

**Reinventing the Residence System @ MIT:**  
**PHASE II STATUS REPORT -- "AN EVOLVING FRAMEWORK"**  
***AN INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN PHASE III***

**1.0 INTRODUCTION.....2**

1.1. OBJECTIVE.....2

1.2. THE PROCESS: THREE PHASES.....2

    1.2.1. Phase I: IAP Design Contest .....2

    1.2.2. Phase II: Steering Committee Synthesis and Framework Development .....3

    1.2.3. Phase III: Community Discussion and Feedback to the Evolving Proposal.....4

**2.0 VALUES .....4**

**3.0 THE FRAMEWORK.....5**

3.1. RESIDENCE HALLS.....5

    3.1.1. The Freshman Year.....5

        3.1.1.1 Resident Advisors (RA's) .....5

        3.1.1.2 Clustering of freshmen .....5

        3.1.1.3 Freshman Hall .....6

            Freshman residences .....6

            Home of freshman programming offices .....6

            Academic space reserved for freshmen .....6

            Physical characteristics of the freshman hall.....6

        3.1.1.4 Selection of residence halls by freshmen.....6

            Summer mailing and selection.....7

            Dorm Rush.....7

            Correction lottery .....7

        3.1.1.5 "Sophomore Shuffle" .....7

    3.1.2. An Entrepreneurial Spirit in the Residence Halls.....7

    3.1.3. Academic/Community Interface .....8

    3.1.4. Community Spaces for each Class.....8

3.2. THEME HOUSES.....8

    3.2.1. Personalities / Themes .....8

    3.2.2. Partnerships.....9

3.3. FSILG'S.....9

    3.3.1. FSILG Recruitment / Rush.....10

    3.3.2. FSILG / Freshmen Programming .....10

    3.3.3. Transition Support.....11

    3.3.4. Cambridge-based FSILG system.....11

3.4. GRADUATE HOUSING.....12

3.5. EXPECTATIONS.....12

3.6. ROLES.....13

**APPENDIX A: RESIDENCE SYSTEM STEERING COMMITTEE VALUES.....14**

**Residence System Steering Committee**

**Committee Members:** Chair William Hecht '61; Students Jennifer Berk '01, Elisha Hopson '00, Eric Liu '00, Abby Pelcyger '01; Faculty and Staff Andrew Eisenmann '70, Paul Gray '54, Karen Gleason '82, Anne McCants; Alumni/ae Erin Hester '82, Stephen Stuntz '67. **Process Manager:** Kirk Kolenbrander

## 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1. Objective

Chancellor Bacow charged the Residence System Steering Committee to propose by September 1, 1999 at least one comprehensive design of a residence system for MIT that is consistent with the educational principles described in the Report of the Task Force on Student Life and Learning. That system is to be created through a series of activities within the MIT community that draws upon all elements of that community in sustained conversation and feedback. The process is to be accessible on-line, via the web site at <http://web.mit.edu/residence/systemdesign>.

### 1.2. The Process: Three Phases

The Steering Committee established a three-phase program that spans January - September 1999, with each successive phase designed to build on the output of the previous phase.

#### 1.2.1. Phase I: IAP Design Contest

A team-based all-MIT design contest was conducted January 19 - 29, 1999, in which each participating team was charged to develop and present a comprehensive design for the MIT residence system. 11 teams, with a total of over 80 members, presented proposals that featured a remarkable range of ideas and innovations. Students were represented on 8 teams, faculty on 4 teams, staff/administration on 3 teams, and alumni on 6 teams.

A brief sampling of a few of the proposed concepts includes:

- 1) Develop an intentional first year experience, featuring First Year Houses
  - Four Freshman Residence Halls
    - Each hall is 75% freshmen
    - Remaining 25% consist of upper-call and graduate student mentors
    - Each hall has dining facilities
  - Residence-based freshman advising
  - Required moves at the end of the first year
  
- 2) Create Two MIT owned and built communities in Cambridge for all FSILG's
  - One "on-campus" (e.g., Vassar Street)
  - One "off-campus" (e.g., Mass. Ave., near WILG/ADP)
  - Both built for FSILG's, but also integrated mixture of grad students, junior faculty, transitional faculty
  - Balance-sheet neutral
  
