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Dear Colleagues,

As many of you are aware, over the past year the College has embarked on a review of the House system in preparation for a major renewal of these historic facilities. Our overarching goal has been to explore the unique role and purpose of House life in the educational experience of Harvard students and to revitalize the House system for the 21st century. Even in these challenging economic times, we are committed to this essential undertaking.

I write now to introduce the release of the Report on Harvard House Renewal, which summarizes the findings and recommendations of many members of our community, working collaboratively. The report includes undergraduate survey results, the findings of several focus groups, and the work of five House Program Planning Subcommittees, two of which were made up entirely of students. These recommendations range from a reaffirmation of the value of certain elements of House life that should remain constant for future generations of students to a consideration of alternative designs for academic, social, and residential space. The report will serve as a working document that will help to guide our plans for House Renewal.

Harvard’s reforms of curriculum, classroom pedagogy, and academic advising provide the context for this major renewal of the 12 residential Houses. The report recognizes that the House system is essential, not ancillary, to a Harvard education as it aims to engage students in the intellectual life of the College and the University beyond the classroom.

In 1929, President Lowell championed the ideal of a Harvard House system that was “a social device for a moral purpose,” believing that the College’s mission was to develop the mind, body, and character of its students. By integrating older students with their younger classmates in a residential community, seniors (and Resident Tutors) would positively influence underclassmen in “personal and corporate responsibility.” Eighty years later, Lowell’s vision still resonates with students: in the Harvard Undergraduate Senior Survey, students consistently rank their satisfaction with House life favorably. We also know that many alumni feel their House experiences helped to define their undergraduate years and created cherished memories and connections that endure decades later.

Of all of the concepts discussed by the subcommittees, faculty leadership and involvement may be the most fundamental to the mission and purpose of House life. The House is a place where learning occurs through reflection and study, through interactions among roommates, in the informal setting of shared meals, and in more formal academic offerings of the House. The educational potential of College housing is even more promising when faculty shape the residential community and engage students in educationally purposeful activities. For this reason, several other academic institutions have also modeled their residential communities on the tenets of the Residential College or House system.
I extend sincere thanks to our subcommittee chairs and to all members of the subcommittees for their candor and valuable insights throughout this process. The University’s ambitious plans for renewing the undergraduate Houses will happen in three stages: planning and program review; design and development; and construction and renovation. The release of this report marks the end of an internal review of the House system, and our goal is to share these recommendations with others in the community, including alumni, to gain additional insight on House planning and program review. We expect this first stage will conclude this spring.

I look forward to hearing from you, both about this report and about the House Renewal project as it unfolds. Please email house_renewal@harvard.edu with your thoughts and suggestions.

Yours sincerely,

Evelynn M. Hammonds

Evelynn Hammonds
Barbara Gutmann Rosenkrantz Professor of the History of Science and of African and African American Studies
Dean of Harvard College
BACKGROUND

President Lowell’s bold “experiment,” the creation of the Harvard House system, has transformed undergraduate life at Harvard. For many students, the House community is as integral to their academic experience as the classroom. In the spring of 2008, Dean Michael D. Smith charged the House Program Planning Committee (HPPC) with undertaking an extensive review of all aspects of House life in preparation for a major renewal of these historic residential structures. Newly-appointed Dean of the College Evelynn Hammonds chaired the HPPC Steering Group, and much of the group’s work took place in five subcommittees: three committees comprising of faculty, staff, and students and two all-student committees.

The Steering Committee and subcommittees met throughout 2008 to discuss the role of the House system in the 21st century and to put forward recommendations related to the mission and purpose of House life. In addition to the HPPC recommendations, multiple focus groups were conducted with students, faculty, House Masters, House staff, Allston Burr Resident Deans (ABRDs), and other College staff. Further, a survey was launched in November of 2008 that solicited undergraduate input on House program planning.

HPPC subcommittee discussions, focus group meetings, and survey findings revealed that there was broad consensus and commitment to the core mission of House life. The House system is viewed by its constituents as a great asset to Harvard because it uniquely integrates students’ academic and social lives and offers undergraduates an enriching and supportive home. At the nexus of learning and living, the Houses support the exploration of new ideas and activities that promote interactions with peers, faculty, and graduate students of differing backgrounds and disciplines.

The information-gathering process for this large-scale undertaking is not yet complete. During the spring of 2009, the University will solicit feedback from College alumni. Suggestions gathered in these discussions will continue to help planners as we envision a renewed House system. Additionally, comments and feedback generated from readers of this report will undoubtedly continue to shape the way we understand the House Renewal program and process.
Many themes emerged during this review process, and included herein are recommendations for renewing all aspects of House life – the educational, programmatic, and architectural.

1. Promote meaningful faculty-student interaction, with the understanding that House life should engender an intergenerational community of scholars.
   i. The Senior Common Room (SCR) is an outdated concept that in many cases is not working well for current students and faculty. The committee recommends that a select number of Houses pilot a House Fellows Program that is designed to increase opportunities for casual yet meaningful interaction between faculty and students.
      1. The House Fellows Program should operate with a clear set of expectations for all participants. Fellows would be appointed to this position for a short, renewable term.
      2. The Houses should consider ways to overcome obstacles to faculty-student interaction (e.g., timing of programs, availability of parking services, and family-friendly activities or childcare options for faculty children).
   ii. Continue and enhance the Resident Scholar program.
      1. Provide clear expectations of participation for Resident Scholars and, if possible, two apartments that are located in or close to the House proper, near student suites.

2. Emphasize the Resident Tutor’s role in advising and entryway community building.
   i. Resident Tutors have taken on a range of administrative and programmatic responsibilities (e.g., housing duties, House library supervision, and Specialty Tutor roles) that in some cases detract from their core purpose as graduate scholars and mentors for students. Recommendations are to shift some of these responsibilities to administrative staff, and, with the guidance of House staff, enlist upperclass students to augment the programmatic roles of Specialty Tutors (BGLTS, Sexual Assault Sexual Harassment [SASH], Race Relations, and Wellness).

3. Modify House staffing to better distribute the House Office workload.
   i. Update or reorganize responsibilities to better support the business of the House.

4. Continue to view dining halls as critical to House life.
   i. Dining halls serve as a hub of activity and as a place where many students study.
   ii. To acknowledge their important place in House life, design dining halls in such a way that all Houses can keep seating areas open to students 24 hours a day.

5. Explore late-night eating options in the Houses.

6. Continue to offer a variety of study spaces in the Houses (including the House library, dining hall, and small group study spaces), and include additional study spaces in architectural designs where they naturally occur (e.g., in alcoves, ends of residential hallways, or hallways of library spaces).
7. Include classroom/seminar space in the Houses. These should have additional purposes as meeting and study space for students.
   i. Seminar space is preferred over formal classroom space.
   ii. Efforts should be made to link classroom activity to the Houses.

8. Programmatically, provide opportunities in the Houses for amateur exploration of the arts, recreation, and cultural and intellectual activities.

9. Continue to use the Junior Common Room\(^1\) (JCR) as the “living room” of each House.
   i. JCRs should be used primarily for House-based events and as student “hang out” space.
   ii. JCRs should not be the only student social space in the Houses.

10. Continue to seek the right balance between “looking inward and looking outward” in the Houses, determining the extent to which the Houses should function as a finite community and the extent to which it should welcome the presence of non-residents.
   i. Connect activities in the Houses to broader campus and community life, while being mindful that student organizations not dominate the use of space (“looking outward”).
   ii. Consistent with the mission, focus House life on building community among House members (“looking inward”).
      1. This can be accomplished through the creation of additional common spaces, programming, and thoughtful policies about usage of House spaces.

11. Examine alternative places for student organizations to meet and hold events, since House dining halls are often inadequate for student organization social events.
   i. Although dining halls will still likely be used for large events after renewal, other campus spaces should be available for use by student organizations, and dining halls should not be the default space for such events.

12. Include key activity spaces in each House, including computer work stations, a House library, game and/or TV room(s), at least one unique specialty space (e.g., wood shop, printing press), and areas for producing and displaying art.

13. Promote the idea of sharing spaces among multiple Houses, including grilles,\(^2\) multipurpose event spaces, and theaters. Fitness rooms might be shared among neighboring Houses. Recommendations also promote the development of shared meeting spaces for groups of students and for student organizations.

14. Update student residential spaces through policy and design.
   i. Eliminate walk-throughs.\(^3\)
   ii. Plan for a diversity of housing options within each House (e.g., suites, singles).
   iii. Design to encourage interaction between class years.

---

\(^1\) For the purposes of this report, discussions of the Junior Common Room refer to the physical space in the Houses and not to the undergraduate population of the House, which can also be referred to by this name.

\(^2\) As of the publication date of this report, there are student-managed grilles in Dunster, Eliot, Kirkland, Lowell, Pforzheimer, and Quincy. These businesses provide students with an educational opportunity, provide a late-night dining option for students and residential staff, and facilitate community development. The managers of the grilles are advised and supervised by the House Master, and sometimes a Tutor provides additional supervision.

\(^3\) “Walk-through” refers to a bedroom in which a student would need to walk through someone else's bedroom in order to access the in-suite common room, bathroom, and/or the student’s own bedroom.
iv. Provide locks on all bathroom doors and on all **private bedrooms** within suites.
v. Continue to examine housing policies related to the availability of gender-neutral housing.
vi. Determine capacity of room by size of the room, not by class year.
vii. Design bathrooms so that, if outside of suites, they are not large group hallway bathrooms (i.e., are not used by 20 students or more).

viii. Maximize student privacy by soundproofing bedrooms and, when possible, designing private bedrooms (i.e., singles).
ix. Design doubles so that they are large enough for all furniture to fit on the floor.

x. Explore moveable closets and university-issued furniture for suite common rooms.

15. In the context of renewing and updating spaces, reevaluate the use of basement spaces for summer storage.

16. Aim to eliminate DeWolfe-style overflow housing. The committee feels that this model is not ideal; overflow housing may be necessary, but it should not be permanent.

17. Design space in each House for House Masters, Resident Scholars, Resident Tutors, and the ABRD.
   
i. Design Tutor suites so that their sizes are consistent within each House and across the House system (one- and two-bedroom).
   
ii. Maintain an ABRD apartment in each House. Allow for the possibility of having a residence for a live-in House Administrator, who might also serve as a Tutor.

18. Maintain/Create certain design elements.
   
i. Maintain the historic nature and unique character of the Houses.
   
ii. Design kitchens and casual lounge spaces that are located throughout each House.
   
iii. Use natural light and glass to enhance the openness of social and study spaces.
   
iv. Where possible, build underground passages to connect all arms of a House.
   
   v. Incorporate sustainability practices, making efforts to educate students about environmental impact.
   
   vi. Design flexible, multipurpose spaces. Allow for the reality that residents’ needs and interests will change over time.

19. Update technology and space management to accommodate students’ and House needs.
   
i. Implement an online scheduling system for the House spaces available to all undergraduates and House staff.
   
   ii. Explore the possibility of using a common web module, supported by the College, to serve as a base for all House websites.
   
   iii. Explore a central system for maintaining fitness room equipment.

Note: This Executive Summary pulls together the overarching recommendations of all five subcommittees. Pages 10-35 contain the recommendations of each individual subcommittee.
The Steering Committee's overarching goal was to explore the unique role and purpose of House life in educating and supporting Harvard students and to build on the historical importance of these residential communities. Dean Smith asked the committee to develop guiding principles and recommendations for an “ideal” undergraduate House in the 21st century. While the program, if realized, will represent the largest capital project in Harvard’s history, committee members were asked to propose practical guidelines that could be reasonably achieved. Throughout this process, architectural professionals from Einhorn Yaffee Prescott Architecture and Engineering, P.C. and Harvard University planners assisted the committee in understanding the feasibility of the ideal program.

Committee members were asked to operate with two basic assumptions: first, that College enrollment remains constant, and second, that the principles being developed could apply to existing and to newly-built Houses in any location. House renovation plans were discussed independent of the possibility of locating student housing in Allston.

Committee Structure

The bulk of the committee’s work took place in five subcommittees: the Subcommittee on House Life, the Subcommittee on Academic and Social Spaces, the Subcommittee on Residential Living Spaces, the Subcommittee on Neo-Georgian Houses, and the Subcommittee on Modern Houses. Representatives from each of these subcommittees reconvened at several times during the process to make up the Steering Committee.

The former three committees were chaired by current or former House Masters and began meeting in spring 2008, for a total of approximately eight meetings each. Membership of these committees included tenured and non-tenured faculty, students, ABRDs, House Masters, House Administrators, and members of the FAS and College administration.

To enlist more undergraduate input, all committees had student representation, but the latter two were all-student groups. These representatives applied and were accepted through a vetting process administered by the Harvard Undergraduate Council. Both all-student subcommittees met during the fall 2008 semester, and both were co-chaired by a student House Committee chair and either a House Master or an Assistant Dean.

Membership lists of the Steering Committee and five subcommittees and are included in Appendix I.

Each of the five subcommittees worked with a unique charge, though due to the interrelated nature of many of these topics, the subcommittees often discussed overlapping topic areas.

4 The House buildings defined as “Neo-Georgian” for the purposes of this report were built between the 1910s and the 1930s. These include: Adams, Cabot (with the exception of the House Office, JCR, and dining hall, all of which were added in later construction), Dunster, Eliot, Kirkland, Leverett (McKinlock), Lowell, Quincy (Old), and Winthrop. The House buildings defined as “Modern” for the purposes of this report were built following World War II. These buildings can be characterized as Modern both in their construction and aesthetic. These include: Currier, Leverett (library and Towers), Mather, Quincy (New), and Pforzheimer.
PROCESS

Focus Groups and Survey

To probe more deeply into the Harvard community’s opinions and constructive suggestions for improving House life, the College sought to glean feedback in a variety of ways. Edwards and Company, Inc., an outside consulting firm, conducted four focus groups with House residents, interviewing 40 students during May 2008. The Office of Residential Life conducted 12 focus groups with a variety of stakeholders in the House system, including students, House Masters, House staff, faculty, and College administrators. Additionally, all House residents were invited to take a House Renewal survey, administered between October 30 and November 18, 2008. These findings undergird the recommendations, and their results are cited throughout this report. An executive summary of the focus group findings is included in Appendix II. An executive summary of the survey findings is included in Appendix III, and the full survey findings are included in Appendix IV.

Additional Sources of Information

To learn more about others’ experiences in renewing their residential facilities, three separate trips to peer institutions were arranged for subcommittee members’ participation. Planners also reviewed historical reports and information related to the Harvard House system. Related to the latter, “The Report of the Committee on the Role of the Faculty in the Houses,” published in 1969, is included in Appendix V.

Throughout the life of this project, representatives and leaders of the Harvard Undergraduate Council (UC) have been and will continue to be an important voice in the planning and feedback process. During the fall 2008 term, the UC passed two pieces of legislation related to House Renewal. 27F-06, “House Renewal Subcommittees Appointment Act,” and 27F-14, “Recommendations for Harvard House Renewal,” are included in Appendix VI. Both pieces of legislation passed unanimously, and the latter was presented to the members of the Steering Committee in January 2009.
In many ways, the House Program Planning Committee reaffirmed the values and inherent strengths of House life, noting that the overall structure and concept is relevant now and for future generations of Harvard students. The following is a list of characteristics the subcommittees felt were important to uphold:

1. Dining halls should continue to function as the hub of House life. They serve many functions beyond eating; they are places for group or individual study, socializing, and large dances and other social events. Due to this function as House nuclei, the HPPC recommends that each House should continue to have its own dining hall. Further, the seating area of each dining hall should remain open at all times.

2. The intergenerational nature of the Houses should be preserved.

3. Each House should have a library that maintains the House’s unique qualities and character and has improved lighting and technology.

4. Each House should be small enough that one could plausibly recognize all residents. This range should be 350-500 students.

5. Each House should have an outdoor space appropriate for Commencement exercises.

6. Programming and architectural space should preserve opportunities for students to explore amateur interests in the Houses.

Cable TV was discussed by several subcommittees with the assumption that it would either be included in renewed House structures or would be replaced by future technologies.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSE LIFE

Subcommittee Charge: This group explored the future direction of learning activities, teaching, advising, and faculty involvement in the Houses, taking into account their history and current status. It also reviewed the roles and responsibilities currently assumed by the House Masters, ABRDs, Tutors, House staff, and Senior Common Room members.

The Idea of a House

A Harvard House is a faculty-led community of undergraduate students, graduate students, and resident and non-resident faculty and scholars who eat, sleep, study, exercise, participate in recreational activities, enter into discourse, and socialize in a supportive learning environment. More than bricks and mortar, the House is a community that cares primarily for its members’ academic and personal well-being. Intellectual, academic, advising, civic, recreational, social, and cultural activities occur in the House, with the central goal of the House being to foster these activities.

To do this, the Harvard House community cultivates a range of programs, both formal and informal. All of these offer opportunities for members of the community to meet, exchange ideas, learn, and fine-tune particular skills. The House is a place where learning occurs through reflection and study, in the informal setting of the dining hall and other social spaces and in the more formal academic offerings of the House.

