

# **DRAW TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Introduction**

---

The Draw Review Task Force was convened in June of 2008 by Shirley Everett, Senior Associate Vice Provost for Residential and Dining Enterprises. She appointed Rodger Whitney, Executive Director of Student Housing, as chair, and Susan Nunan, Director of Housing Assignments, as co-facilitator. The committee was composed of representatives from Student Housing, Residential Education, the Freshman Dean's Office, the Office of the Senior Associate Vice Provost for Residential and Dining Enterprises, the Office of the Vice Provost for Student Affairs, the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Associated Students of Stanford University's Senate, and undergraduate students from varying residence types.

### **Background**

---

The Housing Master Plan, which unstuffs residential spaces across the housing system while restoring academic common spaces, requires revising the Draw in order to better allocate the increasing supply of premier living spaces that its implementation will bring online. The Draw system has evolved over the years and needs to be redesigned to adequately implement the Housing Master Plan, to support residential programs, to achieve a more equitable system for upper-class students.

### **Charge/Purpose**

---

Everett charged the Draw Task Force (DTF) with supporting the implementation of the Housing Master Plan by revising the Draw to allocate the increasing supply of premier living spaces for upper-class students (i.e. spaces with private bedrooms); streamline and simplify the Draw and room assignment policies, protocols, and processes; and create new measures to prevent the integrity of the system from being compromised.

Instructing the committee to review all current policies of the annual undergraduate Draw, Everett delineated the goals and objectives for it to accomplish: achieve a greater sense of fairness for all students entering the Draw; increase the number of all-freshman housing options; and create options for gender-neutral housing beyond the pilot while supporting mixed-gender draw groups.

Everett encouraged the committee to achieve a sense of inclusiveness, to air a diversity of views and opinions, and to scrutinize the validity and appropriateness of all ideas concerning how to improve the Draw. She outlined the committee's timeline, set the deadline for the committee to fulfill its charge as the beginning of March 2009, and instructed the committee to implement its recommendations in time for the 2009 Draw. Everett requested that the committee maintain confidentiality when appropriate in working towards its final recommendations. She cautioned the members that, while desirable, consensus may neither be achievable nor necessary as long as the committee fulfills its charge.

## **Consultation/Outreach**

---

Shirley Everett met with John Bravman, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education; Greg Boardman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs; Tim Warner, Vice Provost for Budget and Auxiliaries; Rodger Whitney, Chair of the DTF; and the DTF itself for their views, insights, and recommendations as these related to the academic programs and the Housing Master Plan. Bravman and Boardman also attended various DTF meetings and provided invaluable insight to the committee to aid it in arriving at appropriate decisions.

The DTF actively engaged students, faculty, and staff to gain valuable feedback to appropriately improve the Draw. A broad spectrum of groups was contacted by the DTF to provide their opinions and insights: the ASSU Senate Committee, Residents of Ethnic Theme House Ujamaa, Resident Assistants and Community Associates, Resident Fellows and College Directors, Residence Deans, Residential Educational central staff, and undergraduate students through a town hall meeting. The DTF also surveyed colleagues from both the PAC-10 and Ivy League institutions.

## **Committee Framework**

---

Rodger Whitney set the committee to operate within a framework that sought community inclusion, that had as its aim the signal accomplishment of transforming the Draw into an easily communicated and understood system, and that focused on distilling sound recommendations from a complexity of historically-based policies, principles, and procedures. Whitney's historical perspective allowed the DTF to consider, where possible, the most complex facet of the Draw - its priority system. He stressed that simplification of this process be held in paramountcy. Sue Nunan provided background of the Draw, its numbering system, and the principles on which the system was founded. Rich Wales provided further information concerning the creation and maintenance of the original and long-used Draw program.

## **Recommendations**

---

To meet the specific goals and objectives of its charge, DTF recommends implementing the following changes to the Draw:

### **I. Create a Three-Tiered Numbering System**

Replace the two-tiered numbering system with a three-tiered numbering system in which students draw into the best tier at most once and into the worst tier at least once. Currently, students entering the Draw choose between two tiers of numbers: a tier of preferred or better numbers ranging from 1 to 2,000; and a tier of un-preferred or worse numbers ranging from 2,000 to 3,000. Under the new system, students entering the Draw will choose from among three tiers of numbers: a tier of better numbers ranging from 1 to 1,000 known as Tier 1; a tier of mid-level numbers ranging from 1,001 to 2,000 known as Tier 2; and a tier of worse numbers ranging from 2,001 to 3,000 known as Tier 3.

### **II. Restrict Tier Usage by Class Level**

Consider class level during draw number assignment by limiting sophomores to choosing between the bottom two tiers. Juniors and seniors always draw into any tier available to them. Students who live in off-campus, non-Student

Housing residences while taking classes at the home campus give up their Tier 1 number. Students housed in Greek residences give up their Tier 1 and 2 numbers.

**III. Allow Unlimited Residence Choice Rankings Starting in 2009-10 until Implementation of a Time Slot-Based Selection Process**

Students can rank as many housing choices as they wish prior to receiving Draw numbers. Rankings are based specifically on preference and interest, not on Draw numbers.

**IV. Replace Current Computer Assignment Process with a Time-Slot System**

Allow house and room type selection online for the 2010-11 Draw. Students are assigned random time slots based on Draw numbers to select residences and room types (e.g., singles, two-room doubles, triples, etc.). Selections are made using an interactive housing map. Specific rooms in a house are assigned during the in-house draw. Pilot program will be implemented for 2009-10 in one or two houses.