- 3) Greatly expand Pre-Orientation offerings
  - Add to the current Discover Ocean Engineering, Freshman Leadership Program, and Freshman Service Program opportunities

- 4) Create a Faculty/Staff Fellows program for the Residence Halls
  - Every faculty and staff member will be affiliated with a residence hall or cluster
- 5) Develop a series of “Theme Houses”
  - Offer existing FSILG’s an opportunity to affiliate as part of the residence hall system
- 6) Require a “leadership” credit as a GIR, as overseen by a “Leadership Development Office” within the residential system
- 7) Create a “Cooking Shop” (similar to the present Hobby Shop) where students will be given the tools and instruction for cooking and dining

### 1.2.2. Phase II: Steering Committee Synthesis and Framework Development

Building on the array of outstanding concepts proposed by the 11 IAP design contest teams, the Steering Committee has synthesized those ideas and thoughts emerging from committee discussion to form a comprehensive framework. That framework, presented below, is to guide the community discussion of Phase III.

In assembling the framework, the Steering Committee met extensively throughout February, March, and much of April. Emphasis was placed on creating a sufficiently broad and not overly constrained series of policies, procedures, and structures that were consistent with the values set forth in the Task Force report and further articulated by the Steering Committee. These values are summarized briefly in the following section (“Values”), and more specifically in Appendix A.

It is understood and expected that the values articulated by the Steering Committee, and the policies, procedures, and structures created as supportive of those values, will not be uniformly shared by each individual member of the MIT community. It is the hope of the Steering Committee, however, that the diverse representation on the committee itself has helped to create a framework that is coherent, educationally sound, robust, and consistent with the unifying themes that bind the students, faculty, staff, alumni, and parents of MIT.

Finally, it is clear that there is not a single, optimal design for MIT's residence system, but that there may be a number of coherent, viable, yet significantly different approaches. *The framework presented here is not offered as the solution*, but as one coherent structure that has found consensus within the 11-member Steering Committee, and in response to which it is believed an excellent solution can be constructed. The Steering Committee looks forward to a sustained, thoughtful discussion with the entire MIT community throughout Phase III as that excellent solution is created.

**1.2.3. Phase III: Community Discussion and Feedback to the Evolving Proposal**  
Late April and May – August 1999 are reserved for community discussion of the framework presented by the Steering Committee, and for developing that framework into a full, comprehensive proposal to the Chancellor from the Steering Committee.

The committee will lead the community discussion via a variety of formats, summarized in the following table.

<i>Format</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>Form of Feedback</i>
<b>Open Meetings, organized by campus region or focus groups</b>	Open to all community members	Oral
<b>On-Line (Web) Forum</b>	Worldwide, continuous access to all community members	Written
<b>Written Responses</b>	Individuals and groups solicited for formal, written responses	Written

## **2.0 Values**

The Residence System Steering Committee is guided by the Task Force's principle of an integrated educational triad of academics, research and community. The MIT residence system is a natural and appropriate home of the community dimension of that triad, and of the interface of community with academics and with research. MIT's commitment to a new excellence in the community dimension of education and the decisions to house all first year students in residence halls in 2001 and to build a new residence hall presents a rare opportunity to recast the policies, procedures, and structures of the residence system to provide all students, and particularly first-year undergraduates, with a new, intentional residential educational experience.

In recasting the system, the Steering Committee recognizes that existing elements offer highly valued experiences to the community. Specifically, the FSILG subsystem strongly complements the opportunities available in the Institute residence halls. Graduate students contribute to the vibrant MIT community. The Steering Committee also recognizes that it is inevitable that conflict will arise between the desire of individuals to choose all elements of their residential experience and the expectation by MIT that individual members of the community will be responsible to themselves, to each other, and to the community as a whole. Both of these values, freedom and community, must be upheld by the residence system. Furthermore, that system must be responsive to changes in the community, the MIT educational experience, and our society. Finally, the Steering Committee is mindful that there must exist a connection for members of the MIT community between their investment of thought or action toward the creation or maintenance of community and the appropriate reward.

Appendix A contains the list of values that were adopted and used by the committee in constructing the coherent and consistent framework described in the following section.

