

DRAW TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

REPORT

Introduction

The Draw Review Task Force was convened by Shirley Everett, Senior Associate Vice Provost for Residential and Dining Enterprises; chaired by Rodger Whitney, Executive Director of Student Housing/CHO; and co-facilitated by Sue Nunan, Director of Housing Assignments.

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. For a detailed composition of the Draw Review Task Force, see the appendix entitled "Committee Members."

Charge and Purpose as Presented by Shirley Everett, Senior Associate Vice Provost, Residential & Dining Enterprises

The Charge

The Undergraduate Housing Master Plan requires that we revise the Draw to better allocate the increasing supply of premier living spaces, 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.

The Purpose

The purpose of this task force is to review all current policies for the annual undergraduate housing Draw and determine what changes need to take place to implement the master plan recommendations and meet the needs of various other stakeholders. The Draw Review Task force will seek to:

- Streamline and simplify the current in-house Draw and the room assignment process, to achieve a greater sense of fairness and equity to the overall housing assignment process
- Improve communications and educational information to better explain the Draw assignment process to students
- Recommend procedures that will better allocate "premier" living spaces (singles and two-room doubles) to upper-class students by "un-stuffing" overcrowded undergraduate rooms
- Increase the number of all-freshman housing options within Florence Moore, Stern, and Wilbur Halls
- Create options for students interested in gender-neutral housing and other types of new housing in support of the Undergraduate Housing Master Plan.

- Make recommendations to create new measures to prevent the system from being compromised.
- Utilize available technology to provide additional Draw options and improved Draw information to students
- Review the special priority system and make recommendation for change to streamline this process and better support programmatic houses

Other topics to be considered:

- STEER committee recommendations to create neighborhoods
- Changes to existing cross-cultural and academic theme or focus houses

Consultation and Outreach Sought

An operating principle of the Draw Review Task Force concerned providing community inclusion. Not only was the committee itself comprised of representatives from many of the communities that have an interest in the Draw, but it also continually sought consultation with these communities throughout its deliberations.

The tone of inclusion was first set during the Task Force's initial meetings and persisted throughout the months during which the committee met. In order to promote transparency, to benefit from community feedback, and to sound out ideas, Rodger Whitney often reminded committee members to discuss the issues under deliberation with the communities they were representing. Committee members, in turn, strove to keep communication open and challenged any tendencies toward focusing inward.

Throughout its meetings, the committee invited outside community members to join in its deliberations whenever appropriate. To discuss the issue of gaming, it invited Muriel Niederle, Associate Professor of Economics. To discuss the issue of ethnic theme houses, it invited Chris Gonzalez-Clarke, Resident Fellow of Casa Zapata, and asked him to join as a permanent member. To discuss the complexities of the sophomore issue, it invited Beth Fox, Associate Director of Sophomore Advising, along with committee members John Bravman, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and Greg Boardman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs. The committee also sought full attendance and participation from its members, asking them to send replacements in their stead to represent their communities should they be unable to attend.

Consultation was also sought with various community groups by giving presentations that were followed by forums. These groups included the ASSU Senate, Resident Fellows, Resident Assistants, co-op house residents, and residents of the ethnic theme house Ujamaa. The committee also held a town hall meeting for all undergraduate students. All of the feedback that the committee received was very positive. The sole issue of contention concerned sophomores and their tier placement within the draw numbering system; otherwise, the committee enjoyed support across the board for its recommendations. Synopses of each meeting follow.

I. ASSU Senate Committee

January 27, 2009, 7:00-9:30 pm, at the Nitery

Shirley Everett opened the presentation to the Senate by thanking its members for inviting us and by giving an overview of the Master Plan and Draw Task Force changes. Rodger Whitney introduced the members of the committee who were present,

including Sue Nunan, Todd Davies, Christopher Collinson, Madeline Paymer, and Eddie Marks. Deborah Golder was also present. Rodger Whitney then went through a slide presentation that explained in detail the Master Plan and Draw Task Force recommendations.

The students generally were pleased with the recommendations. There were some specific questions such as when will the construction of freshman two-room doubles take place in Lagunita, how will Greek students be treated in the Draw, how will students apply with mixed class groups, and how will distribute information to current students.