The House offers cultural opportunities – for example, in film, music, art, dance, drama, and public service – that range in scale from small to large. Intramural sports teams and recreational facilities in or near the Houses encourage athletic activities. A variety of social functions sponsored by Masters, House Committees, and other groups within the House create opportunities for members of the House community to relax and interact.

A House’s primary focus must be to support its residents, while being mindful that those residents are also parts of larger communities – the College and University, and the communities within which these institutions are embedded. Thus, a House needs to be nurturing, supportive, and responsive to its residents while at the same time taking part in the broader activities of the College and University. To be welcoming and inclusive and to share resources, Houses must find a balance between looking inward, at the needs of the residents, and looking outward, at the needs of and opportunities offered by and to the broader community.

The Mission of House Life: An Intergenerational Community of Scholars

The mission of House life is to forge a link between learning and living and to create a smaller, intergenerational community of scholars within the larger College setting. Harvard recognizes that all aspects of student life, the curricular and co-curricular, are integral to student learning. A close-

---

5 A list of what makes a “learning environment” includes activities such as classes, sections, guest speakers, faculty involvement, academic and career advising, study tables, and respect for community standards. To ensure that the Houses do as “learning environments,” the subcommittee felt that these components should be incorporated into every House.

6 Additional functions of the House that were discussed, but are not included in this report, include student governance and space for private reflection/privacy.
knit House community that encourages interactions with peers, faculty, and disciplines aims to support students’ intellectual curiosity, academic success, and emotional development and well-being.

*House Fellows Program*

Presently, each House has an SCR. This term describes both a physical room within the House and a group of people associated with the House, including the House Master, ABRD, House Office staff members, Resident and Non-Resident Tutors, and affiliates or faculty members who have been invited to affiliate with the House. This group is meant to contribute to House life in a variety of ways, serving as resources for the Houses’ students and for each other. In practice, however, the SCR falls short of its mission; through subcommittee conversations and focus group data, it became clear that often there is not an effective link between SCR members and undergraduate residents. While the subcommittee feels the intended mission of the SCR is laudable, it recommends revitalizing the program to encourage more meaningful interaction between SCR members and students. It is recommended that one or two Houses pilot a House Fellows program using the guiding principles outlined below:

- Develop new and creative ways to engage faculty that build on the House’s traditions and unique identity. The House Fellows program is not meant to be a “one size fits all” model. There are many ways to facilitate the involvement of faculty in House Life.

- Secure a commitment. Appoint House Fellows to a short term, which could be renewable provided that the Fellow has been actively engaged in House life.

- Establish expectations. The House Master’s invitation to participate in the House Fellows program should establish and communicate clear expectations to prospective Fellows. Expectations may vary by House, but at a minimum, Fellows should be expected to facilitate intellectual engagement with undergraduate students once per term. This can take many forms but may include hosting a discussion, giving a lecture, or leading students in a cultural event. Fellows should be invited and encouraged to attend regular House events and might be involved in advising.

- Create a Master’s Cabinet. Utilize a small group of House Fellows as a “Master’s Cabinet” or similar group that can assist the Master in developing the cultural and intellectual aspects of House life.

- Minimize barriers. Investigate creative ways to remove barriers for faculty who do not live close to campus to attend House events in the evenings. For example, provide parking or childcare during House events, if possible.

- Encourage peer relationships. House Fellows should, ideally, feel a sense of belonging within the House. Events that facilitate interaction between faculty and graduate students are encouraged.

- Keep a room dedicated to SCR-type functions. While the House Fellows program may replace the body of people known as the SCR, the room in each House known as the SCR should remain.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSE LIFE

Resident Scholar Program

At present, many Houses (but not all) have Resident Scholar apartments. In practice, these apartments are not always rented to a member of the community who is expected and encouraged to contribute to the intellectual life of the House. The apartments are rented at market rate, and policies governing their use vary by House; there is not a common set of expectations for tenants. The subcommittee feels that Resident Scholars can enrich the intellectual life of the House and should become active and valued members of the community. Thus, a Resident Scholar program should be formally established for each House, with the following guiding principles:

- Offer Resident Scholars subsidized housing. If space is not available within the House, the College could identify housing near the House proper to be used by Resident Scholars.
- Select up to two Resident Scholars per House for each academic year.
- Outline expectations for Resident Scholars in their housing contract, and specify the frequency and type of interaction with undergraduates that is expected. Further, House Masters may want to consider appointing each Resident Scholar as a House Fellow.

House Staff and Proposed Staffing Model

The House Master is responsible for overseeing and coordinating the work of all House staff and affiliates in order to effectively create an enriching House community. Given the diverse range of services that are offered by the House, House staff should continue to be accountable to other units and/or functions in the College (e.g., Administrative Board, Advising Programs Office, Office of Residential Life, Administration and Finance, Human Resources, etc.). Select members of the House staff (e.g., ABRDs, Building Managers, and Dining Hall Managers) are expected to work in coordination and collaboration with the House Master, while reporting to other units in the University.

In recent years, House Masters and ABRDs have seen a growth in their responsibilities due to students' mental health concerns, as well as to the demands of pre-professional and sophomore advising initiatives. Further, a more diverse student body has given rise to a need for additional advising and educational programming in areas such as race relations and sexual health and identity development.

Presently, faculty who take on positions as House Masters have no relief from their teaching and scholarly duties, and Resident Deans have a half-time appointment in the House (with the second half of their appointment originating from a teaching appointment in a Harvard academic department). As a result, more and more administrative responsibilities have been delegated to tutorial staff.

Because the subcommittee feels that Tutors can best serve the House community when they focus their efforts on academic and personal advising, the need for a different staffing model that might better distribute the workload of House staff was discussed. Among the solutions reviewed was upgrading the current House Administrator and Assistant to the Resident Dean positions. This upgrade could allow for the possibility of a House Administrator who resides in the House and who may serve as a Tutor. This in turn would facilitate that individual's involvement with the House on-call system (i.e., joining the rotation of the ABRD and Tutors who respond to emergencies in the
evening hours). This individual might also have a formalized role in advising student groups in the House, thus providing greater support to the House Masters and easing some administrative responsibility currently taken on by the tutorial staff.

In all, any changes should assume that the strength of any House staffing model is built on a team effort, where each staff member contributes to the success of the whole. Generally, it will be important to reimagine the House Office staffing model in such a way that it can be adapted to the needs of each House. This discussion should continue throughout the life of this project, and any staffing changes should be implemented gradually through the use of pilot programs.

Below are additional recommendations related to the distribution of work in the Houses:

- The Resident Dean position should remain an academic appointment, where s/he is primarily engaged in teaching and advising. Each House should implement an on-call protocol to relieve the ABRD from being on-call for evenings and weekends.

- Resident Tutors’ duties should be primarily related to advising and entryway community building. It is recommended that all Resident Tutors receive training as first responders in a range of areas related to race relations, health and well-being, and sexual assault prevention. Because students in crisis will often turn to the Tutor whom they know the best (typically their entryway Tutor), all Tutors are expected to respond appropriately to a student in distress and to refer students to additional resources as needed.

- Beyond the first-response and referral of students in crisis, it is further recommended that the House continue to implement programs related to sexual health, race relations, sexual identity, and wellness, but that these educational programs are conducted by undergraduates who are selected for these leadership roles given their interest and background in these areas. A member of the House staff can help coordinate the selection, training, and programming efforts of student leaders with College liaison offices (e.g., University Health Services, Office of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response, Alcohol and Other Drugs Services, the Harvard Foundation, and Phillips Brooks House).

Space in the Houses

Space is a rare commodity on campus, and there is a need for versatile spaces that can meet a variety of needs (e.g., academic advising, art and cultural space, sports facilities, and large social space). The following are general space recommendations discussed by the subcommittee:

- Maintain a dining hall in each House.

- Provide adequate space in each House to allow House Masters to create an engaging community that is dedicated to cultural, intellectual, and recreational/social exploration. Such spaces may include study and/or advising rooms, art and cultural space, common lounges, and seminar space.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSE LIFE

- Offer large, accessible, multi-use space for House “neighborhoods”\(^7\) and student organizations to use for events and activities.

- Maintain a library in each House that offers unique qualities and character but that has improved lighting and technology.

- Locate each House Office in an accessible and central area, where daytime traffic is more likely to occur. (See the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Academic and Social Spaces for more detail about the location and makeup of the House Office.)

- Incorporate environmentally friendly practices throughout the design and program of the Houses.

---

\(^7\) A “neighborhood” is a group of Houses that are geographically near to each other (e.g., Eliot, Kirkland, and Winthrop).
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL SPACES

Subcommittee Charge. This subcommittee examined how public space makes House life special and how it can best enhance learning and facilitate students’ growth and development. The group considered which types of programming and activities (e.g., studying, social events, recreational activities, etc.) should occur in each House and which should be neighborhood-based.

Introduction

In total, non-residential spaces make up approximately 30% of the overall space in a House. In some cases, these recommendations are presented anticipating particular recommendations from the Subcommittee on House Life. Overall, the committee believes that the Houses should continue to be safe and welcoming for students and should provide an intellectual and social community that reinforces and extends didactic learning and encourages exploration and creativity.

Academic Spaces

The definition of an “academic” space is broader today than at the time of initial House construction; moreover, there is considerable overlap between “academic” and “social” spaces in the Houses. Common spaces with academic functions include dining halls, House libraries, classrooms and/or seminar rooms, small-group meeting rooms, music practice rooms, meeting rooms for student organizations, art production rooms, dance studios, grille areas, rooms for advising and mentoring, and the administrative space required to support student academics (such as the House Office). Planners should:

- Include suitable individual and group study spaces. Houses should have as much study space as design will comfortably allow; in addition the architects should be cognizant of incidental spaces that could naturally serve as study spaces. A combination of spaces for group study and quiet individual study is valuable. Wireless internet is essential, as is access to high quality printers, a fax machine, and a copy machine somewhere in each House. Designs should anticipate the need for future technology upgrades.

- Build flexible seminar rooms. The subcommittee spent a great deal of time discussing the existence of classrooms in an ideal House. Ultimately, members feel that spaces used for different learning activities could also be used as classrooms. In other words, while not opposed to the presence of classrooms, the subcommittee feels these spaces should exist primarily to serve other ends, such as group study or meeting space. To achieve this balance, these spaces should have the basic amenities that a classroom might require, including ample electrical outlets, good lighting, and seminar-style seating around a table. If the room is utilized as a classroom, the subcommittee thinks that the experience would be more meaningful if the course were in some way linked to the House in which it was taught. This could mean that a House affiliate teaches the course or that the course is open primarily to House residents. The House should have first right of refusal for how a space is used, and

8 In the House Renewal survey, responding to the question “Should space in the House be designated for class/seminars/sections?”, 44% of respondents answered “Yes.” In the question “How would you like to interact with faculty in your House?”, the option “Class/section meetings” was ranked 3.1 on a 5-point scale from “Very uninterested” (1.0) to “Very interested” (5.0).
the House, in consultation with the Registrar’s Office, should book these rooms. Given the varied nature of their use, these spaces should not be located on residential floors.

- Create small-group meeting spaces in which Tutors can conduct meetings with students. The subcommittee feels that an alternative should exist to conducting advising meetings in Tutor suites.

- Retain House libraries, redesigned with good lighting, more electrical outlets, a mixture of desks and tables, and comfortable chairs. When possible, the libraries should retain the book collections they currently showcase, as these add atmosphere and a sense of history. However, the committee would like to see libraries kept open 24 hours a day. To facilitate this, some of the Houses’ more valuable books could be stored in a secure location. Alternatively, House libraries could require swipe access for entry. (Note that some Houses, such as Cabot House, already require swipe access.)

- Design computer workstations. Each House should have at least eight workstations and at least one printer. These could be located in a space specifically designated as a computer lab or in incidental space(s) where it naturally makes sense, such as a thoroughfare or library hallway. If computer workstations are included in the House library, be sure that they are separated from quiet study spaces.

**Faculty Engagement**

Another potential difference in the House system of today and that of the 1930s-1960s is that faculty schedules are increasingly overfilled with teaching, mentoring and advising, research, grant-writing, and committee meetings. In addition, it is very common for both parents in Harvard faculty members’ families to work, thereby presenting a greater challenge to spending casual time in the Houses. Faculty offices in the Houses were not favored because of separation from research materials and colleagues in the departments. Faculty office hours that would be held in the Houses were discussed, but no definitive conclusion was reached as to the efficacy of such a program. The committee discussed additional ways to help faculty engage in House life, many of which were also discussed by the Subcommittee on House Life:

- Foster informal student-faculty interaction and adapt to the changing needs of faculty with families. Design programs so that young children can participate in House events, possibly including a play room supervised by students who have an interest in education and early childhood development. Overall, student-faculty interactions should not be limited to the formal spaces in the Houses; efforts should be made to facilitate casual yet meaningful interactions through programming and spaces.\(^9\)

- Revitalize and update the SCR as a means of promoting student-faculty interactions. The College and Houses should consider alternative ideas to bring faculty into the Houses in a meaningful way. The SCR space is important for the residential and non-residential tutorial staff, and it is also used as a “special” place where students are invited for concerts, lectures, and thesis presentations.

---

\(^9\) In the House Renewal survey, responding to the question “How would you like to interact with faculty in your House?,” students reported the highest level of interest in informal meals with faculty and families in the Houses (4.2 ± 0.9 on a 5-point scale from “Not very interested” [1.0] to “Very interested”[5.0]).
• Reinstate or maintain the availability of spaces for resident faculty or visiting scholars to live in the Houses. Echoing the recommendation of the Subcommittee on House Life, this subcommittee feels that these faculty should be required to show a sincere interest in participating in and promoting House life. The option to live for one to two years in the Houses could be a recruiting tool for attracting new junior faculty into the expensive Cambridge housing market. Candidates for this position should be taken from many areas of the University and should not be limited to junior faculty members. Possible additional sources include the Nieman Fellows or, per the Task Force on the Arts’ suggestion, faculty-artists.10

Social Spaces

Common social spaces include dining halls, grilles, small group study rooms, meeting rooms for student organizations, JCRs, Masters’ Residences, fitness rooms and athletic facilities (e.g., squash courts, climbing walls, etc.), and TV viewing rooms. Common rooms in student residential areas are also important social spaces that are often used for student organization meetings. In order to meet the need for social spaces, the College should:

• Create “flexible” or “multi-use” spaces. While we recommend designing spaces that can be used in a multitude of ways, colleagues at Yale and Princeton advised us to use caution and be certain to distinguish a “multipurpose space” from “a space that has no purpose,” and through design discussions we should be sure that we are avoiding this potential pitfall.

• Implement an online room reservation system for all Houses. While many social and recreational spaces already exist in the Houses, with more likely to be added through House Renewal, House spaces should be linked to an online room reservation system controlled by the Houses. This will allow undergraduates to have a better sense of the facilities in each House.

• Allow the JCR to continue to function as the “living room” of each House.11 The function of the JCR can be enhanced by directing traffic flow so that it is a central area.

  • Although the JCR might be a primary social space in the Houses, the success of JCRs as social centers varies widely. Many committee members favored a formal look and feel; however, some cautioned that formality can deter use of the space. Our peer institutions (Yale and Princeton) have separate rooms for television viewing. If televisions are located in the JCR, they should be hidden in some way, either inside a cabinet or in a drop down screen in the ceiling.

  • Redesign the JCRs to allow students to see into the space prior to entering it. This will limit the feeling voiced in both the focus groups and subcommittee meetings that at present, walking into a JCR is associated with the risk of “interrupting something.” This remedy could be accomplished by incorporating glass doors or walls. The historic character of these spaces should be maintained for each House.

11 In the House Renewal survey, responding to the question “What types of activities should be held in the Junior Common Room (JCR)?,” the most frequently selected first choice was House-based events (63%).
Where possible, the JCR should not be the only social and/or gathering space in the House; this subcommittee echoes the Subcommittee on Residential Living Spaces’ recommendation (included later in this report) that these additional gathering spaces should exist on residential floors.

**Community Center**

This subcommittee (and the Subcommittee on House Life) discussed the pros and cons of having one large student center versus many smaller “community centers.” While a single student center was not recommended for Harvard, this subcommittee saw value in developing smaller “community centers” or neighborhood common spaces located near the Houses. Depending on the needs of the activity, House dining halls could still serve as appropriate spaces. If the dining halls are used, the College should continue to pursue an updated event staffing model such that the hosting House’s tutorial staff is not responsible for monitoring a non-House related event in the House dining hall.12

- Find an alternative building or space to hold large student organization events so that House dining halls do not, by default, serve this function for the College.

- Ensure that these community spaces accommodate campus needs for large gathering space. We encourage planners to be sure that these are not designed in such a way as to draw students away from the House system. For example, mail delivery should remain in the Houses and should not be moved to a community center.

**Student Organization Space in the Houses**

Presently, student organizations frequently hold meetings and events in House spaces due to the dearth of available spaces elsewhere on campus.

- Create spaces outside the Houses for student organization meetings and events.