## **3.0 The Framework**

### **3.1. Residence Halls**

#### **3.1.1. The Freshman Year**

The first-year (freshman) experience at MIT is unique in both the academic and community dimensions of the educational experience. It presents a time of rapidly expanding opportunity for intellectual pursuit and personal decision-making. This year of transition is enhanced through a unique set of community and curricular experiences that serve as a comprehensive introduction to the undergraduate experience.

The decision to place all freshmen in residence halls beginning in 2001 presents a new opportunity to access all freshmen via residence hall programming. The decision, however, also presents an important new challenge for the residence halls, as the FSILG system has been a leader at MIT in mentoring and advising its freshmen residents.

##### **3.1.1.1 Resident Advisors (RA's)**

A principal mechanism for the intentional, active mentoring of freshmen students in the residence halls will be through upperclass persons serving as "Residence Advisors" (RA). The RA will be a paid position, assigned by the Office of the Dean of Students and Undergraduate Education (ODSUE). Each RA will serve approximately 10 freshmen. All RA's will be appropriately trained to meet the collective and individual community-centered needs of those students.

The RA's will conduct programming with the residence environment, with support and training from ODSUE. That programming will include cocurricular and curricular issues of time management, major selection, career planning, leadership, health and balance, communication skills, self-awareness, and diversity training. Many of these topics will require that the RA work in partnership with MIT faculty and staff professionals.

The RA's will work with (but not replace) the GRT's (who serve all undergraduates), associate advisors (who serve freshmen via academic-centered experiences), and MedLinks advisors. The Housemasters will serve as the intellectual leaders of these residence-based teams and as a direct link to the MIT faculty.

##### **3.1.1.2 Clustering of freshmen**

The effectiveness of the RA in serving the active mentoring role for freshmen requires a physical proximity of the RA's residence to those of each of his or her assigned students. This suggests that residence halls may wish to develop room assignment policies that allow for a modest clustering of small groups of freshmen.

### **3.1.1.3 Freshman Hall**

The designation of one residence hall as the intellectual and community center for the first year enables a concentration of first year residences, key student life programming and first year academic services offices, and first-year dedicated academic space.

Freshmen who select the Freshman Hall for their first year residence will be choosing to live in an environment intentionally geared toward meeting the unique life and learning needs of the first year student.

#### Freshman residences

The freshman hall will be 60% freshmen, with the balance of 40% filled by RA's and other upperclasspersons who have been selected each year to actively serve as mentors to the freshmen residents. Assuming a residence hall capacity of 350 persons, this ratio suggests that the freshman hall will be the home of approximately 210 of the 1100 freshmen. This concentration of freshmen coupled with the active presence of upperclasspersons permits a residence hall dedicated to first year students while simultaneously providing the balancing presence of many upperclasspersons.

#### Home of freshman programming offices

The offices that primarily serve freshman can be integrated in the living environment of the persons they serve. These offices might include the Academic Resource Center offices that are dedicated to the freshman seminar program and select student life programming offices that serve the RA's or that wish to have a strong presence with students from their first days at MIT.

#### Academic space reserved for freshmen

The ongoing Education Design Program (EDP) suggests the value of dedicated academic space for first year classes. The freshman hall would be the ideal location for this dedicated space.

#### Physical characteristics of the freshman hall

The residence designated as the freshman hall should be located near the main campus, avoid a concentration of single rooms, and include significant non-residential space for offices and academic offerings. These requirements suggest the designation of Ashdown House as the freshman hall. MacGregor House, a residence hall of primarily single rooms, would serve well as a graduate residence hall.

The freshman hall will feature a dining area that is available to its residents and all freshmen. This requirement for a dining area in the freshman hall is consistent with the Steering Committee's enthusiastic endorsement of the recommendations contained within the Final Report of the Institute Dining Review.

### **3.1.1.4 Selection of residence halls by freshmen**

The opportunity of freshmen to select a residence hall and a roommate will be maintained via a summer mailing and selection process, a Dorm Rush during Orientation, and a Correction Lottery.

### Summer mailing and selection

A summer mailing will provide information about the residence halls. Incoming students will be asked during the summer to submit preferences for their housing, and will also be asked to identify likes and dislikes to aid in roommate assignments. Assignments of residence hall, room and roommate(s) will be made in advance of the student's arrival for Orientation. Students will be invited to arrive at MIT for the first day of Orientation with all the belongings they intend to bring to campus.