The meeting ended with a discussion about what tier or tiers sophomores will be allowed to draw into. Beth Fox gave a brief presentation explaining the difficulty for sophomores in obtaining the resources they need to declare a major when they live on the Row or in three-class housing. Despite this presentation, all but one senator felt that sophomores should still be able to draw into both tiers two and three. Their main reason for this was that students go abroad their junior year, and therefore this is the year they want to have their least desirable housing. Others were concerned that we might end up with virtually all sophomore houses.

II. Meeting with Residents of Ethnic Theme House Ujamaa

[January 28, 2009 (maybe), time, place]

The Ujamaa Resident Fellow and Ujamaa student staff met to discuss how the Master Plan and Draw Task Force changes will impact Ujamaa and other theme houses. Shirley Everett and Rodger Whitney explained the Master Plan and Draw Task Force changes, concentrating specifically on how Ujamaa will be affected. The main changes discussed included the physical changes to the building that will result in all upperclass students receiving a single and freshmen being housed in doubles, triples, and future two-room doubles. This will result in some decrease in the number of students assigned to the house. Also discussed was the change in priority system from the Draw Task Force. The students expressed some concern in decreasing the amount of freshmen and the difficulty they may have in recruiting students to put on programs. Ujamaa students agreed to put together a proposal that would fall within the new Draw Task Force guidelines that will allow them to recruit upperclassmen to put on programs. Student Housing agreed to review freshmen numbers to determine if it was possible to assign some additional freshmen to Ujamaa. There was some discussion about recruiting freshmen students to ethnic theme houses, and the house agreed to follow up with the Freshman Dean's Office to see what new advertisement might be needed.

Regarding tier selection for sophomores, all except a few Ujamaa students were in favor of having the students draw from tier two and three.

III. Meeting with Resident Assistants and Community Associates

January 29, 2009, 5:30-6:30 pm, at Stern Hall

Greg Boardman introduced Shirley Everett and Rodger Whitney to the Resident Assistants in Larkin's lounge. The purpose of the meeting was to explain the Master Plan changes and Draw Task Force changes and to get their valuable input. Everett introduced the other staff from R&DE that were present, and she gave an overview of the presentation. Rodger Whitney went through some of the Master Plan changes but spent the majority of the time discussing the Draw Task Force recommendations.

Some of the Resident Assistants were concerned that Student Housing was building too much all-frosh housing and reminded us that the upperclassmen enjoy living with some freshmen in their residences. There was then some discussion about how to add energy to three-class houses if freshmen were removed. Some felt that sophomores moving into three-class houses felt rather lost at the beginning of the year and missed the communal experience of their freshman year.

Rodger Whitney then led the group in discussion regarding whether sophomores should be limited to tier three (worst) tier numbers or if they should be able to draw into either tier two or three. This group was 100% in favor of allowing sophomores to draw from either tier two or three. The reason for this is that students go abroad their junior years and therefore want their worst housing that year. Some also felt that seniors are not as concerned with housing as sophomores. Others felt if students apply for staff positions their junior or senior year, then the sophomore year is the only year that they may go through the Draw.

IV. Dinner with Resident Fellows and College Directors

February 10, 2009, 5:30-7:00 pm, at Bechtel I-Center

Deborah Golder welcomed Draw Task Force committee members to the Resident Fellow monthly meeting and explained that we were there to share information on the Draw Task Force changes. Shirley Everett gave an overview of the Draw Task Force proposed recommendations and briefly spoke of the Master Plan. She and Rodger Whitney had previously attended a Resident Fellow meeting to explain the Master Plan changes. Rodger Whitney went through a slide presentation to remind the Resident Fellows of the Master Plan changes and to explain the Draw Task Force recommendations.

The Resident Fellows seemed pleased with the recommendations. Resident Fellows wanted us to consider using returning residence priorities either in the Draw itself or during the in-house draw. There also was a suggestion that students should be allowed to draw by floor as well as by room type. The reason for this request was to split up draw groups. There also were some recommendations that we fully test the new in-house draw system before going live in 2010. Everett had already recommended that we try a pilot for this year.

Beth Fox gave a presentation on sophomores and explained why she felt limiting sophomores to Tier 3 would assist them in their academic careers. She presented research positing that sophomores do better in larger four-class residences than in Mirrielees or other three-class housing locations. The Resident Fellows were about evenly split on whether sophomores should be limited to Tier 3 or should be allowed to draw into Tiers 2 and 3.