- With the understanding that even in a renewed House system, student organization meetings in Houses are inevitable, provide space(s) in the Houses that could be used for group meetings. These spaces should hold between 10-25 people and could be the same space as the classroom spaces discussed above. Priority in use can be given to House students who are not members of a given House community.

- Do not design student organization offices in the Houses.

**Specialty Spaces**

One of the points of pride in the House system is its ability to foster students’ exploration of amateur interests. The subcommittee discussed what types of spaces would best suit this exploration.

---

12 During the spring 2009 term, the Office of Student Life and Activities will begin to employ Student Event Managers to supervise student group events.
Recommendations from the Subcommittee on Academic and Social Spaces

- Include at least one defining, unique specialty space (e.g., digital photography lab, woodworking, etc.) per House. Along this line, the historical spaces that already exist in the Houses should be respected and could certainly continue in a renewed House system.

- Include space(s) in each House, when possible, where students can display, perform, and produce art. In other words, every House should be designed with a recognition that the arts are important. Galleries should be designed where they naturally occur in the Houses (i.e., in hallways, entrances, or foyers) and do not necessarily need a specific, dedicated space. This recommendation echoes the findings of the Task Force on the Arts.\(^\text{13}\)

- In each House, include at least two to three soundproof music practice rooms with pianos (one per room) and, if possible, storage space for instruments and music stands. Individual Houses currently have a variety of art production spaces that should be maintained or updated as appropriate (e.g., pottery studio, darkroom, dance studio). Flexible/multiuse classroom/seminar spaces could be designed to accommodate larger ensemble rehearsals. Create theater performance spaces that can be shared among adjacent Houses.

- Closely examine specialty spaces that are not aligned with the mission of the Houses but that are currently within the House proper (i.e., Eliot Society of Fellows, ECHO). If these groups have a tenuous link to the House in which they reside, and another space is available, the group should be moved at the discretion of the House.

Dining

Dining halls serve as multipurpose spaces for dining, studying, and large social events in the Houses and should remain as such. The following recommendations relate to the design and function of dining in the Houses, with the understanding that present uses of House dining halls would remain:

- Update these spaces with appropriate lighting and additional electrical outlets in the seating area. Air condition these spaces.

- Design dining halls so that there is a way to close the servery while leaving other areas (beverages, etc.) open after hours. This will allow all Houses to keep dining hall seating areas open at all times.

- Continue to include at least one Private Dining Room in each House. These rooms should be located next to or off the main seating area and access to these spaces should be easily managed with a tray of food in hand.

- Examine late-night dining options for residents. This may take the form of better supporting student grilles or a new proposal for late-night eating spaces.

- Anticipate the reality that dining halls will continue to be used for large activities sponsored by the Houses and by Harvard-affiliated student organizations. To accommodate this use, temporary storage space for tables and chairs is recommended, in addition to public address

and/or speaker systems, flexible lighting, improved access and egress to remain compliant with fire codes, and higher-capacity restroom facilities located near the dining hall.

House Offices

In the subcommittee’s discussions, “House Office” referred to the offices of the ABRD, Assistant to the Resident Dean, House Administrator, Building Manager, and Security Guard. House Offices play key roles in supporting students’ academic and residential needs, and the following design elements would meet the needs of House employees and residents:

- Configure each House Office so it is centrally located, accessible, near a thoroughfare like the dining hall or House library, and contiguous (i.e., all offices for the above-mentioned staff members are physically near to each other). This echoes the recommendation of the Subcommittee on House Life.

- Include space within the House Office for student files. Design this area in such a way that if, in the future, student files are solely stored electronically, the space could be altered to fit a different storage need.

- Design the ABRD’s office so that it is private enough that a student trying to visit his or her Dean is not visible to other House Office visitors. The ABRD’s office should not have a window that directly faces a street or a public area. If this is unavoidable, opaque glass should be used.

- Locate the Building Manager and Security Guard area in or close to the House Office. The Building Manager’s office should also be accessible from the outside.

Design

The subcommittees’ discussions of House designs yielded the following recommendations:

- Maintain internal coherence in each House’s design. In renewal, care should be given to preserving the overall feel of the current House.

- Design one central entrance to each House, and include appropriate signage.

- When possible, preserve “House identifiers.” These are items that hold special significance within the House, such as a gate, a door, or a portrait. Items that cannot be used in their original form should be creatively repurposed and embedded in the House in some way.

- Incorporate glass walls and/or doors in common and social spaces. This lessens the impact of entering the space and allows students inside the room to feel connected to what is going on outside.

- Minimize the use of overflow housing. While some form of overflow housing may always be necessary, it should be considered temporary, with a primary goal of housing all assigned students in the House proper.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL SPACES

Storage

While House basements are typically used for summer storage at present, in a renewed House system these basement spaces will be updated and may no longer be appropriate for this purpose.

- Examine the appropriateness of summer storage in a renewed House system. Consider alternative policies and practices.

Fitness Rooms

House fitness rooms were favored for their convenience and for addressing potential safety concerns (i.e., avoiding walking at night to the Malkin Athletic Center [MAC]). Some felt that Houses close to the MAC do not have a justifiable need for an elaborate fitness room. Some students also commented that the anonymity of the MAC is sometimes favored over House fitness rooms.

- Improve the maintenance and upkeep of fitness equipment. Explore ways to maintain these spaces more efficiently across the House system.

- Where proximity facilitates it, share fitness rooms among neighboring Houses. Ideally, each House that shared such a space would have underground access to the facility.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESIDENTIAL LIVING SPACES

Subcommittee Charge: This group was responsible for exploring how residential spaces can help to build community among students and Tutors. Members also explored how students’ studying and learning can be better facilitated through updated residential spaces. The subcommittee discussed systems (including lighting and heating) and practices that would bolster Harvard’s commitment to sustainable living.

Student Residential Spaces

The subcommittees’ discussions centered largely on the ideal design and setup of student residential spaces. These discussions yielded the following recommendations:

- Create a diversity of housing stock to meet current and anticipated student needs and preferences. Experience and feedback during this process tell us that students highly value their privacy. Currently, many seniors select spaces with private bedrooms in suites or along corridors. Juniors select a mix of private bedrooms and double bedrooms. Sophomores, realizing that they will have improved prospects for housing in junior and senior years, often accept accommodations in double bedrooms. The configuration of student living spaces should be thought of as contributing to different scales of community within the House (House⇒cluster⇒suite/room).

- Design three types of housing stock within each House to best meet current and anticipated student needs/preferences:
  
  - Suites: Single and double bedrooms with a small in-suite common room.
  
  - Clusters of rooms: Single and double bedrooms off a corridor, when architectural considerations do no allow suite configuration, with a shared lounge to be used by students living within this cluster of rooms. The cluster concept can promote interaction between class years.

  - Duplexes: Two-story suites with single and double bedrooms on one floor and an in-suite common room on the adjacent floor. These should be created where the upper floor (which is not visit-able\(^{14}\)) is used for bedrooms and the floor below (which is visit-able) is used for common rooms (e.g., Mather Low-Rise and New Quincy).

---

\(^{14}\) The term “visit-able” refers to the standard by which the common rooms and shared social areas of all residential spaces must be accessible to an individual in a wheelchair. The following are the relevant guiding principles for accessibility and visit-ability in a renewed House system:

The Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (MAAB) regulations require that five percent of suites, bedrooms and supporting bathrooms be accessible. The MAAB goes further by stating through recent rulings that these accessible bedrooms cannot be isolated in one area of a building and cannot be isolated to one housing arrangement type or suite type. The accessible bedrooms should be spread around the House and included in each of the variety of housing types.

In addition to providing accessible bedrooms, MAAB also requires that all the suites and shared residential common space be accessible for visiting. The notion of visit-ability is a legal interpretation that will need to be reviewed on a House-by-House basis. The goal of renewal is to achieve as close to 100% visit-ability as possible. However, achieving visit-ability may be challenging in some of the older buildings. Issues of visit-ability will need to be resolved early in the design process because they will require variances from the MAAB.
When possible, maximize the number of private bedrooms. Mindful of the constraints of building fenestration and other architectural considerations, and assuming no future increase in College enrollment, we recommend maximizing the number of private bedrooms.

Maintain adequate space for double bedrooms. Double bedrooms and single bedrooms should be able to accommodate furniture on the floor without having to use bunk beds or lofts. Therefore, double bedrooms should be at least 160 square feet and single bedrooms should be at least 85 square feet.

Keep adequate common room space within a student suite. For suites and duplexes, the associated common rooms should be proportional to the capacity of the suite.

Design suites that accommodate two, four, or five students. Suite configurations with three or more than five persons can contribute to difficult suitemate dynamics.\footnote{Note that this recommendation to avoid suite configurations for three or more than five students is based on anecdotal observation by subcommittee members and not on documented frequency of roommate conflicts.}

Avoid large group hallway bathrooms. Bathrooms should serve a small number of suites or clusters, avoiding bathroom configurations that would be designed for use by 20 or more students (which presently exist in some of Harvard’s freshman dormitories and Quad Houses). These bathrooms should be gender-neutral.\footnote{In this context, “gender-neutral” means that shower stalls and bathroom stalls would all have locks.}

Additional Comments about Clusters of Rooms

The subcommittee’s discussions yielded the following specifications for cluster arrangements:

The cluster common room should be proportional to the number of students living in the cluster, and large enough for a full cluster study break. Glass walls along the corridor and locations with natural light can contribute to an open and welcoming presence for these spaces. Design should allow for quiet privacy and should include sound insulation that minimizes the likelihood that activities in the common room will disturb neighboring students. Cluster common rooms should be “owned” by those living in the cluster rather than by the House. They should not be thought of as places for campus organizations to gather, rehearse, etc.

The cluster concept will be an effective element in the structure of micro-communities within a House. To maintain this sense of community, clusters should ideally accommodate no more than 25 students.

Any floor with a high density of double bedrooms must have a higher density of nearby space for study, private discussions, etc.

The ends of the “U” in the Neo-Georgian Houses and the floor level transition areas (e.g., Lowell House) may be good choices for cluster configurations.
Informal Interaction Spaces

In addition to student bedrooms and bathrooms in the Houses, the subcommittee also discussed ways in which spaces within the residential floors might build community and foster increased interaction among residents.

- Create more student lounges for study and socializing in residential areas. Where architecture permits, there should be small lounges for groups of two to six students (approximately 150 square feet). They should be adjacent to residential areas and part of corridor life.

- Build floor kitchenettes. Kitchenettes should not be within student suites, but instead conveniently located for shared use by multiple suites and clusters. There should be approximately one kitchenette per 80 students. These spaces should be lockable and should be connected to a large lounge or gathering area.

Tutor Residential Space

Currently, Tutor suite sizes are unequal both within the same House and between different Houses.

- Create equity in Tutor spaces. The Tutor-to-student ratio should be approximately 1:20 - 25 (depending on architecture and how Tutor couples are counted). Each single resident Tutor should continue to have his or her own suite. Half of Tutor suites should be one bedroom units and half should be two bedroom units to accommodate tutor couples. Each Tutor suite should have a bathroom, common room area with a kitchenette, and private bedroom(s).

- Place Tutor suites centrally, among residents (i.e., within clusters/groups of suites rather than at the end of a corridor). Tutors advise students and help to create a welcoming entryway or hallway environment, and their proximity to the entryway is essential to carrying out these roles.

Resident Dean Residential Space

Each House currently has, and should continue to have, one ABRD apartment.

- Design the ABRD apartment so that it is within or immediately adjacent to the House, but not within student residential space. The apartment should have an outside entrance so the ABRD does not need to travel through the House to exit the building. In addition the apartment should be separate from but still provide the ABRD with easy access to the House Office. The ideal ABRD apartment would have two to three bedrooms, one full kitchen, one full bath, one half-bath, a living room, and a dining room.

Resident Scholar Residential Space

- Include a small number of Resident Scholar apartments in each House. (Note that this recommendation was made contingent upon the implementation of the recommendation from the Subcommittee on House Life to continue and/or expand this program.)
• Place these apartments within student residential space. (Note that this recommendation differs from that of the Subcommittee on House Life, which stated that this residential space could be located adjacent to the House proper.)

Furniture

Carefully consider the size and type of College-issued furniture in student bedrooms and suite common rooms.

• Consider what types of College-issued furniture will be offered in a renewed House system. Using beds with storage capability underneath (e.g., dressers) and/or moveable wardrobes instead of built-in closets would provide more flexibility. These wardrobes should be large enough to accommodate personal items in addition to hanging clothes. The subcommittee recommends further exploration of the advantages and disadvantages of offering College-issued furniture for in-suite common rooms (e.g., couches and futons).

Housing Lottery

Housing lotteries are used to assign upperclassmen into the particular bedroom they will occupy during each academic year.

• Determine student capacity for a room (the number of students assigned) by the size of the room(s), not by class year of occupants. Currently, the number of students assigned to a suite is most often determined by the class year of the students and not the size of the suite. For example, a suite with two small bedrooms and one common room will be occupied by four sophomores, three juniors, or two seniors rather than just two students (regardless of class year), even though each bedroom is really only large enough for one student. The rationale for the current practice is that there are presently not enough bedrooms for students (and thus, many sophomores and juniors must reside in suite common rooms). The current method of assignment is complex, but one of its driving factors is the goal that by the time a student is a senior, he or she will get a reasonable accommodation (see Appendix VII for more information about the gradual increases in House occupancy over the life of the Harvard House system). The subcommittee recommends that the size of the bedrooms should determine the number of occupants assigned to the space, rather than continuing the current practice, which results in sophomores and juniors being crowded. This new practice will ensure that each student, regardless of class year, receives reasonable housing (i.e., not living in suite common rooms).

• Continue current practice where lotteries have their own local character. Each House should have a document which outlines its housing lottery rules and procedures, and this should be available to all students in advance of housing selection.

Sustainability

In addition to discussing the characteristics of student, Tutor, and ABRD residences, this subcommittee was also charged with recommending sustainable practices and design elements for

17 Note that this recommendation is not related to Houses’ current practices of assigning suites by seniority. The subcommittee assumes that this practice will continue.
the Houses. To that end, two students from the Resource Efficiency Program sat on the subcommittee during the fall 2008 term.

- Implement sustainable and energy-efficient practices. All residents (students, Tutors, resident scholars, House Masters, ABRDs, House staff, etc.) need localized energy control and monitoring systems to assist in managing energy use to enhance both living space comfort and efficiency. This includes a recommendation for individual thermostats in student and Tutor residential spaces. Sustainability-related technologies are certain to become more sophisticated in the future, and these trends should be anticipated as best they can in this planning process. Features should be incorporated into the Houses to educate students about the environmental impact of their choices.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEO-GEORGIAN HOUSES

Subcommittee Charge: The subcommittee was asked to consider all the major issues discussed by House Life, Academic and Social Spaces, and Residential Spaces through the lens of the Neo-Georgian Houses.18

Student Residential Spaces

• Maximize student privacy in residential spaces.
  o Eliminate walk-throughs.
  o Soundproof residential spaces.
  o The ideal model for student residential spaces would be private bedrooms, in-suite bathrooms, and an in-suite common room. However, the subcommittee recognizes that inclusion of all of these elements will be near-impossible to accomplish given space limitations and thus recommends that these features only be incorporated as space permits.

• Embed lounge spaces within the residential floors. The subcommittee agrees with the Subcommittee on Residential Living Spaces in this regard and feels that floor lounges would encourage students to meet students outside their immediate blocking group. Like many other social spaces in the Houses, these should be designed with glass or open doorways to allow students to see what is going on inside prior to entering.

• Carefully consider inclusion of common rooms within student suites. Subcommittee members feel that if students had a larger common room on the floor, they might be willing give up a common room within the suite. However, suite common rooms are also important because they can be decorated, furnished, and used depending on the needs of the residents.

• Include a few large residential suites in each House that could function as larger gathering spaces.

• Design a multiplicity of room types within each entryway to facilitate integration of class years. Architects and House staff should be aware that riverside views will be more popular within floors or entryways, and attention should be given to this reality when designing for integration of class years.

• Include an appropriate number of electrical outlets in bedrooms.

Bathrooms

• To the extent possible, include in-suite bathrooms in student residential spaces. In keeping with the above recommendation for diversity of housing, some areas could include hallway

18 For a definition of “Neo-Georgian,” please see page 4 of this report.
bathrooms. Specifically, designs should be explored in which two neighboring suites share a bathroom (with multiple toilets, sinks, etc.).

- Update lighting in the Neo-Georgian bathrooms.

**Junior Common Room**

- Carefully consider the furniture and style of JCRs. Sometimes the JCR can be “too nice,” so that students are reluctant to use it for more casual events. If the House feels that the augustness of the JCR is worth preserving, furnishings in other social spaces should be student-friendly. The JCR should remain the “meeting place” of the House.

**Student Grilles**

- Explore food choice in the Houses at night, as this is highly desirable and currently lacking. For grille location, Quincy is a good model with accessibility on the first floor and good lighting.

- Include proper lighting and ventilation if these spaces are underground.

**Basements**

- Remove the squash courts in Neo-Georgian basements.

- Update House basements to make them desirable places for dance spaces, fitness rooms, specialty spaces, etc. Presently, Neo-Georgian basement spaces are generally gloomy, damp, and cramped.