### Dorm Rush

At some appropriate time during Orientation, a Dorm Rush will be held to provide students a more comprehensive introduction to the residence halls than is possible via a summer mailing. That Dorm Rush, which will continue for approximately three days (but not exclusive of other Orientation activities), will allow students to assess the appropriateness of their summer preferences and their assigned roommate(s).

### Correction lottery

Students who wish to change their room assignment will be invited to enter a correction lottery at the close of the Dorm Rush. That lottery will again permit students to enter preferences, and students will be reassigned as space permits. "Stapling" of a maximum of four persons will be permitted in the correction lottery.

### **3.1.1.5 "Sophomore Shuffle"**

A number of elements of the recast MIT residence system require a fluid movement of students between the freshman and sophomore years. Specifically, the FSILG system will need to see significant numbers of students leaving the residence halls for the FSILG residences for the start of the sophomore year, and the freshman hall must be vacated each year (aside from those residents staying to serve as active upperclassperson mentors).

To foster this fluid movement of students, a "sophomore shuffle" for all rising sophomores will be instituted. In approximately March of the freshman year, rising sophomores who wish to remain in the residence halls will enter their residence hall preferences in a lottery. "Stapling" of a maximum of four persons will be permitted. The results of the lottery will establish the residence hall home of the lottery participant for the remaining three years of his or her undergraduate experience. Students who choose to not participate in the lottery will be randomly assigned. Students who wish to remain in the residence hall of their freshman year (but not in the freshman hall) may apply to forego sophomore standing in the selection process (reverting to freshman standing), and select from those rooms otherwise designated for freshmen.

### **3.1.2. An Entrepreneurial Spirit in the Residence Halls**

An entrepreneurial spirit is central to learning at MIT, but needs to be developed in our living. Direct, professional support is needed for individuals within residences or coalitions of residences to create, maintain, and update community experiences in their locations.

An office of community entrepreneurship is to be created in service to the residence units. That office will provide professional support and encouragement to residence hall sponsored efforts to introduce integrated living and learning opportunities to the residence system. In addition, the office will serve as a clearinghouse for information of successful residence programming experiences. Also, the office will serve to reward residences and community members for successful entrepreneurship.

### 3.1.3. Academic/Community Interface

An integrated educational triad of academics, research, and community requires efforts focussed at the interfaces of the three dyads contained within the triad. The residence system offers the opportunity to explore the academic/community interface by physically locating select academic activities within the residence halls.

An effort to place subject offerings within the residence halls must only be done with the leadership and ownership of the residents. One can imagine, however, a residence hall or coalition of halls inviting a favorite faculty member to serve as a "House Professor" and to present a subject within the residence hall. The subject content would ideally reflect the relationship of the faculty member to the hall and its residents (perhaps even inviting the students to participate in defining the curriculum), and would serve to welcome students from throughout the Institute into the residence hall. The relationships formed between faculty member and students in this House Professor offering could facilitate natural and lasting interactions.

### 3.1.4. Community Spaces for each Class

Consistent with 3.1.1.3 above, the designation of an intellectual and programming "center" for each class has value in nurturing a sense of class community. Building upon the heightened class awareness and identity made possible through intentional freshman programming, each class will have a specific community space within the residence system reserved for its use. That space, though perhaps quite modest in size, will serve as the recognized "home" of a given class throughout their upperclass years at MIT.

## 3.2. *Theme Houses*

The MIT residence halls, and subunits within those residence halls, have long enjoyed the opportunity to create unique personalities. This opportunity can be extended in exciting new educational directions. First, the personalities (themes) that are assumed can play an important role in the educational experience of its residents and the people of the MIT community with whom they interact. Second, MIT can expand its perspective on what is a "residence hall" through formal partnerships with otherwise "independent" living groups.

### 3.2.1. Personalities / Themes

The themes that might be adopted by a house range well beyond the ethnic and cultural themes that are presently available within, for example, the existing language houses or Chocolate City. Of particular interest are those themes that are directed at the academic/community interface. Such themes will ideally be built around sustained relationships with faculty and staff who share those interests. These interests might be as formal as "persons interested in undergraduate research in the physical sciences" or as

informal as "persons with a passion for fly fishing". Whatever the theme, it is the sustained relationship of a number of non-residents from throughout the community that is the particularly compelling opportunity within the theme house construct.