V. Stanford Undergraduate Students Town Hall Meeting

February 11, 2009, 7:00-8:30 pm, at Toyon Hall

Shirley Everett called a town hall meeting with undergraduate residents to get their input about the Draw Task Force changes. Central R&DE promoted the event through email flyers that were distributed to all undergraduate students living in housing, posters that were put up the residences, and an advertisement in the Daily.

Everett opened and hosted the meeting and gave an overview of the Master Plan and Draw changes. Rodger Whitney went through a slide presentation that explained the details of both the Master Plan and Draw Task Force changes. The students attending were 1/3 freshmen, 1/3 sophomores, two juniors, and one senior. Other staff that attended included Greg Boardman, Vice Provost for Student Affairs, Deborah Golder, Director of Residential Education, and Sue Nunan.

These students had questions about specific issues such as how the transition plan from preferred and unpreferred numbers to tier numbers was going to work. This was unable to be answered at this time. There was quite a long discussion on the in-house draw process, and students were split on whether or not they thought the current system was effective. Again this group almost unanimously voted that sophomores should be able to choose from the bottom two tiers although there was a rather long discussion about it. Other questions answered included information about Oak Creek in 2009-10 and possible impacts to the Row when Branner and Mirrielees were unstuffed.

VI. Meeting with Co-Op House Residents

March 12, 2009, 7:00-8:30 pm, at Breer Library

This meeting is scheduled to take place on March 12, 2009, and will be lead by Sue Nunan and Nate Boswell. The meeting will focus on how the recommendations of the Draw Review Task Force will affect co-ops.

Specific Recommendations to Meet Task Force Objectives

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.

Background

The current two-tiered numbering system, which underpins the preferred/un-preferred year housing allocation system, does not support a prime objective of the Housing Master Plan: to provide premier housing, or housing that has a private bedroom space (e.g., singles and two-room doubles), during two of a student's three upperclass years.

When Resolution Reached

See meeting minutes of August 26, 2008.

Pros and Cons

Through this change and the changes brought about by implementation of the Housing Master Plan, students can expect to receive premier housing during two of their three upperclass years.

Impact and Expected Outcome

No objections were raised by the various groups who were apprised of this recommendation, which include the ASSU Senate, Resident Fellows, Resident Assistants, and students attending Draw Review Task Force town hall meetings with undergraduate students, with co-op residents, and with ethnic theme house residents in Ujamaa.

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.

Background

Administrators, alumni, and students have expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that the present Draw system often leads to students having their best housing in their sophomore year. Most sophomores choose to draw using a preferred year number under the present system, which would equate to numbers in Tiers 1 and 2 in

the proposed system, leaving their one un-preferred year number, which would equate to a Tier 3 number in the proposed system, for their junior or even senior year. Reflecting widespread sentiment that students should receive progressively better housing as they advance through their undergraduate careers, the Task Force seeks to build in an advantage for older students. The present system has also led to a large concentration of sophomores in Row houses without Resident Fellows and with minimal other support nearby, such as Academic Directors and Residence Deans, and sometimes in houses that also lack juniors and seniors.

The assignment of "tiers to years" is one means for addressing these issues because Row houses tend to be the most popular houses on campus and generally require what will be a Tier 1 number in the proposed system. Students also desire flexibility in when they have their best housing options because many students spend at least part of one year (most often the junior year) overseas or at Stanford in Washington, and in the past have chosen to use their un-preferred housing year when they are planning to be away. At the same time, VPUE has collected compelling data showing that sophomores are not developing optimally as a group. Many wait too long to declare a major, and a substantial number experience a "sophomore slump" academically and/or psychologically. This latter observation suggests it would be better if sophomores lived closer to University resources geared to them, which tend to be in or near the large residences, not on the Row.

When Resolution Reached

Task Force members all favored considering class level during draw number assignment by 1) allowing sophomores to choose only the lowest tier or 2) providing sophomores with the choice between the lower two tiers. Under both options, juniors and seniors will have the opportunity to draw into any tier, while students who forgo the Draw as sophomores will not have the opportunity to draw into Tier 1. The resolution of this issue came at the February 23, 2009 meeting. See meeting minutes of September 19, 2008, November 19, 2008, January 7, 2009, and February 23, 2009.