- Include unique spaces for each House (e.g., Adams Pool Theater, Eliot Wood Shop). Houses should collectively do a better job advertising that such spaces exist and are open to all College students.

**Study Spaces and House Libraries**

The group feels that Neo-Georgian Houses generally have sufficient or nearly sufficient study space already. Were it to be included in the Houses, more group study space would likely be utilized, but the subcommittee feels that the dearth of social and casual lounge spaces was more pressing.

- Include more electrical outlets and make current library and study spaces less dreary through better lighting (e.g., a sufficient number of lamps), better temperature regulation, and updated paint jobs.

- Soundproof House libraries from street noise where necessary.

- Use Kirkland’s Hicks House as an example of an effective library space. The inclusion of many distinct rooms makes this library setup ideal for a variety of student study needs. If a
library is not easily converted into many smaller rooms, a variety of study spaces, including a large reading room and smaller group study spaces, would be ideal.

- Continue to incorporate the historical “Harvard” aura into Neo-Georgian Houses’ libraries.

**Computer Labs**

- Include a computer lab in each House. These do not necessarily need to be near or in the House library. They should contain at least one printer. Additionally, locating a computer kiosk close to the dining hall is desirable if there is an appropriate space for it.

**Senior Common Room**

The subcommittee agreed with the groups already mentioned in this report that there is presently a lack of clarity about what the group known as the SCR is and what it is supposed to do. Thus, more attention should be given to publicizing the SCR and explaining its function to House residents. While the mission to create a multi-generational community is laudable, often the SCR members and the students lack a feasible way to engage each other. The subcommittee postulated that perhaps using only Resident Tutors as sophomore advisers, and not all House affiliates, has decreased opportunities to integrate the students with the SCR. Recommendations discussed are as follows:

- Make sure that SCR events are well-publicized, appealing, and comfortable for students and affiliates. In order to be considered successful, the goal should be that SCR members and students both know about the events, are able to attend, and find them gratifying.

- Provide more clarity about how the SCR space is used, acknowledging that this is also sometimes a living and cooking space for Tutors. Students on the subcommittee were generally unsure how the physical space of the SCR is currently utilized.

**Neighborhoods**

Neighborhoods work when the Houses are naturally close together. For example, Dunster and Mather make sense as “neighbors,” but Leverett is not close enough to them to function effectively as a part of that “neighborhood.” This reality must be carefully considered when designing space that is meant to be functionally shared by multiple Houses.

- When neighboring Houses do not share common green space, make additional efforts to link them in other ways (i.e., underground passageways to neighboring House’s artery).

**Meeting Space in the Houses**

The subcommittee agrees with the Subcommittee on House Life that there should be spaces in the Houses in which to hold events.

- Include simple, moveable furniture in these spaces.

- As a policy point, include both reservable and non-reservable spaces in the Houses.
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEO-GEORGIAN HOUSES

*Sustainability*

- Address heat issues; presently, money and energy are wasted because of antiquated heat systems and overheating in some residential spaces. Ideally, students should be able to regulate heat in their rooms.

- Design lighting in residential spaces to allow for overhead lighting and table and/or floor lamps. Choose designs that can be fitted with Compact Fluorescent (CFL) bulbs.

- Install motion sensors in common spaces so that lights are off when these spaces are not in use.

- Incorporate mechanisms into the Houses to make residents aware of their energy consumption. This recommendation echoes that of the Subcommittee on Residential Living Spaces.

*Neo-Georgian Specific Issues and Recommendations*

- Consider moving away from vertical entryways. Vertical entryways make meeting neighbors and breaking out of blocking groups harder.

- Address disparities between Neo-Georgian and Modern Houses. Presently, students in Neo-Georgian Houses have far less chance of getting singles as sophomores, juniors, and even seniors. Neo-Georgians tend to have limited social spaces and small SCRs, Private Dining Rooms, etc.

- Preserve the Neo-Georgian style. Neo-Georgian House residents value the history inherent in the façades and libraries of their Houses.

- If possible, design all common spaces (dining halls, libraries, etc.) so that they are accessible from all entryways without having to go outside.

*Areas for Further Consideration or Discussion*

- Echoing the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Residential Living Spaces, explore College-issued furniture for suite common rooms (e.g., common couches and/or futons). The addition of College-issued couches and/or futons would cut down on the number of items students need to store in the summer. However, these would be difficult to clean and would likely need to be replaced frequently. If this option is explored, this group feels that furnishings should be lightweight, durable, “green,” attractive, and varied in size and appearance.

- Design spaces that need not be staffed. Presently, many spaces, like House libraries, grilles, and SCRs, need to be staffed to protect House valuables and are locked during times in which staff is not present.

- Examine the extent to which the physical SCR space should be open to students.
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Subcommittee Charge. The subcommittee was asked to consider all the major issues discussed by House Life, Academic and Social Spaces, and Residential Spaces through the lens of the Modern Houses.\(^{19}\)

Student Residential Space

- Focus attention on students’ privacy in residential spaces by eliminating walk-throughs and soundproofing residential spaces. The subcommittee hopes that as a long-term goal of House Renewal, Harvard housing will get as close to possible to making all suites gender-neutral.

- Include a diversity of room styles. Echoing the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Residential Living Spaces, this subcommittee supports creating a diversity of housing types within each House. Such a setup within a floor or entryway will facilitate interaction between class years. Additionally, selecting from a variety of designs will allow students to make housing choices that are best for them. Overall, subcommittee members recommend designing student residential spaces in suite setups rather than singles off a hallway. However, in keeping with the recommendation for diversity in housing options, suites should be one of several configurations available to residents.

- Include common lounge spaces in residential areas. Also echoing the Residential Living Spaces recommendation, this subcommittee agrees that where possible, small common spaces should be included within the residential floors. This will contribute to community engagement and interaction between residents. This subcommittee agrees with the Subcommittee on Neo-Georgian Houses that to further foster community in the Houses, horizontal hallways are preferred to vertical entryway setups. The subcommittee believes that the nature of the vertical arrangement detracts from community building by limiting the amount of space available for residents to congregate or naturally pass each other.

- Set common regulations for room size. This subcommittee agrees with the Subcommittee on Residential Living Spaces that doubles should have enough square footage to fit both beds on the floor (i.e., no bunk beds). Subcommittee members felt that, in general, students’ ideal residential setup would be a suite of singles with a common room. While they postulated that students would be willing to reduce the size of a single to allow for the possibility of having a common room, there is a point at which a single would be functionally too small.

Design

- Where possible, connect all sections of a House through its basement. This will add to the sense of community by connecting all residents architecturally, and it also serves a pragmatic function in bad weather.

\(^{19}\) For a definition of “Modern,” please see page 4 of this report.
• Explore the possibility of connecting neighboring Houses through their basements. This would be particularly important if neighboring Houses were sharing a specific specialty space, like a fitness room (see “Fitness Room” section).

**Social Space in the Houses**

• Include recreational spaces (e.g., game room, pottery, bowling, etc.) in the Houses to help foster community.

• Provide more opportunities for students to organize their own events in the Houses. The subcommittee recommends that each House have multipurpose and lounge spaces in addition to the JCR for such events. These spaces would also likely be used for group study and group meetings.

• Where possible, design a space that residents must walk through to get to the dining hall. This could be a good social space, and having one main entrance to the House facilitates the use of this space.

**Unique Nature of the Houses**

The subcommittee reaffirms the value of having many unique styles of architecture among the Houses.

• If space allows, plan for one unique social/recreational space in each House, and actively publicize specialty spaces contained in the House system. Assume that students will travel to other Houses to use such specialty spaces. Thus, the spaces should not be replicated in each House.

**Policy and Reservation Information**

• Proactively provide House policies and space information. This recommendation applies to specialty spaces, the function of the SCR space, and a continuously updated House calendar. Such information could be effectively conveyed with an efficiently run and easily updateable website for each House. To carry this out most efficiently, the subcommittee recommends that the College support one base system for websites so that each House has a similar platform from which to design and update. The College should explore the possibility of implementing this change in the near future, prior to renewal of the Houses, to optimize the usefulness of this investment.

**Study Spaces**

Presently, the dining halls, student rooms, and House libraries are (and should remain) the primary study spaces in the Houses.

• Continue to include a variety of study spaces in the Houses. Within the House library, an ideal setup would include different types of study spaces, with smaller rooms or sections of the library. This subcommittee agrees with the Subcommittee on Neo-Georgian Houses that Kirkland’s Hicks House library is a good example of the sort of effective library space that the group envisions.
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Classrooms

The subcommittee did not expressly discuss whether classrooms should or should not be included in the House proper; it saw this as the purview of the Subcommittee on Academic and Social Spaces. However, pending that subcommittee’s recommendation, this group felt that if classrooms were more widely present in the House system, these could be used for other purposes when not being used for classes.

House Seminar Program

The subcommittee supports the existence of the House Seminar program. If the House Seminar program is kept or expanded (again, pending the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Academic and Social Spaces), the group offers the following thoughts and suggestions:

- Increase publicity for House Seminars.
- Explore the possibility of Tutors teaching House Seminars in their own House.
- Design House Seminars in such a way that they have a more relaxed learning atmosphere than the typical Harvard course. In other words, they should not simply be classes that happen to occur in the Houses; rather, they should have a unique set of expectations to connect them to the House setting. This alleviates potential for students feeling as though academics are “following them home.”

Tutor Role

House Tutors are an asset to House life. The role should be examined, however, as it is in theory important to the mission of House life but presently does not function in a way that fully contributes to this mission.

- Examine ways to make this role less administrative and more focused on holistic advising. Subcommittee members feel that having Tutors in administrative or disciplinary roles and overemphasizing their specific academic expertise makes them less accessible to all residents. This proposed move away from administrative roles for Resident Tutors echoes a similar recommendation by the Subcommittee on House Life.
- Build at least one Tutor office per House, to be shared by the Tutors of that House. The subcommittee notes a present dearth of facilities in which students can get to know House Tutors. This recommendation echoes the Subcommittee on Academic and Social Spaces’ suggestion to build spaces for Tutors to convene meetings with undergraduates.

Senior Common Room

The subcommittee agrees with the previous subcommittees’ impression that theoretically, the SCR’s mission is constructive, but it is failing in practice. One committee member described the program as being “in shambles,” and this general feeling framed the group’s conversations about the SCR. The subcommittee feels that bringing faculty into the Houses is important, and this goal should be explored through alternate programs or a renewed and updated SCR model. Presently, the purpose of the SCR is not sufficiently communicated to students. Houses should examine how these
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affiliates can meaningfully contribute to student experience. Possible solutions that the group discussed include:

• Integrate activities that facilitate active participation between SCR members and students around a common activity or topic.

• Give students an active role in picking who is a part of the SCR.

• Distribute more information about SCR members. Each House should publish information about SCR members on the House website.

Dining Halls

Like many of the previous subcommittees, this subcommittee reaffirms that the dining hall is generally the most social space in each House, and its presence contributes to the feeling that the House is a home. The House dining halls serve many functions: as a meeting space, study group space, and a place for eating and socializing. Renewal should assume that all these functions will remain. Recommendations for improvement to dining halls are as follows:

• Strive to keep the dining hall seating area open at all times.

• Recognizing that maintaining 12 upperclass dining halls is financially difficult, explore the possibility of having breakfast in only one dining hall per neighborhood. This would be especially feasible if the dining hall were accessible to the neighboring Houses via underground passage.

• Work on access to food after-hours.

Student Organization Space in the Houses

The College should make efforts to move student group meetings out of the Houses, recognizing that having some space in the Houses for this purpose will likely still be necessary.

• Where possible, include at least one multipurpose meeting space per House that is more casual than the JCR. This space could be used by student organizations.

Neighborhoods

Like the Subcommittee on Neo-Georgian Houses, this subcommittee feels that neighborhoods work best when the Houses are centered around a logical outdoor space (e.g., Radcliffe Quad, the MAC Quad in front of Eliot, Kirkland, and Winthrop).

Subcommittee members feel that students will be more likely to go to a Neighborhood space if it is “unaffiliated” (i.e., is perceived as “neutral” space and is not strongly tied to another House).
Fitness Rooms

- Space permitting, residents of each House should have access to a small House fitness room.
  - As has been previously stated, the subcommittee feels that these facilities can be shared by more than one House. Were the Houses to share these, the fitness room should be designed to be large enough to hold more users. In keeping with the previous recommendation for underground passageways, an ideal design would include underground passageways from the House(s) to the fitness room, allowing users to access this space without walking outside.

- Where space permits, design an aerobics room and a weight room as two separate spaces within the House.

Areas for Further Consideration or Discussion

- The subcommittee discussed moving to Yale’s model, in which freshmen are assigned to a House before they arrive, but did not come to a consensus about the efficacy of this model at Harvard.

- There were mixed feelings from some group members about where and how Tutors should be deployed within the Houses, given limited resources. The subcommittee discussed the existing model and alternative models, such as concentrating House Tutors in one wing of each House or creating a hybrid model of House Tutors for advising and upperclassmen Resident Advisers. Again, no consensus was reached on this issue.

- Pending a reorganization of the SCR, the group feels that an exploration of the possibility of not having a dedicated physical space for the SCR might be valuable. Were this space to remain, group members’ sentiments suggest that the purpose(s) of this space should be better communicated to residents.

- The group briefly touched on the role of Non-Resident Tutors, wondering if these positions are a valuable use of House resources.

- Finally, the group recommends an examination of the role of pre-professional advising in the Houses. Students perceive emphasis on pre-professional rather than on concentration advising and wonder if this is responding to student need or simply perpetuating expectations for certain fields (pre-med, investment banking, etc.). Since the Office of Career Services has pre-professional advising, the subcommittee wonders if having this feature in the Houses is redundant and recommends exploring this issue further.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF HOUSE RENEWAL FOCUS GROUPS

1. Undergraduate Focus Groups
   i. Consultant Mark Edwards and his staff met with four student focus groups (total of 40 undergraduates) in May of 2008. A summary of findings is below:

   1. Student Residential Living Spaces
      a. The House is, above all else, a place of residence and rest for students.
      b. Students favored the idea of suites situated along a corridor (as long as the corridor is not “too long”).
         i. Participants envisioned that students would keep their doors open while home, allowing for a feeling of community that often does not exist in the present vertical entryway model.
      c. Respondents stressed the need for better lighting and soundproofing. They also prefer to control their own heat, and they hope that renovations allow for more environmentally friendly heating and cooling.
      d. Eliminate walk-through rooms, especially rooms that students must walk through to reach the bathroom.
      e. Try to give each student within a class roughly the same square footage of floor space.

   2. Personal Advising in the House
      a. Students are “self-starters,” seeking out academic advice from Deans, etc. when they need it.
      b. Many of the students were familiar with their own entryway Tutor and with the House Master but were not quite sure who the rest of the staff were.
      c. This was not much of a problem, as students felt capable of finding support people when they “really” needed them.

   3. Appearance
      a. Almost all of the residents felt that the historic look and feel of the Houses should be maintained. However, students were more willing to give up the “old Harvard” aesthetic if it resulted in more private the space.

2. Office of Residential Life Focus Groups
   i. The Office of Residential Life (ORL) conducted 12 focus groups (over 90 people) with the following groups: Office of Student Life and Activities, Advising Programs Office, Office of Undergraduate Education, House Administrators, Allston Burr Resident Deans, UHS/College Committee, Freshman Deans Office, Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid, House Committee Chairs, and Senior Common Room (SCR) members.
   ii. In addition, Evelynn Hammonds (Dean of Harvard College) and Suzy Nelson (Associate Dean, Office of Residential Life) met individually with House Masters to discuss their thoughts on renewal.
   iii. Findings were analyzed by ORL, and a second reader was asked to review the notes and highlight themes that emerged. A summary of findings is below:

   1. Reaffirmations of the Value of House Life
      a. Inherent strengths in the House system:
         i. The House is a community, where one “belongs.”
         ii. Dining halls function as hub of social life in the Houses.
         iii. Intergenerational atmosphere.
iv. Existence of intellectual community (including faculty involvement).

v. Entry point to all College services.

b. Houses are a place for amateur exploration of interests.

2. **Connecting to the Academic Mission**
   a. Tutor and faculty involvement is an important part of community, and it is what gives us Houses rather than dorms.
   b. While the SCR model works well in some Houses, it needs to be revisited.
      i. House Masters’ leadership and expectations are important.
      ii. Model may work better if affiliates have a more specific and defined role to play within the House.
      iii. SCR plays a role for certain faculty, connecting them with their colleagues in other departments.
   iv. However, it isn’t a fulfilling role for House life the way it could be.
   v. Proposed reasons for its lack of success in many Houses:
      1. Require a great deal of upkeep.
      2. No expectation of faculty involvement (e.g., as part of tenure process) in the Houses.
      3. Faculty members typically live further away from Cambridge than they did when the SCR concept was conceived.
   c. Current Resident Scholar program is valuable but could work better.
      i. Improvements/Suggestions:
         1. Clarify expectations.
         2. Have a visiting scholar teach a class in the House.
         3. Have Scholars-in-Residence mentor Tutors.
         4. Visiting faculty may not always be the right group for this role; should explore additional populations.