### 3.2.2. Partnerships

A new mechanism will be created for residences to enter into formal partnerships with MIT, such that the residences are afforded the privileges of the MIT residence halls. These residences will be subject to the same control and oversight by MIT as are the residence halls, and will therefore be without independence. The smaller, self-contained community within the partnering house, however, provides the MIT residence system with the opportunity to offer very different experiences than are practical within the 100+ resident halls.

Policies and procedures will need to be created and adopted that describe the mechanisms by which a residence can apply to become a "theme house", the criteria MIT will use in accepting such an application, the constraints that MIT will impose on the living arrangements (including, for example, the possible requirement for resident housemaster(s)), the nature of the financial relationship between MIT and the parties that own the property (if not already MIT), and the review process that will allow the relationship to continue. While these policies and procedures will not be easily created or enacted, the "theme house" concept is conceptually solid and needs to be a vibrant part of the MIT residence system.

An important element of the partnership between the theme house and MIT will likely be the opportunity for freshmen to live in the house. Within the proper relationship, the theme houses will serve as excellent residences for freshmen. It is important, however, that freshmen be given uniform access to the house in their housing selection via the summer mailing, Dorm Rush, and correction lottery. It is equally important that upperclassperson residents play no role in selecting which freshmen will be given the opportunity to live there.

### 3.3. FSILG's

The fraternities, sororities, and independent living groups (FSILG's) within the residence system of MIT are strongly valued. That value lies particularly in the unique set of varied educational experiences the individual FSILG's units offer the students of MIT – a set that is not reproducible within the residence halls.

The greatest value of the FSILG system resides in the relative independence of the member units. The system and its units are therefore only the subject of this design effort to the extent of the interface between those units and MIT. Particularly important within that interface is the access of the FSILG system to the students (both through FSILG rush and through programming), the support of MIT to the system in a time of transition, and the opportunity to enhance the long-term relationship of the units to MIT through physical relocation.

### 3.3.1. FSILG Recruitment / Rush

Thoughtful, comprehensive access of the MIT students to the FSILG's, and *vice versa*, is critical to both the FSILG system and to MIT. The nature and timing of an experience that fosters such access is therefore pivotal.

The term "FSILG Rush" is used here to be that period that provides thoughtful, comprehensive mutual access, and to be that period after which it is assumed both students and FSILG members will make decisions regarding the issuing and accepting of bids. An appropriate FSILG rush has the following characteristics:

- a) The rush period provides the student the sufficient, thoughtful opportunity to investigate the FSILG system to identify those FSILG's from which he or she would welcome a bid.
- b) Rush is conducted at a time when all prospective participants have reasonable access to the process.
- c) The rush period gives each member of a given FSILG ample opportunity to evaluate a prospective student to determine if a bid is to be extended.
- d) MIT gives institutional support to the rush process, including designating time that is free of conflicting academic or research pressures, and serving as an information clearinghouse for both the FSILG's and the student participants.

With the decision that all freshmen will live in MIT residence facilities for the fall and spring semesters beginning in 2001, the existing timing of FSILG Rush within the August Orientation period will not be required. The Steering Committee wrestled at great length with when that FSILG Rush period should take place, and ultimately reached only limited consensus on its decision to position FSILG Rush at the end of January IAP and/or the beginning of the spring semester. This timing was determined to be that period when each of the requirements (a-d) listed above could be met, while at the same time providing freshmen the unique first year experience described in section 3.1.1 above.

FSILG Rush will take place over a 3 or 4 day period that includes a weekend and that marks the close of IAP. The academic calendar will be cleared so that no IAP, Registration Day, or spring semester offerings interfere with the students' opportunity to participate.

FSILG units that feature a pledge period will time that pledge period after FSILG Rush as they see appropriate, including during the Spring semester of the freshman year. FSILG units that are non-pledging may wish to create some activities that serve as a transition for persons they rush in January but who will not be residents in the FSILG until after the spring semester.