**V. Standardize In-House Room Selection Process**

Procedures for selecting specific rooms are pre-approved and announced prior to the Draw by Residential Education and Housing Assignments. Room assignments are based on specific, well-defined criteria that will include Draw number and year in housing and be applicable to all students. Co-ops, however, will be able to continue assigning rooms via consensus. Students choose rooms, which are assigned a gender according to Title IX requirements, within their Draw-assigned room type. Returning residence priorities and other such mechanisms will no longer be used unless specifically approved in advance for programmatic reasons.

**VI. Replace Complex Priority System with Binding Agreements and Pre-Assignments**

All theme and focus houses are clearly described, and program requirements for choices are well-defined. A core group of theme/focus house residents may be pre-assigned through a transparent application process overseen by Resident Fellows, Faculty Affiliates, or other Residential Education staff designates. These houses will benefit from a greater connection with and guidance from VPSA and VPUE. Pre-assignments may or may not affect room assignment depending on the particular needs of the house. The remainder of theme/focus house spaces will be assigned via the Draw through a process that designates some or all spaces for students who meet program requirements and, in the ethnic theme dorms, allows for appropriate ethnic/racial balance among residents. Students who gain entry into a house by meeting the terms of the house's program must certify their commitment or eligibility or risk becoming reassigned. Subsequent to implementation of task force recommendations, Residential Education will evaluate theme house programs and will work with Housing Assignments to identify and implement changes necessary to support these programs.

## VII. Support Gender-Neutral Housing

Mixed-gender groups can stay together during the Draw process through group retention. The gender-neutral pilot program should be made permanent, while the number of residences included in this pilot should be increased beginning in 2009-10.

### How Recommendations Meet Charge

---

Purpose	Fulfilled by
Support Housing Master Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ All</li></ul>
Simplify the Draw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Allow house and room type selection online</li><li>▪ Replace priorities with pre-assignments and binding agreements</li></ul>
Achieve a greater sense of fairness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Allow unlimited residence choice rankings</li><li>▪ Create three-tiered numbering system</li><li>▪ Standardize in-house room draw criteria across system</li></ul>
Prevent system from being gamed or compromised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Allow house and room type selection online</li><li>▪ Standardize in-house room selection process</li></ul>
Better allocate premier spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Create three-tiered numbering system</li><li>▪ Consider class-standing in housing allocation</li></ul>
Options for gender-neutral housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Support mixed-gender Draw groups</li><li>▪ Request making gender-neutral pilot permanent</li><li>▪ Request expansion of gender-neutral pilot to other residences</li></ul>
Expand all-frosh options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Accomplished through the Housing Master Plan un-crowding program and through creation of Wilbur and Stern as primary all-frosh housing.</li></ul>

### Implementation Timeline

---

If these recommendations are approved, all recommendations with the exception of two will be implemented in this year's Draw (2009-2010). These exceptions are: allowing students to rank room types in the Draw and to choose specific rooms within their Draw-assigned room type in the in-house draw. These will be implemented this year in pilot houses and the following year across the housing system. Co-ops, however, will be able to continue assigning rooms via consensus. Students choose rooms, which are assigned a gender according to Title IX requirements, within their Draw-assigned room type. Returning residence priorities and other such mechanisms will no longer be used unless specifically approved in advance for programmatic reasons.

### Transition Plan

---

In order to prevent some students, who are new to housing, from receiving an unfair advantage over other students, who have already lived in housing under the rules of

the preferred/un-preferred year system, a transition system that considers past years in housing is required. The following rules convert a student's usage of housing under the preferred/un-preferred system to its equivalent in the proposed three-tiered numbering system.

- Translate all un-preferred year usage into Tier 3 usage. All students are required to use Tier 3 at least once, so current sophomores and juniors who have not yet used their un-preferred year will have a Tier 3 number to use.
- Translate the first used preferred year into Tier 2 usage.
- Translate the second used preferred year into Tier 1 usage.
- Current students will use their remaining tiers after the above translation takes place. Students who have not used Tier 3 will be required to do so. Students who have a preferred year left will have a Tier 1 number left to use.
- Staff exemption years will translate into Tier 3 numbers.
- Sophomores will apply according to the new rules.
- Current Greek residents will have their Tier 1 and 2 numbers removed and will use Tier 3. In the current system, Greek residents forfeit all preferred years when pledging and are required to use an un-preferred year if they seek to obtain housing through the Draw.

## **Summary**

---

The Draw Task Force believes it has successfully fulfilled its charge of supporting the Housing Master Plan through the implementation of these recommendations. The committee has simplified the Draw by replacing priorities with pre-assignments and binding agreements and by allowing residence and room type selection online, the latter of which also prevents the system from being gamed or compromised. Also, a greater sense of fairness was achieved by allowing unlimited residence choice rankings, creating a three-tiered numbering system, and by standardizing in-house room draw criteria across the system. In-house room draw standardization also aids in preventing the system from being compromised.

Through creation of the three-tiered numbering system, and through consideration of class level to determine tier usage, the DTF has ensured better allocation of premier spaces. Options for gender-neutral housing has increased by supporting mixed-gender draw groups and requesting that the gender-neutral pilot be made permanent and expanded to other residences. Finally, the DTF increased all-freshman housing options through its support of the Housing Master Plan, which creates largely all-freshman housing in Wilbur and Stern while un-crowding stuffed spaces across the housing system.

The following full report and appendices includes detailed information of the DTF activities and copies of all supporting documents.

Everett thanked and acknowledged the value of DTF members and expressed appreciation for their time and help while highlighting the diversity of the committee's composition and breadth of its representation.