Taking into consideration the opinions of task force members as well as Resident Fellow and student input, the Task Force's final recommendation is to provide sophomores with greater choice by allowing them to draw into either of the lowest two tiers (option 2 above). This recommendation is the only one in this report on which the committee did not achieve consensus, however. The Task Force recommends careful data collection and analysis during the first two years of implementation to determine how well sophomores are being served by their choice of Tier 2 versus Tier 3. Relevant variables include post-implementation student feedback, numerical clustering of sophomores in different types of residences (with and without Resident Fellows), and pre- and post-implementation and "natural experiment" comparisons of student outcomes, including academic performance, major declarations, engagement with faculty, and mental health.

Pros and Cons

Stronger tier restriction, reflected in both options, ensures that juniors and seniors, but not sophomores, will be able to choose the subjectively best housing options, measured by student preferences. Data from past Draws suggests that this will strongly reduce, though it will probably not eliminate, sophomore presence in Row houses without Resident Fellows. It should also mean that any sophomores who do live on the Row will be in the presence of many older students, which should help with their development. More sophomores will likely also receive academic and

programmatic support through their residential communities, since more of them will likely be in houses with RFs and other resources. Sophomore specific resources will be organized, administered, and evaluated through a cooperative effort between Residential Education and VPUE.

The option of limiting sophomores to the lowest tier (option 1) proved generally less popular, but such a scenario would more easily enable active sophomore support since such efforts could be directed towards sophomore heavy-residences. At the same time, limiting sophomores to the lowest tier could reduce opportunities for interactions with older students in the residences. This scenario would also fail to account for the tendency of juniors to use their lowest tier (or worst year of housing) when they go abroad. Restricting sophomores to certain tiers is considered preferable to restricting them to certain residences because residence restrictions imbue the Draw with additional complexity, engender an atmosphere of perceived proscription, and increase the difficulty of assignment. Class segregation (dorms full of only freshmen or only sophomores, for instance) appears to be popular with students and may foster greater social identification. On the other hand, students who do not live around many juniors or seniors during their first two years may also suffer somewhat developmentally.

The members of the task force recognize the potential pros and cons of both scenarios, but a task force vote favored allowing sophomores to choose between the bottom two tiers by a margin of 7 to 4, with one abstention. Students who provided feedback favored this option by a large margin, but Resident Fellows were more evenly split. The option of limiting sophomores to the lowest tier (option 1) was the preference of VPUE but proved generally less popular.

Impact and Expected Outcome

The task force members acknowledge that restricting sophomores to the bottom tier, as under option 1 above, could result in the formation of sophomore-heavy residences, where support could be focused. The task force further recognizes that restricting sophomores to the bottom two tiers will likely result in their greater dispersal across the housing system, a consequence that will require more active sophomore-targeted programming and support, although the situation will likely be much better than it has been under the present system.

We recommend that the results be closely observed following implementation. The random number assignment in the Draw creates "natural experiments" in which students who express similar preferences but receive different types of housing can be compared to each other pre- and post-implementation to see whether and to what extent housing types impact academic and health outcomes. Such data, together with post-implementation surveys of student satisfaction with the system itself, might help to determine which of options 1 and 2 would ultimately better serve students.

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

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

Background

Students can currently rank up to a maximum of sixteen residence choices even though dozens more may potentially exist depending on the term and the housing category for which the students are applying. The current limitation prompts many students to choose houses to which they think they have a good chance of being assigned, in the process ranking their choices based on their Draw numbers and previous years' cut-off numbers rather than simply according to where they would prefer to live. The current system also drives many students to reopen their housing applications after the Draw numbers have been announced and to change their choices once they know their Draw number.

When Resolution Reached

See meeting minutes of October 1, 2008.

Pros and Cons

Through unlimited choices, students may exhaust their residence (and eventually room type) preferences, thereby obviating the need to know their Draw number and various previous-year residence cut-off numbers before assignments are made. This reduces gaming, simplifies the Draw while making it easier to understand, and eliminates the practice of students having to adjust their residence rankings upon receipt of their Draw numbers.