3. **House Administration and Staffing**
   a. Allston Burr Resident Dean (ABRD) workload needs to be examined.
      i. The job is overwhelming for one person.
      ii. ABRDs are supposed to contribute intellectually, but a great deal of their time is taken up by crisis management, roommate conflicts, etc.
   b. Tutors
      i. Examine roles Tutors should play in the House.
         1. Should they have fewer prescribed roles so that they can counsel students more generally?
         2. For both pre-professional Tutors and specialty Tutors (e.g., SASH, BGLTS, Wellness, and Race Relations Tutors), examine ways to improve:
            a. Pre-Professional
               i. Should these be central or at the House level?
               ii. If they are at the House level, how can we ensure consistency?
            b. Specialty
               i. Important to have some specialty roles in the House.
               ii. Could students serve in these roles?
      ii. Tutor Suites
         1. Many advocated for kitchens in Tutor suites.
         2. Equitable suites for Tutors across the House system.
         3. Equitable number of students per Tutor.
4. Try to provide a space in the House where Tutors can meet with students (other than the Tutor’s residence).

5. Must consider Freshman Proctor suites at some point and the equity issues between Proctors and Tutors.

4. **Student Residential Living Spaces**
   a. Student Spaces
      i. Flexibility and diversity of housing options are important.
      ii. Eliminating walk-throughs must be a priority.
      iii. A variety of room/suite types is optional.
      iv. Shared bathrooms (rather than in-suite bathrooms) could be an effective tradeoff.
      v. Soundproofing is important.

5. **Common Social Spaces**
   a. There is a need for a large event space on campus.
      i. This need currently falls on the Houses, but the Houses are not designed to fulfill this role.
   b. From a House perspective, respondents felt the availability of a community center or multiple community centers “would not thwart House life”; rather, it would “help it immensely.”
   c. Presently, common spaces in the Houses are often “taken over” by student groups in the evenings.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF STUDENT SURVEY FINDINGS
PREPARED BY THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS,
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

The House Renewal Survey was administered between October 30 and November 18, 2008. A total of 1497 students responded to the survey, giving a response rate of 30.7%. Quincy House and Currier House had the highest response rates (42% and 37%, respectively) (Table 1). Sophomores represented the largest group of respondents (Table 2). Results for each question are included in the attached report, with a brief summary below. Because the results did not differ by gender or ethnicity, the information presented below represents the data broken out by year-in-school only. When these differences are statistically significant, it is noted in the report.

Table 1. Response Rate by House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Percent Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams House</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>27.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabot House</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier House</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>37.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunster House</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>32.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot House</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>29.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland House</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverett House</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>32.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell House</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mather House</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>28.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pforzheimer House</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>25.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy House</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>41.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop House</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>25.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Respondents by Class Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, on a scale of 1-5, students found the House to meet their expectations “well/very well” for most functions, especially dining. Although seniors found it met their expectations as a place for quiet or group study slightly less than sophomores, in general students appear to find the Houses places where quiet study (4.1 ± 0.9), academic or intellectual functions (4.0 ± 0.8), dining (4.3 ± 0.8), residential activities (4.1 ± 0.9), and social/cultural activities (4.1 ± 0.9) can be accomplished reasonably well, as well as equally well (see Q1 pg. 2). However, when asked “How easy is it for you to participate in the following activities within your House as it is presently designed?” (4-point scale), mean scores were highest for dining (3.6 ± 0.7), studying (3.3 ± 0.8), student group meetings (3.1 ± 0.8), and guest speaker meetings (3.1 ± 0.8), and LOWEST for class section meeting (2.8 ± 0.9) (and other) (see Q. 2, pg. 3). Less than half the students (44%) felt that space in the Houses should be designated for class/seminars or sections (Q. 5, pg. 4). When viewed by year in school, only 39% of sophomores reported they wanted space for this in the Houses.
On a scale of 1-5, Tutors were found to be most important for their roles in pre-professional advising (4.1 ± 0.9) and community building (4.1 ± 0.9). Specialty Tutor roles (e.g., sexual health, race relations, wellness, etc.) received the lowest mean scores for importance (3.4 ± 1.1). Sophomores rated the academic assistance/advice aspect of tutors higher than their junior or senior peers (4.1 vs. 3.8 and 3.7, respectively) (Q. 6, pg. 5).

Regarding faculty interaction, students reported the highest level of interest in informal meals with faculty and families in the Houses (4.2 ± 0.9). Students were least interested in the vehicle for faculty interaction to be class or sections in the Houses (3.1 ± 1.2). When viewed by year in school, seniors were more interested than juniors or sophomores to have formal faculty dinners. Juniors expressed significantly greater interest in having junior faculty living in the Houses than the other classes (Q. 7 pg. 6).

Students most often study in the bedroom (83%), followed by campus libraries (59%) and dining halls (55%). Only 37% reported studying in the suite common rooms and 15% reported using on-campus cafés. When asked if they used the House library, 59% said they did. Being able to select all the options that apply, most (94%) of the 869 students who answered the question reported using the House library for individualized study. Very few used the House library for books (5%), socializing (6%), or for reference materials (4%). DVDs and group study were identified as ways the House library was used by 16% and 11%, respectively (Q. 8 and 9, pg. 7-8).

Regarding energy use, 85% (n=1460) would like the House’s overall real-time energy use displayed. There was no consensus as to how to display this information. The most selected way to display the information was on HUDS flat screen panels (26%), followed by posters in dining hall/green board/etc. (20%) and the homepage of the House’s website (19%) (Q. 11, pg. 9).

When asked what types of activities should be held in the JCR, the most frequently selected first choice was House-based events (63%). The most frequently selected second choice was student hang out space (39%), and the most frequently selected third choice was a TV common room (27%) (Q. 12, pg. 13).

For the top three functions that could be shared in the House system, the 30% of students suggested the grille, 30% of students suggested multipurpose spaces for large groups, and 28% suggested a theater. Among the options for items that should be in each House, 51% selected computer lab, followed by 44% selecting the library, and 41% selecting game/TV room (Q. 13, pg. 16).

Students reported most frequently that the House supported their personal development and emotional well-being by serving as a smaller community of friends (82%), followed by social events in the Houses (73%) and recreational activities (62%). Only 19% identified Specialty Tutors as supporting personal/emotional well-being in the Houses (Q. 16, pg. 29).

Despite being a smaller community of friends, 66% of students said that House life could better support personal development if it allowed for a “better connection with fellow students in the Houses.” When viewed by year in school, sophomores reported this at a much higher rate, 72%, than seniors (59%). The next most frequently cited way to improve the House in regards to personal development was to offer “Better support from House staff, including Tutors, ABRD, and/or House Masters (34%) and “Better Access to Services” (33%) (Q. 17, pg. 29).
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### House expectations

**Q1. How well does your House meet your expectations with respect to each of the following functions?**

By Year in School

* (Scale: 1=Very Poorly  2=Poorly  3=Barely Acceptable  4=Well  5=Very well)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A place for quiet or group study space</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.8</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=543)</td>
<td>(N=491)</td>
<td>(N=458)</td>
<td>(N=1496)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and/or Intellectual</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.8</td>
<td>SD=0.8</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=542)</td>
<td>(N=492)</td>
<td>(N=455)</td>
<td>(N=1493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.8</td>
<td>SD=0.8</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=544)</td>
<td>(N=491)</td>
<td>(N=458)</td>
<td>(N=1497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (e.g. sleeping and living space)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=543)</td>
<td>(N=491)</td>
<td>(N=458)</td>
<td>(N=1496)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and/or cultural</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.8</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=543)</td>
<td>(N=487)</td>
<td>(N=457)</td>
<td>(N=1491)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different from sophomores, p<.05
### Participation in activities

**Q2. How easy is it for you to participate in the following activities within your House as it is presently designed?**

By Year in School

*(Scale: 1=Very difficult  2=Difficult  3=Easy  4=Very easy)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class/ section meetings</strong></td>
<td>2.9 (SD=0.9, N=280)</td>
<td>2.8 (SD=1.0, N=268)</td>
<td>2.7 (SD=0.9, N=273)</td>
<td>2.8 (SD=0.9, N=823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dining</strong></td>
<td>3.6 (SD=0.6, N=529)</td>
<td>3.6 (SD=0.7, N=490)</td>
<td>3.6 (SD=0.8, N=454)</td>
<td>3.6 (SD=0.7, N=1476)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guest speaker meetings</strong></td>
<td>3.2 (SD=0.7, N=380)</td>
<td>3.0 (SD=0.8, N=374)</td>
<td>3.1 (SD=0.8, N=353)</td>
<td>3.1 (SD=0.8, N=1108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student group meetings</strong></td>
<td>3.2 (SD=0.7, N=457)</td>
<td>3.0* (SD=0.8, N=432)</td>
<td>2.9* (SD=0.9, N=407)</td>
<td>3.1 (SD=0.8, N=1299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studying</strong></td>
<td>3.3 (SD=0.7, N=527)</td>
<td>3.2 (SD=0.7, N=481)</td>
<td>3.2 (SD=0.8, N=448)</td>
<td>3.3 (SD=0.8, N=1459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>2.9 (SD=1.2, N=28)</td>
<td>2.6 (SD=1.1, N=35)</td>
<td>2.7 (SD=1.2, N=25)</td>
<td>2.7 (SD=1.1, N=88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different from sophomores, p<.05
### Space in the Houses

**Q5. Should space in the Houses be designated for class/seminars/sections?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Year in School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent Responding Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>39%φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>48%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

φ *Significantly lower than expected, p<.05*

* *Significantly higher than expected, p<.05*
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Importance of Resident Tutor roles

Q6. Resident Tutors may fill many roles in the Houses. Rate the importance of each of the following Tutor roles.

By Year in School

(Scale: 1=Not important at all  2=Unimportant  3=Neither important nor unimportant  4=Important  5=Very important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic assistance or advice</strong></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8*</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=535)</td>
<td>(N=485)</td>
<td>(N=450)</td>
<td>(N=1474)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult presence/mentoring</strong></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=534)</td>
<td>(N=483)</td>
<td>(N=450)</td>
<td>(N=1471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advising on personal matters</strong></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=534)</td>
<td>(N=483)</td>
<td>(N=449)</td>
<td>(N=1470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community building</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=533)</td>
<td>(N=479)</td>
<td>(N=450)</td>
<td>(N=1466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-professional advising</strong></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. Pre-Med, Pre-Law, etc.)</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=535)</td>
<td>(N=481)</td>
<td>(N=446)</td>
<td>(N=1466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophomore advising</strong></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td>3.4*φ</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=0.9</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=532)</td>
<td>(N=483)</td>
<td>(N=444)</td>
<td>(N=1463)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialty roles (e.g. Wellness, SASH, Race Relations Advisors, BGLTS)</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3*φ</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.0</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
<td>SD=1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=532)</td>
<td>(N=479)</td>
<td>(N=449)</td>
<td>(N=1464)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different from sophomores, p<.05
φ Significantly different from juniors, p<.05
Q7. How would you like to interact with faculty in your House? Rate your level of interest in each of the following opportunities that could exist or do exist.

By Year in School

(Scale: 1=Very uninterested  2=Uninterested  3=Neutral  4=Interested  5=Very interested)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class/ section meetings in the Houses</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty lectures in the Houses</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty offices in the Houses</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal faculty dinners</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal meals with faculty and their families in the Houses</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior faculty living in the Houses</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorships with Senior Common Room (SCR) members</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different from sophomores, p<.05
## Q8. Where do you prefer to study?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sophomore (N=537)</th>
<th>Junior (N=484)</th>
<th>Senior (N=450)</th>
<th>Overall (N=1475)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom</td>
<td>76%φ</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%*</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining hall</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House library</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus sites</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus cafes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite common room</td>
<td>42%*</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

φ Significantly lower than expected, p<.05  
* Significantly higher than expected, p<.05
## Q9a. I use the House library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent Responding Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Q9b. How do you use the House library? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore (N=308)</th>
<th>Junior (N=290)</th>
<th>Senior (N=269)</th>
<th>Overall (N=869)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check out books</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check out DVDs</td>
<td>10%φ</td>
<td>21%*</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group study</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%φ</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized study</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User reference materials</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

φ Significantly lower than expected, p<.05
* Significantly higher than expected, p<.05
Q11a. Should we display data related to the House’s overall real-time energy use? (This would allow you to see how much students’ personal actions affect Harvard’s energy consumption.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Year in School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent Responding Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11b. If so, how should this be displayed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Selected Choice</th>
<th>2nd Most Selected Choice</th>
<th>3rd Most Selected Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore (N=459)</td>
<td>Posters in dining hall/green board/etc.</td>
<td>On HUDS flat screen panels</td>
<td>Homepage of the House's website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (N=409)</td>
<td>On HUDS flat screen panels</td>
<td>Homepage of the House's website</td>
<td>Posters in dining hall/green board/etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (N=373)</td>
<td>On HUDS flat screen panels</td>
<td>Homepage of the House's website</td>
<td>Posters in dining hall/green board/etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (N=1244)</td>
<td>On HUDS flat screen panels</td>
<td>Posters in dining hall/green board/etc.</td>
<td>Homepage of the House's website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Homepage of the House's website by Year in School

- Sophomore: 20%
- Junior: 19%
- Senior: 19%

Interactive kiosk by Year in School

- Sophomore: 4%
- Junior: 5%
- Senior: 7%
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Display of energy use

Monthly or quarterly emails by Year in School

- Sophomore: 16%
- Junior: 16%
- Senior: 17%

On HUDS flat screen panels by Year in School

- Sophomore: 24%
- Junior: 28%
- Senior: 26%
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Display of energy use

Posters in dining hall/green board/etc. by Year in School

- Sophomore: 25%
- Junior: 18%
- Senior: 18%

Television monitor(s) in House lobbies by Year in School

- Sophomore: 6%
- Junior: 5%
- Senior: 5%

Website designed for this specific purpose by Year in School

- Sophomore: 6%
- Junior: 8%
- Senior: 9%
### APPENDIX IV

**Activities in the Junior Common Room**

Q12. What types of activities should be held in the Junior Common Room (JCR)? Identify your 1st choice, your 2nd choice, etc.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Year in School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
<th>4th Choice</th>
<th>5th Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>House-Based Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student group events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student group meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student hang-out space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![House-based events (N=1432) chart]

**Graphical Representation**:  
- 1st Choice: 63%  
- 2nd Choice: 14%  
- 3rd Choice: 14%  
- 4th Choice: 5%  
- 5th Choice: 4%
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Student group events (N=1400)

- 1st Choice: 7%
- 2nd Choice: 25%
- 3rd Choice: 23%
- 4th Choice: 35%
- 5th Choice: 10%

Student group meetings (N=1366)

- 1st Choice: 3%
- 2nd Choice: 8%
- 3rd Choice: 20%
- 4th Choice: 26%
- 5th Choice: 43%

Student hang-out space (N=1418)

- 1st Choice: 22%
- 2nd Choice: 39%
- 3rd Choice: 17%
- 4th Choice: 17%
- 5th Choice: 4%
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TV room (N=1344)

1st Choice: 9%
2nd Choice: 17%
3rd Choice: 27%
4th Choice: 13%
5th Choice: 34%
### Q13. Sharing of Specialty Spaces: Recognizing that there are space limitations,

**Q13a. Select the top three functions below that should be in the House system, but could be shared among two or more neighboring Houses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Most Selected Choice</th>
<th>2nd Most Selected Choice</th>
<th>3rd Most Selected Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore (N=516)</td>
<td>Grille</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Multipurpose space for large events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (N=473)</td>
<td>Multipurpose space for large events</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Grille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (N=435)</td>
<td>Tie between Grille and Studio (e.g., art, pottery, media)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (N=1427)</td>
<td>Tie between Grille and Multipurpose space for large events</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Select the top three functions below that should be in each House.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Most Selected Choice</th>
<th>2nd Most Selected Choice</th>
<th>3rd Most Selected Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore (N=518)</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>Tie between Computer lab and Game/TV room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior (N=476)</td>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Aerobic equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (N=432)</td>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (N=1429)</td>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 13a – Option, by Year in School
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Aerobic equipment by Year in School

- Sophomore: 20%
- Junior: 14%
- Senior: 13%

*Significantly higher than expected, p<.05

Classroom/seminar space by Year in School

- Sophomore: 19%
- Junior: 20%
- Senior: 18%

Computer lab by Year in School

- Sophomore: 13%
- Junior: 6%
- Senior: 6%

*Significantly higher than expected, p<.05
Specialty Spaces

APPENDIX IV

Dance Studio by Year in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Darkroom by Year in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Game/TV room by Year in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Specialty Spaces

Library

- Sophomore: 11%
- Junior: 8%
- Senior: 9%

Meeting space for student organizations by Year in School

- Sophomore: 23%
- Junior: 25%
- Senior: 25%

Multipurpose space for large events by Year in School

- Sophomore: 29%
- Junior: 32%
- Senior: 28%
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Music practice rooms by Year in School