### 3.3.2. FSILG / Freshmen Programming

The FSILG system has been a leader at MIT in mentoring and advising freshmen. Also, the freshmen living within the FSILG units have played a vibrant role in the lives of the upperclassperson residents. With the upcoming practice of housing all freshmen within MIT residences, the FSILG members are invited to continue their relationship with

freshmen by expanding their excellence in mentoring and advising to the MIT residences. As MIT develops the first year experience, the expertise, guidance and participation of the FSILG units and their members will be of great value to the students, staff, and faculty of MIT. Programs that FSILG's bring to the MIT residences that add value to the educational experiences of MIT's students are clearly win/win situations for all parties, and will be welcomed.

### 3.3.3. Transition Support

The FSILG member units face great uncertainty in the years immediately preceding and following 2001, the first year in which all freshmen will be housed in MIT residences. Many FSILG's fear for their long-term existence. A transition plan is needed that offers security, principally financial, to the FSILG's throughout these early years.

The financial concerns of FSILG's center on the likelihood of empty beds when access to the freshman class is no longer available. Conversely, MIT has a serious problem in providing adequate housing opportunities to its graduate student population. The transition support plan for the FSILG's will therefore focus on the creation of "lease" arrangements for MIT graduate students in otherwise vacant FSILG beds. MIT will financially underwrite a voluntary program that keeps FSILG units at capacity through the short-term (semester by semester) housing of graduate students. The FSILG unit will select those graduate students they are willing to house from a pool of willing graduate students. The FSILG will negotiate with MIT to determine the fee that will be charged for the student, and MIT will make up the difference between that fee that the flat amount charged by MIT to the graduate student.

This program is entirely voluntary for the FSILG, and the FSILG will retain student-by-student control of who is granted a lease. MIT will maintain some minimum standard to which all FSILG beds must adhere, and once established, a lease may only be terminated within a semester via formal MIT procedures.

The Steering Committee notes that transition support should take many other forms in addition to purely financial, and that it should begin prior to 2001. As one example, an expansion of the SafeRide program will make the FSILG system more accessible to all members of the community. This expanded mutual access serves the needs of both the FSILG units and of MIT. A second example of non-financial support would be an MIT-sponsored FSILG Rush in IAP of 2001 that augments the traditional rush in August of 2000. That second rush would allow FSILG houses the opportunity to experiment with new rush policies and procedures in advance of the implementation of the freshman housing practices in the fall of 2001.

### 3.3.4. Cambridge-based FSILG system

The development of an integrated educational environment of living and learning is made more difficult by the significant distances that separate the main campus and many Boston and Brookline-based FSILG's. Further, a number of Boston-based FSILG's are experiences changing neighborhood expectations and are not as welcome as they once were. Finally, the changing demographics of the MIT undergraduate population (and particularly, the increasing number of women relative to men) suggests that the physical

structures of the FSILG system are less suitable than they once were in meeting the residential needs of MIT students.

MIT will create a mechanism that works with interested FSILG houses to move the house to either a campus-based setting (such as on Vassar Street across from the athletic fields) or to a near-campus environment (such as the developing Central Square area). The mechanism will feature a cooperation between the FSILG and MIT in selling the existing house and in creating new housing in the new location.

This program is to be made available to the FSILG's, and is to be voluntary. It is important to note, however, that many FSILG's may find that the opportunity to redefine an optimal membership size that is made possible through a move may allow them to remain viable for the long-term. It is also interesting to consider how several FSILG's might partner to occupy a single larger building that includes a flexibility to adjust boundaries to reflect current membership sizes.

### ***3.4. Graduate Housing***

Graduate students, who represent nearly one half of the members of our campus community, are largely excluded from the residence system. The lost opportunity for the graduate students brought on by this exclusion is obvious. They are required to live in sometimes sub-standard living environments that are frequently changing and often distant from the campus. Graduate recruiting, central to issues of future excellence for MIT, is hampered by our competitive disadvantage among some other premier research universities.

The lost opportunity of even greater concern for the Steering Committee, however, is that of the other members of the campus community, and particularly the undergraduates. The Graduate Resident Tutors (GRT's), a group of skilled and dedicated employees of MIT, have for many years demonstrated the powerful, positive impact of graduate students in the living and learning of MIT undergraduates. These experiences serve as a reminder of what might be possible through significantly expanded on-campus graduate residences.

The Steering Committee calls on MIT to build the long-promised graduate residence hall. As MIT designs and builds that residence facility, the Institute will aggressively promote and subsidize the FSILG/graduate housing system described in 3.3.3 above.