Impact and Expected Outcome

Some students will choose to spend very little time defining their residence choices, while others may choose to go more in depth; however, doing so is completely optional. Students only stand to benefit themselves by spending more time defining finer gradations. They do not disadvantage other students. The residence choices are defined to enable students to state their preferences in as narrow or in as broad a fashion as they wish, allowing them to list just a few general choices or a plethora of specific choices. This change frees students from needing to research the Draw in order to benefit from it while eliminating their reliance on obsolete (e.g., previous-year residence cut-off numbers) or incorrect (e.g., hearsay) information to inform their decision-making.

No objections were raised by the various groups who were apprised of this recommendation, which include the ASSU Senate, Resident Fellows, Resident Assistants, and students attending Draw Review Task Force town hall meetings with undergraduate students, with co-op residents, and with ethnic theme house residents in Ujamaa.

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 are assigned during the in-house draw. Pilot program will be implemented for 2009-10 in 1 or 2 houses.

Background

Students can currently only state their residence preferences, not their room type preferences. This produces a situation in which students can be saddled with unfavorable room assignments, which are assigned through in-house draws, in

otherwise favorable residence assignments, which are assigned through the Draw proper.

When Resolution Reached

For room type rankings, see meeting minutes of November 5, 2008, and December 3, 2008. For the interactive housing map, see meeting minutes of October 15, 2008. For the pilot, see meeting minutes of January 7, 2009, and January 23, 2009.

Pros and Cons

Being able to state room type choices in the Draw gives students the ability to define finer gradations of their preferences while maintaining the benefits of in-house room draws.

Impact and Expected Outcome

Beginning with the pilot house, students will benefit from being ensured a certain room type assignment within a certain residence through the Draw. According to the last annual housing survey, half of all students, or those who are pleased with their room assignments, view the in-house draw process positively, while the other half, or those who are not pleased by their room assignments, view it negatively. It is expected that more students will view the housing assignment process favorably if they know their room type assignment before entering their respective in-house draws.

No objections were raised by the various groups who were apprised of this recommendation, which include the ASSU Senate, Resident Fellows, Resident Assistants, and students attending Draw Review Task Force town hall meetings with undergraduate students, with co-op residents, and with ethnic theme house residents in Ujamaa.

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.

Background

Current in-house room draw rules vary wildly across the housing system, are not publicized until after Draw assignments are made, and often run contrary to the rules of the Draw itself, sometimes resulting in students with the best Draw numbers receiving the least desirable rooms in the house.

When Resolution Reached

See meeting minutes of December 3, 2008.

Pros and Cons

The positive aspects of the in-house draw, which include serving as a bonding experience for house residents and Resident Fellows while solving roommate

matching problems, are preserved, while its negative aspects, which include having unknown and varying rules that sometimes run contrary to those of the Draw, are removed.

Impact and Expected Outcome

Students will appreciate having clearly-defined, publicly-announced rules in advance of the Draw that are standardized across the system. Moreover, their room assignments, which will be determined by their randomly-given Draw numbers and their years spent in housing, will be predictable and conform to expectations. Residences will also be allowed to split Draw groups during the room assignment process. Gender balance for each house will be pre-determined by Housing Assignments based on Title IX requirements.

No objections were raised by the various groups who were apprised of this recommendation, which include the ASSU Senate, Resident Fellows, Resident Assistants, and students attending Draw Review Task Force town hall meetings with undergraduate students, with co-op residents, and with ethnic theme house residents in Ujamaa.

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.

Background

Resident Fellows currently find difficulty in determining which students are applying for a residence priority due to interest in the program versus those who are applying due to interest in the physical house. Moreover, the existence of a complex, multi-level system of residence priorities whose requirements are not centrally published complicates the Draw and allows its integrity to be compromised.

There are currently three types of special programming houses:

- Academic Theme Houses are nominally supported by academic departments working closely with Residential Education. Most are language-focused, but there is one for Hum Bio students and East Asian Studies. There are currently 7 houses.
- Cross-Cultural Theme Houses are overseen by Residential Education. There

are currently four on campus: Casa Zapata, Okada, Muwekma-tah-ruk, and Ujamaa.

- Focus Houses focus on a particular interest of a Resident Fellow and are overseen by Residential Education. Focus Houses allow up to 30% of residents to be assigned under the focus umbrella. There are currently six focus houses.