Other by Year in School

Studio (e.g., art, pottery, media) by Year in School

Specialty Spaces
Q13b. Option, by Year in School

*Significantly higher than expected, p<.05
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Specialty Spaces

Classroom/seminar space by Year in School

- Sophomore: 6%
- Junior: 3%
- Senior: 3%

*Significantly higher than expected, p<.05

Computer lab by Year in School

- Sophomore: 41%
- Junior: 54%
- Senior: 59%

φSignificantly lower than expected, p<.05
*Significantly higher than expected, p<.05

Dance studio by Year in School

- Sophomore: 3%
- Junior: 3%
- Senior: 3%
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Specialty Spaces

Darkroom by Year in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Game/TV room by Year in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grille by Year in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX IV**

**Group or individual study space by Year in School**

- Sophomore: 39% *
- Junior: 31%
- Senior: 30%

*Significantly higher than expected, p<.05*

**Studio (e.g., art, pottery, media) by Year in School**

- Sophomore: 5% *
- Junior: 2%
- Senior: 2%

*Significantly higher than expected, p<.05*

**Indoor basketball court by Year in School**

- Sophomore: 3%
- Junior: 2%
- Senior: 1%
APPENDIX IV

Specialty Spaces

Library by Year in School

- Sophomore: 45%
- Junior: 42%
- Senior: 44%

Meeting space for student organizations by Year in School

- Sophomore: 12%
- Junior: 11%
- Senior: 13%

Multipurpose space for large events by Year in School

- Sophomore: 15%
- Junior: 12%
- Senior: 13%
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Music practice rooms by Year in School

- Sophomore: 19%
- Junior: 17%
- Senior: 15%

Other by Year in School

- Sophomore: 1%
- Junior: 0%
- Senior: 1%

Studio (e.g., art, pottery, media) by Year in School

- Sophomore: 5%
- Junior: 2%
- Senior: 2%
**Theater by Year in School**

- Sophomore: 3%
- Junior: 2%
- Senior: 2%

**Weight lifting equipment by Year in School**

- Sophomore: 13%
- Junior: 16%
- Senior: 14%
### Q16. How does the House support your personal development and emotional well-being? Please select all that apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore (N=491)</th>
<th>Junior (N=451)</th>
<th>Senior (N=410)</th>
<th>Overall (N=1356)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller community of friends</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events in the House</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Tutors (e.g. Wellness, SASH, Race Relations Advisers, BGLTS)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from House Office, including Tutors, Resident Dean, and/or House Masters</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q17. In what ways might House life be improved for your personal development? Please select all that apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Year in School</th>
<th>Sophomore (N=458)</th>
<th>Junior (N=417)</th>
<th>Senior (N=378)</th>
<th>Overall (N=1257)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better access to services</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better connection with fellow students in the House</td>
<td>72%*</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>59%φ</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better support from House staff, including Tutors, Resident Dean, and/or House Masters</td>
<td>30%φ</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less competitive atmosphere</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less noise</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less stressful environment</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More privacy</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

φ Significantly lower than expected, $p<.05$

* Significantly higher than expected, $p<.05$
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FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Report of the Committee on the Role of the Faculty in the Houses
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77
INTRODUCTION

To the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Sir:

The Committee on the Role of the Faculty in the Houses begs leave to submit the following report.

By letter of April 5, 1968, and by announcement to the Faculty on May 7, 1968, you appointed the present committee with the following membership:

Dr. George Richard Allison, Instructor in History and Resident Tutor in Leverett House.
Dr. Fred L. Glimp, Dean of Harvard College.
Dr. Richard J. Herrnstein, Professor of Psychology.
Dr. Arthur Maass, Professor of Government.
Dr. William P. Reinhardt, Instructor in Chemistry and Resident Tutor in Lowell House.
Mr. F. Skiddy von Stade, Dean of Freshmen and Master of Mather House.
Dr. Dean K. Whiting, Lecturer in Education and Director of the Office of Tests.
Mr. George C. Homans, Chairman, Professor of Sociology.

In your letter constituting the committee you gave it the following terms of reference: “In recent years, and with particular intensity during the past few months, several questions and worries about the administration of the undergraduate Houses have been bearing down on a number of us concerned with the institutional health of Harvard College. (1) Some of the Masters and Senior Tutors have been arguing, with considerable justification, that the relentless increase in the number of references to be written for undergraduates, as well as in the complexity of the problems about which such undergraduates need advice, is placing a burden on the House administrations which could soon become intolerable. (2) At the same time, specific events which have focussed attention on communication among dif-
different elements of the Harvard community (including senior and junior faculty members, graduate students, and undergraduates) have also raised the question: how can the Senior Common Room of each House more successfully fulfill its functions, including that of supporting the Master and Senior Tutor? (3) Still other arguments have been in progress concerning the special responsibilities of resident tutors in the Houses, not simply as teaching fellows and other faculty members fortunate enough to get free room and board, but as officers of the College. (4) Finally, of course, the mounting interest in centering more units of instruction and perhaps more instructional facilities, including computer consoles, in the Houses has engaged considerable interest as evidenced by the attached report of the Harvard Policy Committee.

In the course of its work, the committee has interviewed all the present and recent House Masters, all the Allston Burr Senior Tutors, representatives of the Harvard Undergraduate Council and its special committee, the Harvard Policy Committee, the chairmen of the undergraduate House Committees, a number of other undergraduates, especially graduating seniors prepared to evaluate their experience in the Houses, and a number of officers of instruction or administration, interested in the Houses and in General Education in the Houses. The committee has considered all the issues raised in the letter bringing it into existence, but has made no effort to confine itself rigidly to them. Anything brought up in discussion that might fall under the rubric of the role of the Faculty in the Houses the committee felt it should give its mind to. Some matters, such as rents, clearly did not fall under the rubric, but many others had at least a tangential relation to the role of the faculty. A year and a half has passed since the committee was set up, a year and a half filled, moreover, with change: the occupation of University Hall and its consequences, the discussion of the impending merger of Harvard with Radcliffe. In this time, some issues would not wait for this report but settled themselves. Others became even more salient, and the committee has spent more time on them than was originally envisaged in its terms of reference.

Before getting down to specifics, the committee must make some general remarks. At a time when the world is going through "the revolution of rising expectations," the committee has been tempted to recommend change for the sake of change. The advice we get sometimes runs like this: "Try something new — it makes no differ-
another if the halls and the Houses became co-residential, all being organized as Houses, each inhabited by both men and women students. The latter arrangement would be very popular with many Harvard and even more Radcliffe students, who feel that it would be more natural and more civilizing than the present state of affairs and would make the women fully members of the university community. The men must, of course, remember that some of them would then be required to live in the present Radcliffe halls, at some distance from the center of things in the Yard.

The issue of co-residence was not given to the committee to consider, and it will not consider it. The problems raised by a merger must be resolved by a body different from, and more powerful than, the present committee. All the committee will say is this: it believes that the changes it recommends in the organization of the Houses will and should apply just as much to co-residential Houses as to Houses constituted as they are at present. Its recommendations are neutral with respect to co-residence.

THE BURDEN OF ADMINISTRATION

The committee now turns to the specific problems it was asked to consider. It begins with those that, though difficult, present no particular subtleties. One of these is the burden placed on House administrations by the relentless increase in the number of references to be written for undergraduates. The committee's chief informant on the general nature of this problem was Mr. John B. Fox, Jr., Director of the Office for Graduate and Career Plans.

The pressure for letters of reference comes chiefly from the seniors, who need such letters to accompany their applications for entrance into graduate schools. To these must be added recommendations for special scholarships, such as the Rhodes, and, increasingly in recent years, for entrance into the Peace Corps, VISTA, etc. The percentage of seniors applying for entrance to graduate schools alone went from 54% in 1957 to 94% in 1967. There has been some falling off in the percentage in the last two years, when the draft began taking graduate students, but this trend is unlikely to continue indefinitely, and we must look forward to nearly 100% of our seniors applying for graduate schools or other activities, admission to which requires letters of recommendation. A senior usually considers about three main kinds of option for his immediate future, for example: some law school, an overseas fellowship, and the Peace Corps, and about three letters have to be sent out for each student under each option.

What creates the administrative burden is not just the increased number of seniors that need letters but the nature of the letters that must be written. Some universities have standardized the procedure. Each senior's dossier is circulated, and three letters are written for each man, one by a Dean or the equivalent, such as our Senior Tutors, one by an ordinary instructor or tutor, and one by some member of the staff that the student chooses for himself. These letters are then reproduced, and the same set is used for every application made by the student in question. Such a procedure has not been adopted at
Harvard, which has no standardized method at all. Largely at the student's own initiative, different individuals are induced to write different letters for each of the student's applications, so that the set of letters sent in with one application may be quite unlike the set sent in with another.

The former is the more efficient system from the point of view of letter-writing: fewer original letters have to be written for each student. But the latter system—if it may be called a system at all—is, in Mr. Fox's view, the more efficient one for actually getting students into the places they apply for. Letters do make a difference. On the average they count immediately after a student's grades in gaining him admission to a graduate school. And the more personalized and individualized they are, the better. Our system, even if we grant that many letters are fairly routine efforts, tends to accentuate this feature. The student is more apt to be admitted to graduate school if, even when the same letter is sent out with several of his applications, the letter is typed out each time as if it were an original and not simply reproduced by carbon or mimeograph. The Harvard method obviously multiplies both the amount of work involved in composing letters and the amount of secretarial help needed in getting them typed.

The sheer length of a letter written for a student seems to make a difference in his favor. It is as if an admissions officer said to himself: "This man must be pretty good if he can get his dean or instructor to put out so much effort for him." The one person whom every admissions officer in the country knew about was Professor Finley when he was Master of Eliot House. His letters for students were famous for both length and eloquence. But what was true of Master Finley is true, in a lesser degree and by comparison with other universities, of letters of recommendation by the Harvard staff as a whole. Mr. Fox believes that Harvard's is the best record of any university in getting students into graduate schools, though of course there are other reasons for this than the letters we write.

A final factor in the increasing burden of recommendations is that seniors are applying to more different graduate schools or other activities. The total result is suggested by the following figures, dated ten years apart. The data are based on the results of a questionnaire Mr. Fox sends out to all seniors and to which most of them reply. Though the figures are in part estimates, they are not believed to be far off the actual situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior class size</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applications</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of letters per application</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of letters written</td>
<td>4900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, the number of letters of recommendation to be written has more than doubled in ten years. And although the number of seniors making applications cannot rise much further, so close is it to 100% already, the number of different applications made per man can readily increase.

Mr. Fox has no firm figures on what proportion of the increasing number of letters is written by resident officers of the Houses—Masters, Senior Tutors, and other resident tutors—and what by other officers of the university, but his best guess is that at least two-thirds of all these letters come from the Houses. Not only is the burden of letter-writing large, but most of it is borne by members of House staffs.

Indeed most of it is borne by the Master and Senior Tutor in each House. They especially have to bear the burden of writing the so-called "Dean's Letters," which assess a student's overall character. They also are the only persons who have access to a student's full record, including all the information that has for one reason or another gotten into his file. Other members of House staffs have access to the complete file only with the permission of the Master or Senior Tutor, though they may have access to some part of the file, such as the student's grade record. Many resident and non-resident tutors do, of course, write letters for students whom they know well and who ask them to do so, but the bulk of the work certainly falls to the Masters and Senior Tutors.

The impression of the committee is that Masters and Senior Tutors vary greatly from House to House in the amount of effort they put into letter-writing and the degree of burden they feel this effort to be. Both variables are important. As Master of Eliot House, Professor Finley put a great deal of time into letter-writing, but that extraordinary man may not have felt it to be a great burden. At any rate, some House staffs feel that the load is too great and that they can readily handle, except perhaps for certain periods of the year. Most of the work must be done in the fall term. Other staffs feel that they are overwhelmed with the work and that it gets in the
way of their main job, communicating with students and advising them.

Though we stress how important it is for students that thoughtful letters be written for them and how good it is for the College that its excellent record in this respect be maintained, neither this committee nor the faculty can dictate to House staffs how much effort they should put into the job. All we can do is make sure that the other work of no House shall suffer because of the burden of writing letters of recommendation. Accordingly the committee proposes that extra staff be assigned to the Houses for administrative purposes.

In recent years the Masters have begun naming certain resident tutors as Assistant Senior Tutors or Assistant to the Senior Tutor or other titles implying the same sort of position. We shall refer to them as Assistant Senior Tutors. The jobs assigned to them vary greatly from House to House. Some are assigned minor housekeeping duties, such as tending the logistics of the Senior Common Room. Others do a great deal of the most important work of their Houses. Assistant Senior Tutors also vary greatly in the proportion of their salaries that they receive specifically for serving in this position. Some receive nothing. That is, they get, beside their room and board as resident tutors, their regular university pay, but no part of that pay is assigned them for their work as Assistant Senior Tutors. On the other hand, some Assistant Senior Tutors receive almost $2000 for that specific job. The committee recommends that this developing system be regularized. Specifically it recommends that each House be assigned, in addition to its present staff, the equivalent in time and hence in salary of an additional half-time tutorship for administrative duties, to be distributed as the Master sees fit among those tutors entitled Assistant Senior Tutors. That is, the Master could employ a single additional tutor at half-time for this purpose or two additional tutors at a quarter-time, etc.

The increased burden of writing letters of recommendation requires both more time for composing letters and more time for typing them. At the present time there are two main secretaries employed in each House office. One is the House Secretary, who is secretary to the Master, and the other is the Assistant House Secretary, who is secretary to the Senior Tutor. Usually these secretaries are fully employed, and ordinary resident tutors do not have access to them. The Office for Graduate and Career Plans offers secretarial services for the writing of letters of recommendation to those mem-

bers of the teaching staff, including resident tutors, who do not have access to secretaries of their own. Why should not this service be provided in the House offices themselves? After all, the students' records are kept there. The committee recommends that resident members of House staffs have secretaries available to them for this purpose in the House offices for two days a week or on some other part-time arrangement.
III

THE SENIOR TUTORS

We turn now to another problem in the pressure of work on House staffs, in this case the pressure on Allston Burr Senior Tutors. Under the Master, the Senior Tutor is the man who makes more difference to the success of the House than any other. He is in charge of the discipline of students and of problems arising out of their academic records. In this capacity, he carries the chief everyday burden of advising students in his House. In effect he is responsible both to the Master and to the Dean of Harvard College, for he serves under the Dean as a member of the Administrative Board and brings before it cases for its consideration that originate in his House. The Administrative Board is, by faculty delegation, the body that ordinarily makes final decisions or recommendations to the faculty on matters of the discipline of students or their academic records. Until the faculty set up the Committee of Fifteen to deal with certain extraordinary cases, the Administrative Board made all such decisions and recommendations. Thus the duties of Senior Tutors are both important and onerous, collectively and individually.

An Allston Burr Senior Tutor may be a tenured professor. More often he is an Assistant Professor. His job as Senior Tutor is supposed to occupy half his working time. He is supposed to devote the other half to his ordinary departmental duties in teaching and research.

The committee has been deeply impressed by the high character, ability, and dedication of the Senior Tutors. Harvard College owes much to them. They testify, and the committee agrees, that their duties as Senior Tutors tend in fact to occupy a good deal more of their time than the half-time theoretically allotted for this purpose. They do not complain: they say that their experience is a valuable one, which they would not have missed. But as Assistant Professors they are at a critical point in their careers, concerned with carrying out the research and writing the books that will win them promotion to tenured professorships either at Harvard or elsewhere. Their work as Senior Tutors tends to get in the way of these other necessary activities. And some of them feel that their departments in considering them for promotion do not give sufficient weight, if any at all, to their services as Senior Tutors.

The committee will not pass judgment on the behavior of departments in this respect. Departments find it difficult to recommend men for promotion to tenured positions on other than purely scholarly grounds, if only because their recommendations must face the scrutiny of outside, ad hoc, committees whose terms of reference are wholly academic. But the committee does wish to take a little pressure off the Senior Tutors faced with these competing duties. It wishes to provide them with a little leeway to devote to their research and writing. An Assistant Professor normally serves for a five-year term, in the course of which he now receives one half-year's leave of absence with pay. A Senior Tutor often serves for five years too—but not always, and it may be that Senior Tutors are increasingly unwilling to serve for that long. The committee recommends that each Allston Burr Senior Tutor be granted an extra half-year's leave of absence with pay after at least three years of service in that capacity. Thus Senior Tutors who are also Assistant Professors would receive a full year off with pay. Since not all Senior Tutors are Assistant Professors, the intention of the committee in making this recommendation is to allow Senior Tutors an extra half-year off in respect of this service, whether or not they would receive a first half-year off in any event.
IV

HOUSE COURSES

One of the matters on which the committee was asked to report was “the mounting interest in centering more units of instruction and perhaps more instructional facilities, including computer consoles, in the Houses.” To some extent, as we shall see, the committee’s possible recommendations on this matter have already been anticipated. For instance, we understand that computer consoles have already been installed in the Houses. But let us comment on the issue of “House courses.”

