with a “focus five to 20 years into the future to recommend design and land use solutions that have the potential to provide the greatest long-term benefits to the Institute.” More detail can be found on OCP's website (http://campusplanning.mit.edu). We have determined that role to be closely aligned with our own, as described below.

In the spirit of our principles, and informed by our fact-finding, we decided to consider how best to map our mission to our Institute’s structure. For our work to have perennity and significance, it is evident that we must interact closely and regularly with OCP. Our current structure consists of six elected members of the Faculty, along with up to three members of the Faculty designated by the Provost. We recommend that the organization of the committee evolve, by appointing the director of OCP to serve on it ex officio; we would like to bring this to the Faculty for a discussion and vote in Fall 2016. We are pleased to report that Dennis Swinford has agreed to participate in our committee and to begin attending our meetings as a guest in the interim. We also seek administrative support from OCP. To establish a strong liaison with MITIMCo, we recommend that we have at least a yearly meeting.

Both current and future issues
- Create a set of key working issues, prioritize them and focus on one or two per year
- Create a partnership with the Office of Campus Planning to provide input ahead of major campus commitments
- Help the Institute in its efforts to balance academic, financial and civic goals in a manner that reflects our core principles

In the spirit of our principles, and informed by our fact-finding, we decided to consider how best to map our mission to our Institute’s structure. For our work to have perennity and significance, it is evident that we must interact closely and regularly with OCP. Our current structure consists of six elected members of the Faculty, along with up to three members of the Faculty designated by the Provost. We recommend that the organization of the committee evolve, by appointing the director of OCP to serve on it ex officio; we would like to bring this to the Faculty for a discussion and vote in Fall 2016. We are pleased to report that Dennis Swinford has agreed to participate in our committee and to begin attending our meetings as a guest in the interim. We also seek administrative support from OCP. To establish a strong liaison with MITIMCo, we recommend that we have at least a yearly meeting.
The committee will also meet at least once a term with only its faculty members in attendance.

The current state of campus planning and our remit established, we are now able to envisage the major questions that affect planning. One main topic for our committee to consider is learning spaces and how they adjust to our current and future needs. As teaching modes and modalities evolve, we require an examination of the suitability of our current space for teaching and attendant activities, such as projects. This work, which calls upon our role as faculty and is central to the core educational mission of the Institute, requires reflection and information from all schools and departments, and we shall be seeking detailed input from our different academic constituencies. We welcome and appreciate the thoughts and suggestions of our colleagues at large.

As members of the faculty, we are aware that we represent a wider polity, that of staff and students. Another area of consideration is that of living spaces. This topic is closely connected to the work of the Faculty Committee on Student Life, but also concerns members of the academic community, such as junior faculty and our growing postdoc community. Accessibility, affordability and availability are here the principal elements of planning.

In conclusion, we have spent our initial time together working to understand and define the role of the committee, creating a set of core principles and goals, and setting sound plans for advancing. Most importantly, we believe that our committee’s role fills a need, but that, to be effective, its principles and goals must be embodied in the campus planning process. It is our earnest hope that our suggestions will benefit the campus planning process.

*The Committee’s 2015-16 roster is attached.*
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The Committee on Campus Planning serves as the standing Faculty advisory body to the MIT administration on campus planning. It provides Faculty perspectives and counsel on campus planning issues, including, but not limited to, future academic and research needs of the community. The committee seeks to understand the needs of the Faculty for the campus environment and ensure communication with the Faculty on important matters related to the MIT campus and surroundings. The chair of the committee serves ex officio on the MIT Building Committee, and members may be called upon to serve on task forces and/or other ad hoc committees concerned with campus planning.
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