When Resolution Reached

See meeting minutes of January 26, 2009, February 23, 2009, and March 2, 2009.

Pros and Cons

Allowing Resident Fellows to pre-assign a small group of students to a theme/focus house supports program houses by ensuring a core group of committed residents. It is unclear how the proposed process will affect Residential Education's ability to attract a core of students into all theme and focus houses. There is particular concern with whether or not a critical mass of students can be induced to forego the draw in order to be pre-assigned to less desirable locations. For this reason, the committee expects to revisit this recommendation after the 2009-10 Draw.

Impact and Expected Outcome

Students will not spend time gaming the Draw by securing multiple residence priorities solely for gaining priority assignment to more desirable residences. Resident Fellows will benefit from using pre-assignments to build a strong cadre of program participants as a core of their houses.

VII. Support Gender-Neutral Housing

Mixed-gender groups can stay together during the the Draw process through group retention. Request making gender-neutral pilot permanent. Request expansion of gender-neutral pilot to other residences beginning in 2009-10.

Background

Although mixed-gender groups may currently form, they are split into gendered groups before they are considered for residence assignment by the Draw program. The current gender-neutral pilot program in Castaño, Mirrielees, Terra, and Narnia has received positive feedback from students and is considered successful.

When Resolution Reached

For mixed-gender groups, see meeting minutes of November 5, 2009. For gender-neutral, see meeting minutes of January 26, 2009.

Pros and Cons

Students may stay together and be considered for assignment as a mixed-gender group by the Draw program through as many residence choices as group members collectively set as their group retention level before their group is possibly split. Students benefit from being able to take advantage of gender-neutral housing options should they be assigned to gender-neutral pilot residences.

Impact and Expected Outcome

Students may live with whom they wish to live regardless of gender or gender

identity. No objections were raised by the various groups who were apprised of this recommendation, which include the ASSU Senate, Resident Fellows, Resident Assistants, and students attending Draw Review Task Force town hall meetings with undergraduate students, with co-op residents, and with ethnic theme house residents in Ujamaa.

How Recommendations Meet Charge

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

Implementation Timeline

All recommendations save for the two noted above are slated for implementation in this year's Draw. Those two exceptions, which 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, will be implemented this year in pilot houses and the following year across the housing system.

Transition Plan

Over the past two years, current sophomores and juniors have made housing choices under the preferred/un-preferred numbering system, necessitating a plan for translating their preferred year usage in the current two-tiered numbering system to tier usage in the proposed three-tiered numbering system. For example, current juniors may have used two

preferred years, one preferred year and one un-preferred year, one staff year and one preferred year, two staff years, and so on.

Additionally, Draw number translation may vary. Students who have used two preferred years, for example, may have Draw numbers that correlate to two Tier 2 numbers, two Tier 1 numbers, or one Tier 2 number and one Tier 3 number, where Tier 1 is the best tier and Tier 3 is the worst tier.

Finally, students may have used one preferred year as a sophomore, for example, and yet received the least desirable room in their assigned residence. An ideal transition system, therefore, would need to consider preferred year usage, staff exemption year usage, Draw number, and room assignment vis-à-vis preferred year usage when determining tier usage - all while ensuring that current students are not given more preference than is fair. With this in mind, the following transition system is proposed.

Proposed Transition 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 Review Task Force successfully fulfilled its charge of simplifying and streamlining the Draw. Its recommendations are transformative, ensuring not only support of the Housing Master Plan, but also amelioration of the many issues plaguing the current Draw. These improvements lead to the surcease of gaming and the abrogation of vagaries. Moreover, they increase the sense of fairness and equity, lessen overall complexity, and make the Draw easier to understand.

The success of the Task Force in its efforts was also reflected in the committee's consensus, which was achieved after lengthy debate and good discussions. More importantly, the Draw Review Task Force found unanimous support in all of its consulting sessions with the Draw's numerous stake holders - including the ASSU Senate; undergraduate students in ethnic theme houses, co-ops, and dormitories; Resident Fellows, Resident Assistants, and Residential Education Central Office staff; the Freshman Dean's Office; VPSA; VPUE; Student Housing; and Residential and Dining Enterprises - for effecting its final recommendations to improve the Draw.