Seven such courses were offered experimentally during the past academic year, 1968–69. They were officially listed in the Register as lower-group courses in General Education under the number Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, or Humanities 96. Their subjects ranged from Natural Sciences 96c, Energy in Science and Technology, to Social Sciences 96c, Current Problems in Law, Government, and Sociology of the United States, to Humanities 96f, The Modern Sensibility. Winthrop House has offered three such courses, Dunster, Leverett, Lowell, and Quincy, one each.

These courses are “House” courses in the sense that they have been initiated, organized, and offered by members of the teaching staff, usually junior members, attached to particular Houses, that their places of meeting are within particular Houses, and that application for admission to the courses is made through the House offices. Most of the students in a House course have also been members of the House in which it is given, but most such courses have also admitted some students from outside the House in question, including Radcliffe students. The number of students in any course is small, and the presentation of material is more like that of a seminar or discussion group than that of a regular lecture course.

The House courses have generated a good deal of enthusiasm. It is true that most novelties at Harvard generate a good deal of enthusiasm. Whether the House courses would continue to generate such enthusiasm if they became regular features of the curriculum is another question. But there is no reason why they should become regular features. If they fail to retain their charm with advancing age, there should be no presumption that they are to be continued. It is also true that many students are enthusiastic for some escape from regular lecture courses, where what is known about a subject is laid down cold from the podium, as they are for escape from anything that smacks of authoritarianism. But it is the job of the faculty at least to teach what is known; not all subjects are equally well or economically taught by discussion, and the vocal participation of students must, in learning some subjects, be limited. Students’ questions to clear up ambiguities in presentation are always indispensable, but in these subjects students cannot be expected through discussion to discover the essential truths for themselves. They must frankly be taught them. Mathematics, for instance, is not easily learned through pure discussion groups, and there are many other examples, even in the social sciences. Still, discussion groups, with full and active participation by students, are a vital feature of the educational process, especially in fields where issues are still unclear and knowledge is inchoate. What we should look for at Harvard is a balance of methods of learning, and the committee believes that House courses contribute to a proper balance.

The other advantages of House courses are the following. For the members of the staff who offer them, they provide an opportunity for discussing topics of peculiarly immediate concern both to them and to many students in the House. They give members of the House, both students and faculty, a sense that they are conducting an enterprise that is peculiarly their own, and thus they contribute to the sense of identity in a House. They bring the academic life of students and faculty into close relation with their social and residential life. The discussions in the House courses can easily spill over into discussions in the dining and common rooms. Thus House courses can, ideally, add greatly to the contribution to instruction now made by the Houses through tutorial.

Several obvious objections may be made to House courses. One is the inequity of offering courses to students on the basis of where they live and not on that of interest and competence. The committee does not consider this objection to be a crushing one, provided that some opportunity is given for at least some students from outside the House that is offering a course to enroll in it. Another is that the Houses may come to compete with one another in offering
glamorous courses. But why should they not compete? As long as the substance of the courses is intellectually sound, can there be any objection to competition in methods of presentation? It is not as if any House had much to gain by winning such a competition, so long as the assignment of students to a House is not affected by winning, and under present methods of assignment it certainly could not be. There would be some danger if House Masters actively sought to get certain men as tutors only because they believed them peculiarly gifted in presenting House courses. Tutors should be selected primarily because they are believed to be good tutors, to be able to do their job well in this capacity, both on the academic and the other side. If tutors are so chosen, we cannot see that there is any possible objection to their also being able teachers of House, or of other, courses.

More important are the objections on purely mechanical grounds. The first is that of expense. If the money available for instruction, in the first instance the money available for salaries, is thought to be constant in amount or increasing fairly slowly, then it is obvious that the proliferation of House courses would cut into the funds available for regular departmental teaching. Since the committee believes that basic instruction in the fundamental academic disciplines should remain, where it is now, with the regular departments, then obviously any large increase in the number of House courses is not to be recommended. Another cause for question, on the part of some departments, is whether the persons who teach the House courses, usually teaching fellows, are yet well-trained enough in their own academic disciplines.

The House courses are all at present listed as courses in General Education. They are approved by the Committee on General Education and are financed from its budget. Last year this committee voted, in effect, to make House courses a regular part of its offering. Let us note the change in the meaning of General Education that has taken place over the years. In the original report of the Committee on General Education (the Red Book), the notion of general education approached very closely, though it never quite reached, the notion of a core curriculum. General Education courses were to bring all students into contact with those central ideas and books in the physical sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities, without some familiarity with which no man should have the right to call himself educated. General Education was to be concerned with central ideas. Since these ideas were their ideas also, the academic departments were much concerned with the teaching of General Education. The only difference was that, in courses in General Education, members of the departments were to teach these ideas to men who did not plan to become specialists within the fields represented by the departments in question.

Over the years General Education has, half-unwittingly, tended to move away from the original conception, to move indeed in a direction the very opposite of the original one. General Education is increasingly thought to be the place for the discussion of ideas and material that are not necessarily accepted as central by the regular disciplines, but rather are new, “exciting,” and “different.” General Education has tended to become the place par excellence for freedom and experimentation rather than for teaching the ideas of a central tradition. In effect, the House courses represent the new notion of General Education even better than do most of the other courses in the field. The present committee appreciates the value of the new freedom expressed through General Education, but it also sees the value of the original idea, and it sees some danger that the proliferation of House courses may, if uncontrolled, undermine the original idea altogether.

In view of these considerations, the recommendations of the committee with respect to House courses are the following:

1. The principle of allowing the offering of House courses should be approved. But no House should be under any compulsion to offer such courses if it sees fit not to do so.

2. No House should offer any large number of such courses in any one academic year. No more than three or four half-courses a year would be about right. In any event, lack of suitable space for meeting will present a built-in restriction on the number of courses a House can offer.

3. No House course should be allowed to become an established part of the curriculum, offered year after year as a matter of course. Otherwise House courses would lose the experimental quality and the responsiveness to changing interests that are their virtues now. That is, old courses should be abandoned and new ones offered frequently.

4. A House course should offer some opportunity for the enrollment of students not members of the House in question.
5. At the same time, the courses should be genuinely House courses, of interest to some significant body of students in the respective Houses and not simply opportunities for teachers who happen to be attached to the Houses to offer the sort of courses they fancy. House courses should over the years make use of the full range of instructors available to a House. Offering a House course would, for instance, be an excellent means of attaching an Associate more closely to his House. To insure that the courses reflect House interests and exploit House resources, the initial approval of these courses should be the responsibility in each House of what we shall call a House Council and describe below.

6. Final approval of House courses should remain, as it is now, the responsibility of the Committee on General Education (and of course of the Committee on Educational Policy and the faculty as a whole). The General Education Committee should insist that every House course be submitted anew for approval every year. That committee should also continue to have financial responsibility for House courses.

V

THE RESIDENT STAFF

This report now turns to more subtle problems in the role of the faculty in the Houses, problems for which the committee finds it difficult to suggest solutions with confidence. The first set of problems is connected with the resident staff of the Houses, or rather with the relations between the resident staff and the students, on the one hand, and the Master and Senior Tutor, on the other.

The tutors associated with a House fall into two groups. The larger consists of the non-resident tutors. Besides their ordinary salaries, they get the meals they eat in the House free and are regular members of the Senior Common Rooms. They conduct tutorial with the students either in offices provided by the Houses or, by reason of crowding and lack of space in the Houses, in offices provided through their academic departments.

The smaller group of tutors, and the one that most concerns us, consists of those resident in the Houses, where each gets free meals and a small set of rooms. They are usually unmarried, but a few of the newer Houses, including Mather, can offer a very small number of apartments, three in the case of Mather, for married resident tutors. Depending on the size of the House in question, the number of resident tutors in a House runs from nine to fifteen. For an unmarried graduate student, serving as teaching fellow, or an unmarried younger member of the faculty the job of resident tutor is attractive, and there is no lack of candidates for it.

The primary duty of a tutor, whether resident or non-resident, is academic. According to the rules and requirements of his department, he must conduct tutorial, both group and individual, for students in his House who are concentrators in his field. Attached to some Houses are also tutors who, though they conduct little or no tutorial, are valuable because they are able to advise students who are planning to take up graduate work in certain specially demanding fields, such as medicine. There is every reason to believe that tutors accept their academic duties as natural and proper and, within the
limits of human frailty and variability, do a good job in carrying them out. At least the committee has not heard of systematic difficulties in this area of the tutors' job, and will have nothing more to say about it.

Outside the purely academic sphere, the duties of tutors are much vaguer, and they concern largely the resident tutors. It is said that a resident tutor should get to know not only the students that concentrate in his subject, but also those that live in his entry. He should be available to spot the men who are getting into trouble for one reason or another, and should be able to steer them to the sources from which they can receive help. He should see that the Master and Senior Tutor are informed about potential cases of trouble, and should be ready to help them in dealing with it. He should advise them in setting the policies of the House and should take responsibility for upholding and enforcing House rules. One or more of these duties have been seen, at one time or another and by one person or another, as falling within the responsibility of a resident tutor. But compared with the tutor's academic duties, these others were much less clear and the means of carrying them out much less obvious.

The choice of tutors is in the hands of the Master. He will naturally be most interested in securing tutors from the departments with large numbers of concentrators, which are also apt to be the departments that require tutorial instruction. Since they are not large departments and do not all offer tutorial, some of the physical sciences are unlikely to be represented among resident tutors. Within these limits, Masters vary greatly in the ways in which they find potential tutors. Some tutor men who were formerly undergraduates in the House, on the ground that they are familiar with the ways of the House and with the job of resident tutor. These are good reasons in themselves, but the supply of such men is limited, and their actual superiority as tutors is not always clear. Some rely heavily on recommendations made by the Senior Tutor, other tutors, or Associates. And some simply get in touch with the Head Tutor in the department from which a House tutor is needed and ask him to make a recommendation or recommendations. The difficulty about taking departmental recommendations is that the department is apt to name men for their purely academic achievements, and it is not at all clear that academic achievement alone is what foretells a good resident tutor. All we can say is that academic achievement is not necessarily a drawback. These methods are not, of course, alter-

natives. A Master normally uses some combination of them in getting the names of potential resident tutors.

Once Masters have the names, they vary greatly in the means they use of choosing among them. Some Masters have a very clear, though not always communicable, idea of the kind of man they want as resident tutor, and interview the various applicants very carefully with this idea in mind. Some Masters are prepared to take with the minimum of scrutiny the men who have been suggested to them, provided that they are not obviously unacceptable. It would be easy to say that such Masters were not working hard enough at selecting the very best men for a crucial job—that is, it would be easy to say, provided we ourselves could state clearly the proper criteria for choice.

Masters also vary greatly in the time they take in explaining to new tutors just what is expected of them. Some appear to expect a new tutor to pick up an idea of his duties from the general ambience, common knowledge, or conversation with tutors already in the House.

 Whatever the method of selecting tutors, they tend to have one characteristic that differentiates them from those of the past, particularly those of the thirties before the adoption of the rules limiting the number of years a man could serve in the position of instructor or assistant professor. Because men get married earlier and because a man with a PhD degree can readily get a good job in some other university, tutors today are on the average younger than those of the past; they are more apt to be teaching fellows rather than instructors or assistant professors, and they are apt to remain a shorter time as resident tutors, at best two or three years. As a result they do not have much time to become experienced in their duties before they leave, and they are more similar to the undergraduates than their predecessors were. For other reasons they are more apt to identify themselves with the students. Many of them, after all, are still students themselves.

With this description of the duties, selection, and characteristics of resident tutors, let us look at some of the problems connected with them and, first, problems in their general advisory function for the students. Getting to know the students, getting in a position in which students would feel free to come to them for advice, both in academic and non-academic matters, might be expected for a resident tutor to follow naturally from his tutorial work. But this
avenue of reaching students is less effective than might be supposed. Several departments, including some of the physical sciences, do not offer tutorial at all. And not all the departments that do offer tutorial can be represented by a resident tutor in every House; there are just not enough places. House tutors are naturally most apt to come from the five departments in which the bulk of the students are concentrators. The result is that, at any given time, only about forty per cent of undergraduates are receiving tutorial from tutors, either resident or non-resident, attached to their own Houses. The rest are either not receiving any tutorial at all or are being tutored by men who are not attached to their particular Houses. Even if tutorial were always an effective bridge to a more general counseling relationship, the bridge would only reach a minority of students in a House. The question is how to reach the other students that may be in need of advice.

The problem seems to be peculiarly severe for sophomores. They are low men on the totem pole for two years in a row, first as incoming freshmen and then as newcomers to a House in which they may know nobody either among the students or among the tutors. Dean von Stade reports that last year about four hundred sophomores, besides seeking help in planning their academic programs from tutors in their new Houses, went back for advice to the professors whom they had got to know the year before in their Yard dormitories. But the problem remains for many juniors and seniors. It is estimated that the Houses “reach” only about a third of the students; they become fully a part of the House, familiar with its tutors and active in House intellectual, social, or athletic activities. These are the men for whom, if they need to seek counsel — and they may be just the ones that do not need it — the channels are easy and wide-open. Another third are reached peripherally, through the first group. And another third the Houses do not reach at all. They are in the system but not of it.

Let us make our assumptions clear. By no means do we believe that all students, particularly all juniors and seniors, need elaborate advice from resident tutors or other members of the staff. They are perfectly well able to look out for themselves, indeed, to beat the system, if they see their problem in this way. Nor do we feel that all is lost if some students fail to be fully “integrated” into a House, whatever that may mean. It is wholly reasonable that some students, with strong ties to outside activities, should look on a House as no

more than a place to eat and sleep, or that some should want to “live out” — a matter we shall have something to say about later. More generally, it is wholly reasonable that some students, who know just what they want, should treat Harvard simply as a means for getting it, should treat Harvard, in the words of David Riesman, as a “public convenience.” Indeed we are a little skeptical about the virtues of a sense of emotional community with others, a sense some students feel the lack of. A feeling of emotional community is magnificent when it arises naturally out of collaboration in a common enterprise. But the effort to create such a sense and maintain it for its own sake and by its own means alone can be a dreadful strain. We dare say that what many students, like the rest of us, most need is a chance of being alone. From this point of view the worst thing about the Houses is their crowding. Our ultimate aim certainly ought to be that every man in the Houses should have a bedroom-study of his own.

Our desire is not, then, to force advice on students in the Houses. It is rather that, if a student does need advice, there should be some member of the staff with whom he has a relationship such that candid discussion between them might occur easily and naturally. We also recognize the difficulty, which faces us throughout this report, of devising formal institutions that will have informal results.

On the other side, resident tutors vary greatly in their ability to advise students. Some are so new as graduate students themselves that they are not very knowledgeable even about the mechanics of departmental requirements, to say nothing about the intangibles of the system. More important, resident and other tutors, like the rest of us, vary greatly in their capacity and willingness, outside of strictly academic business like tutorial, to “get to know” students in House entries, dining rooms, and extra-curricular activities. Some do a splendid job; others both students and Masters complain that they “get nothing out of.” It is true that we have no infallible prescription for getting to know students or for selecting in advance the kind of man who will get to know students. But in view of the desirability of the job of resident tutor and the pool of men ready to take such jobs, it seems to us that Masters could select them more carefully than they always do now, and could instruct them more carefully in what is expected of them. Moreover, Masters should be ready to ask resident tutors who have not proved satisfactory to give up their positions — without prejudice, for it may not be in the least
a resident tutor's fault that he has not been successful; the difficulty may lie in matters of temperament not wholly under his control. There is no fixed term for the position of resident tutor, and at present a man who gets the job usually keeps it for as long as he cares to do so and he is still connected with Harvard. There should be no such presumption that a resident tutor stays on automatically. A Master may find it disagreeable to ask him to resign, but someone must be ready to be disagreeable if the Houses are to get the kind of tutor they need.

We turn now to another problem particularly associated with resident tutors in the Houses, the problem of their functions in what is vaguely called student discipline. The problem that the Dean of the Faculty referred to, in the letter setting up this committee, as "the special responsibilities of resident tutors in the Houses, not simply as teaching fellows and other faculty members fortunate enough to get free room and board, but as officers of the College."

Let us illustrate this problem by looking at the enforcement of the parietal rules, about which the university in general and this committee in particular has heard so much. The most recent version of the parietal rules was adopted by the Committee on the Houses and approved by the Faculty as late as last year. We do not need to consider the details: the rules say that women shall not be in students' rooms in the Houses after certain hours of the night, depending on the day of the week. It is not that the parietals are of overwhelming importance; little trouble arises from them, largely because they are not enforced in fact, certainly not to the letter. But they illustrate the sort of problem that arises out of other and more important rules, such as the rules against the use of drugs, and the duties of resident House staff in connection with them.

There are resident tutors, and perhaps they are the majority, who say that they will do nothing to enforce the parietal rules, that they will not even speak to a student and warn him when they happen to run into him leaving the House with a girl after hours, but look the other way, much less report the matter to the Senior Tutor and Master. When asked why he would not do so, a resident tutor of this sort is apt to say one or all of the following things.