### ***3.5. Expectations***

The Task Force report observes that MIT has traditionally demanded a separation of student life and learning. The expectations for faculty, staff, administration, and students that exist today were created to reflect that separation. If the institution is to move toward the Task Force's principle of an integrated educational triad of academics, research and community, then those expectations must change. Central to any change in expectations must be the understanding that MIT will recognize and reward the investment of thought or action by a member of the community toward the creation or maintenance of community.

For faculty, two fundamental changes are needed. First, simple information tools need to be made available to faculty to let them know what community-based opportunities exist. There is presently no easily accessed means available to faculty to make them aware of the richness of experiences available in the residence system, nor is there any coherent, institute-directed means of inviting them to participate. Whereas the conventional wisdom is that faculty do not care about issues within the residence system, a more likely reality is that faculty simply do not know what is there.

Second, some reasonable effort must be made to *measure* the activity of all faculty within the community element of the triad. When MIT chooses to measure this activity, faculty will choose to take notice.

For the staff and administration, the expectations are very high. ODSUE is the office or department with the authority and responsibility for the educational program and resource allocation within the community dimension and the residence system. All human, physical, and financial resources allocated to the residence system should be expected to support the community dimension of education, and to do so with excellence. That excellence can only be established through regular review and assessment. For the physical resources, this assessment begins with a commitment by MIT to use its residential space as designed, rather than in "crowded" arrangements. It continues by requiring a periodic assessment of the residence halls and a coherent and comprehensive program to address any deficiencies that are detected.

The expectations for students are centered on the individual. Each student will be expected to take responsibility for him or herself, and to continually endeavor to take increasing responsibility for others in the community. For MIT's part, it will recognize that certain elements of choice have been removed from those traditionally enjoyed by all undergraduates at MIT, and it will protect those opportunities that remain and those that will be created for each student until that individual has demonstrated an inability to accept a given responsibility or privilege.

### **3.6. Roles**

Many professionals contribute to the residence system at MIT. The intellectual leaders of the activities of those professionals and the students within the individual residences are the Housemasters. They oversee an expanding team of programming providers that includes the GRT's, Associate Advisors, RA's, MedLinks persons, and ODSUE professionals. They also are the direct link of the residence system to the faculty, the body responsible for the complete educational experience of MIT's students. The work of the Housemasters is critical to the short and long-term efforts of the residences, and must be supported and recognized by the Institute.

The Residence System Steering Committee will monitor and annually assess the progress of MIT toward the residence system design that is adopted by the Chancellor. Assessment is a critical issue in this redesign effort, and formal mechanisms for that assessment need to be included in the adopted design.

## **Appendix A: Residence System Steering Committee Values**

1. The MIT residence system is a natural and appropriate home of the community dimension of the educational triad.
2. The first-year (freshman) experience is unique. It presents a time of rapidly expanding opportunity for intellectual pursuit and personal decision-making. This year of transition requires a unique set of community and curricular experiences that serve as the comprehensive introduction to the undergraduate experience.
3. It is inevitable that conflict will arise between the desire of individuals to choose all elements of their residential experience and the expectation by MIT that individual members of the community will be responsible to themselves, to each other, and to the community as a whole. Both of these values, freedom and community, will be upheld by the residence system.
4. Certain elements of choice have been removed from those traditionally enjoyed by all undergraduates at MIT. There is ongoing concern that further elements will be removed over time. In considering further changes, students should be presumed to be responsible individuals, and MIT should treat them as such until individuals prove themselves otherwise.
5. FSILG's offer a valued set of varied experiences to the MIT community that complement those provided in Institute residence halls. The FSILG system should be supported by MIT resources throughout the time of transition brought about by changes in MIT residence policies, such that the FSILG system thrives in the new environment.
6. The graduate student community is essential to building a vibrant MIT community.
7. MIT values and will recognize and reward the investment of thought or action by any member of the MIT community toward the creation or maintenance of community.
8. The residence system must have the capacity to adapt to changes in the student body, the MIT educational experience, and our society.
9. Diversity, which strengthens the MIT community and contributes to the individual development at MIT, will be encouraged and protected.
10. An entrepreneurial spirit, central to learning at MIT, must be fostered in the residence system for the community dimension of the "educational triad" to thrive.