First, "I do not believe in the parietal rules." The statement is wholly sincere but there is one obvious answer to it. It may sound doctrinaire, and it certainly is not much used. It would go like this: "You know that the rules have been adopted by the faculty. As a resident tutor you are an officer of the university and, as such, bound to enforce the rules of the faculty. You are perfectly free not to believe in the rules, but if you did not believe in them, you did not have to apply for, or accept, the job of resident tutor. Or if, undertaking the job, you find by experience that the enforcement of the rules is repugnant to you, you are perfectly free to resign. That, indeed, would be the honest thing to do. As it is, you are in a weak moral position, that of accepting the real advantages that a resident tutorship brings you, while not bearing all the burdens that it also entails."

There is one practical difficulty with this argument. Though the resident tutors do know that the rules are on the books, it is not always made clear to them that they are in fact expected to enforce them. When a House Master interviews a prospective tutor, he does not always make clear to him just what he expects, whether it is enforcement or something else. In this case, a resident tutor can hardly be blamed for not carrying out what he has not been asked to carry out. One of the recommendations of this report is that Masters make crystal clear to resident tutors what the Masters expect of them. Then they would be bound to refuse or resign the job if they found that they could not bring themselves to carry out its duties. We do not know how many prospective resident tutors would in fact refuse the job if they knew that they were expected, if not to go out of their way to look for violations of the parietals, at least to report cases that actually came to their attention. It may be that enough would refuse to make it impossible for the university to man the posts. Then the university would be forced to bring its rules into line with what its officers were actually prepared to do. But it strikes us again that this would be a less hypocritical way of bringing about change than the present one, when the faculty leaves the rules on the books, when some of the Masters and many of the tutors are unwilling to enforce them, and indeed even themselves on their liberal morality in not doing so, while enjoying all the perquisites of a position that has enforcement as one of its duties. Of course, the refusal or resignation of a resident tutorship would be costly to a graduate student. We all talk about morality and integrity nowadays. We ought to shut up unless we are ready to be moral all the way. It is not moral to expect to indulge one's morality free of charge.

A second sort of statement that some resident tutors are apt to
make about the enforcement of the rules is: “I do not propose to be a policeman.” But no one asks him to be a policeman, if that means going out of his way, snooping, in order to discover violations of the rules. All he might be asked to do is to speak to a student violating them whom he happens to run into and be ready at least to report the fact to the Senior Tutor. Indeed the failure of a resident tutor to take such action may perhaps make it more likely that violations, or rather their further consequences, will be discovered by university or city policemen. Yet there seems to be nothing that many members of the university agree on more than that the university should protect students from the actions of the police.

Third, and far more significant, since it points to a problem that has no obvious solution, is the statement: “My trying to enforce such things as parietal rules would tend to destroy the other relations I am trying to establish with the students.” A resident tutor who makes this statement may fear that he will lose the students’ respect if he tries to enforce rules that they know he does not believe in himself. Of course it might also be argued that he would lose their respect just as surely if he showed he lacked the guts to enforce rules they knew he was bound to enforce. He may also lose their respect through no fault of his own if he does try to enforce the rules and does report violations to the Senior Tutor, but nothing happens: the Senior Tutor does not bring up even repeated violations to the Administrative Board. That such things occur is the subject of rumor. If they do occur, they eventually persuade a student that what a tutor says may be safely disregarded, and make the latter look silly. After all, if rules are to be enforced, the responsibility does not lie with tutors alone: they must be backed up by the Senior Tutor, the Master, and the Administrative Board, and these others may feel as ambivalently about the rules as the tutors do themselves.

But the heart of the matter is not the problem of respect. As the tutors see it, and see it rightly, it is a problem of the conflict of roles. In tutorial a tutor is expected to develop an easy and open relationship with his students, an atmosphere in which free discussion may flourish. Outside tutorial, in the less academic side of House life, he is expected to get to know the students and be friendly with them. This relationship of ease and friendship appears to conflict with the tutor’s more authoritarian role as an enforcer of rules: the latter gets in the way of the former.

The conflict becomes the more serious by reason of certain characteristics of present-day tutors. As we have said, they are apt to be somewhat younger than tutors of the past. They have been more recently undergraduates themselves, and thus are more like the undergraduates. Indeed some of the latter feel that the tutors are too much like them: they would welcome a greater difference. Some Masters feel that graduate students are less eager than were their predecessors to identify themselves with their coming status as professional scholars. And on top of everything else is the guilt the modern man feels when he finds himself acting in a manner that might by any stretch of the imagination be dubbed authoritarian, for to be an authority is thought to make him constructively a fascist. The result is that a tutor is apt to resolve his role-conflict in favor of his first role and, at the extreme, to abandon his second role altogether and identify wholly with the undergraduates.

If he does so he loses much of his usefulness as a tutor. We do not deny in the least that a role-conflict exists, though for purposes of clarifying the issue we have made, by talking about the enforcement of rules, the second role seem more authoritarian than it need be in fact. The thing to do is not to deny the conflict but to be fully aware of it, so as to be able to think about its implications and learn to live with it. Role-conflict is not a pathological but a normal feature of the human condition. The interesting and challenging problems in behavior are those of resolving such conflict at some higher level of complexity. Their resolution is the sign of social maturity in a man. Don’t yield all the moral authority to the Thoreaus: they lead the simple social life as parasites on men who live complex ones.

It is impossible to legislate a role, and we do not propose to offer such legislation here, but we do want to make some general remarks. The danger in identification with the students is that a resident tutor, in order — as he thinks — to establish good relations with them, may try too hard to be like them. He may try to show that he is one of the boys by protesting that he is not square, that he smokes pot too. In so doing he forfeits his right to be different from them when necessary and to speak up — which does not mean that he must always be preaching — for the standards he believes in as a member of the scholarly community. He must remember that
he is a teacher, both in and out of class, and that the teacher can never be altogether identical with the taught.

If the tutor will remember that he is a teacher, but in his teaching and other contacts with students is always ready to listen and respond to them, to encourage what they have to say and recognize their right to say it — if he will remember, that is, that making him a teacher does not make the students children, he will not fail to earn their understanding. He certainly need not report everything they say and do, which seems the least bit out of line, to higher authority. The fact is that he will do more if, instead of speaking to higher authority, he is ready to speak up to the students first, and this he will not be able to do if he seeks popularity by pretending to be one of them. In this role he may lose some social interaction with the students, but less perhaps than he might fear, and in any event there are plenty of times when students need to be left alone. And if he must pull rank, all we can say is that it is better to admit that one has authority and really live up to its responsibilities than to pretend one does not have it and then in fact fall back upon it sporadically and guiltily. In this role a tutor will gain both in self-respect and in the respect accorded him by the students.

In the discussion of these intangibles we are almost bound to give the wrong impression. We do not wish to imply that, by and large, the resident tutors are not doing a conscientious job. We have not received testimony to that effect. What we do wish to say is that the issue we have been considering does become salient for many resident tutors, and that some of them, some of the time, have trouble dealing with it.

We began, by way of illustration, with examining the role of the resident tutors in enforcing rules. But rules are at best only a means to an end. There are those, and intelligent they are, who argue that there should be no rules at all governing the behavior of students and other residents of a House. We think they are taking the easy way out and not facing up to the real problem. For when the committee pressed such men, and it did press them hard, it found that very few of them believed that a regime in which anything goes, in which everyone smokes all the pot he wants and shacks up indefinitely with every girl he wants, is a good regime in which learning to be a man and a scholar can take place. Such men are not in fact prepared to accept an indefinite degree of social squalor in the Houses. They want a regime in which something we call "civility" reigns. It may be that there is no real danger that, whatever we do, behavior in the Houses would in fact sink into squalor. But at least we have got to think about it, especially when the tolerated squalor of some may tempt others into squalor, if only to show that they too are human. And if we are not quite ready to allow that anything goes, then at some point we must be prepared to throw students out of the Houses or out of the college if they get too squalid. That is, the problem of rules and their enforcement cannot be swept under the carpet. It is not the province of this committee to state just what the rules ought to be. It may be that the rules should not be as specific as some of them are now. It may be that we should rely on the old, vague, but not necessarily bad standard of "conduct unbecoming a Harvard man." But to say that one should behave like a Harvard man is still to state a rule, and the problem of enforcing it still remains.

Though squalor is attractive to all of us some of the time, and to some of us all the time, we do not believe that most students want to live in social squalor. They will be prepared themselves to help bring it under control. Therefore they should probably participate in, share power in, setting the rules for their common life in the Houses. Indeed they are better equipped by experience to contribute to decisions in this field than in the purely academic one. Through the problem of enforcement will still remain, it may be easier to enforce rules that the students themselves have had some share in establishing. But this committee is unwilling to go further in a matter that falls within the competence of the committee headed by Professor Fainsod.

It is idle to proclaim glibly that the university should not act in loco parentis towards its students. If it is one of the jobs of a parent to help prevent his children from getting into bad trouble, to help if they do get in, and to set up rules that, if obeyed, will contribute to these ends and positively enhance the purposes for which they are members of the family — if these are among the duties of a parent, they are duties that the university will in fact and rightly undertake. But if the word "parent" bothers us, let us say that they are duties that any member of a community, which is a real community, will undertake towards other members. Remember that a community may still be a community even if its members are not all the same and not all equal. Let us put the matter crudely: if a student in a House were known to be getting into a situation that might lead him
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or others into serious damage, there is hardly anyone in the university who would say that its officers and members should pass by on the other side and claim that its job was over when it had done its best to teach the student an academic subject. By all means let a man make his own mistakes, provided they are not irretrievable mistakes—and it is not always clear which are irretrievable. In this sense the university will act in loco communitatis, and the real question as usual is not whether it should do so as a general principle, but how the principle is to be applied in particular cases.

The final danger is that resident tutors, in their reaction against the enforcement of rules they do not believe in and feel that others do not believe in, may adopt a policy of never saying anything at all about students to the Master and Senior Tutor. Thus information about students who may be getting into real trouble may never be brought together and examined, and nothing may be done to check the student in his downward path before it is too late. The worst examples have been a very few cases of suicide, the investigation of which disclosed that some persons had had scattered evidence of potential trouble but had never reported it and, indeed, had never done anything about it at all. Now when all the formal doctrines have been self-righteously asserted, we do want to prevent our students from doing serious damage to themselves, just as we would want to prevent anyone we were living in a community with from doing so. Whatever else they do, resident tutors must feel free to talk with the Senior Tutor and Master about students they know who look as if they might be getting into trouble; and they certainly ought to be able to do so in such a way that it does no further damage to the student: "Don't crack down on so-and-so now. If you do, I'll never tell you about a student again. But keep an eye on him, and perhaps have a word with him would be a good plan. I can't say anything more." If resident tutors get into the doctrinal position of never paying any attention to students' non-academic life or never speaking about it to the Master and Senior Tutor, they will certainly not be able to do one of the most important parts of their job.

The recommendations the committee is ready to make are admittedly out of proportion with the length of the foregoing discussion. More good may be done by making explicit the nature of the problems than by indicating specific remedies, especially when the solutions must rely so much on the way individuals play their roles. In this connection we make no formal recommendation but invite the favorable attention of students and tutors to the discussion groups on the tutorial relationship in the Houses which the Bureau of Study Counsel is ready to organize on request. On the basis of its earlier experience with discussion groups of teaching fellows, the Bureau is prepared to provide moderators and materials for such groups, to consist of from five to fifteen tutors and students. Even when we do make recommendations, we make them rather in the form of suggestions for measures that might be experimented with rather than as rules to be embodied in formal legislation by the faculty. We wish above all to encourage the Masters and staffs of the Houses to try experiments in organization, and we are interested to discover how little knowledge of the experiments now being tried in particular Houses disseminates to the other Houses.

1. Quincy House has introduced a system whereby all resident tutors and such non-resident tutors as wish to participate are each assigned as advisors to a certain number of sophomores. In order to spread acquaintance with students more widely and to multiply the channels of contact with them, the students assigned to each tutor are chosen so as not to come either from his entry or from his field of concentration. The committee recommends that the other Houses experiment with some such system, continuing it in later years to include juniors and seniors and, if they are sufficiently familiar with the House and the problems of undergraduates, and if they are willing to put in the time, bringing in selected House Associates to serve as advisors.

2. The committee recommends that Masters specify clearly, especially to resident tutors but also to non-resident ones, the duties they are expected to perform. If they accept the job under these conditions, the Masters will be in a position to require that they perform these duties, and indeed their own consciences will lead them to do so. If they cannot bring themselves to perform these duties, they will have no excuse for accepting the job, which will then be open for acceptance by others who are willing to perform them.

3. As we have repeatedly pointed out, most resident tutors tend to be young and not to remain in the Houses for any considerable length of time. There is absolutely nothing wrong with these characteristics in themselves, but the committee believes that the Houses would benefit by including among the resident staff persons of a greater variety of ages and seniority in the academic
profession. In view of the currently early age at which men get married, there is only one way of bringing this about — by providing in the Houses more suites for married resident tutors. Married women and even babies would also, we believe, bring a further civilizing influence to the Houses. At present Mather House provides three suites for married resident tutors. The committee recommends that at least this many be provided in the older Houses that do not include such suites now. We recognize that the conversion of student rooms into suites for married couples will involve the university in great expense. Money is no minor consideration, and we sometimes feel helpless before the unshakable conviction of many students, that if money is needed Harvard will always be able to find it. Nevertheless we recommend that, if money can possibly be made available, it should be spent for this purpose.

4. More generally we believe that the Houses would benefit by including a somewhat greater variety of inhabitants. To include a greater variety obviously entails a smaller proportion of undergraduates, and accordingly this proposal gets us into the problem of "living out." Upon application to the Dean of Students in Harvard College, students in certain categories are allowed at present to live outside the Houses: married students, of course, Crimson editors, musicians, students with various psychological problems, etc. Even after such persons have been given permission to live out, each House still has more students assigned to it than it has beds for. The difference is called the Master's Quota, because the Master exercises, in consultation with the Dean of Students, the right to allow this further number of juniors and seniors to live outside his House.

In testimony before the committee, a number of undergraduates expressed a strong preference for living out. They gave a variety of reasons. For example, one student complained that he was not allowed to paint the walls of his room the color he liked; another, that he was allowed to eat in the dining hall at certain hours only; a third, that in a House with four hundred members he saw the same people all the time; a fourth, that living in a House was incompatible with his personal "life style." At times we have been scared by our realization that some students are more sorry for themselves than they will be able to afford to be in later life. It is touching but terrifying that they expect the university to be nothing less than everything for them. Of course we pressed the students for their reasons, and they cannot altogether be blamed for what we got. The reasons are less important than the fact. About two hundred students now living in Houses, who will be juniors and seniors, applied this last year to be allowed to live out during this present one. How many would in fact choose to live out, if all were allowed to live out who wished to do so, we cannot tell. Perhaps the number would not be great: the very fact it is forbidden gives some undergraduates a strong reason for wishing to live out now. Nor can we tell what effect the co-residence of men and women in the Houses would have on the number wishing to live out. It might well decrease the number, but we feel sure that in any event some students would wish to do so.

While recognizing the force of some of the reasons undergraduates give for wishing to live out, the committee believes strongly that Harvard should remain a residential college, indeed that students should not be encouraged to come here unless they are ready to accept this fact. Complete freedom of residence is incompatible with the maintenance of such an institution. The committee is also worried about the effect the freedom to live out might have on the demand for housing in Cambridge, a demand that is already insufferably great. Still, the committee wishes the college to retain some flexibility in this matter, provided flexibility will serve other useful purposes at the same time.

The completion of Mather House will make a number of additional places available for occupancy by undergraduates in Houses. Harvard College remaining approximately constant in size, this would in due course tend to decrease the Master's Quota, and thus actually decrease in any one House the number of students allowed to live out. The committee recommends that, even after the completion of Mather, a Master's Quota not exceeding five per cent of the students assigned to each of the Houses be retained. The advent of Mather House is supposed to make possible the deconversion from multiple occupancy to single of all rooms assigned to juniors and seniors. A Master might use his quota to deconvert further sophomore rooms: our ultimate aim should surely be that every student shall have a bedroom-study of his own. A Master might also use his quota to allow more juniors and seniors to live out than he would otherwise be able to do. The
committee does not recommend that he exercise this option unless he is able to fill the places thus made vacant with graduate students from all parts of the university and not just from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, but it does not believe that he would find it difficult to do so. The presence of a few more graduate students would add to the variety of life in the Houses. It might also help allay, though only in token fashion, the discontent of those graduate students who feel that they are not treated as full members of the university community.

5. The committee ends this section of its report with a recommendation on a related but different matter. The House libraries are, or can be, vital supports for the specific contribution Houses make to education. At the present time many of the House librarians are students who belong to some Graduate School of the university, but who have no other connection with the House, and who are so busy elsewhere that they can play little part in its life outside the narrow limits of their job. The libraries might be more responsive to the needs of the Houses if the librarianships were assigned to persons more fully members of the Houses. The committee recommends that every House librarianship, with its stipend, be assigned to a resident tutor of the House in question, except when the result would be so rapid a turnover in the office of librarian that the library would be apt to go downhill. That is, the resident tutor should be in a position to serve as librarian for more than one year.

VI

THE FELLOWS AND ASSOCIATES

The committee now turns to the role of senior faculty in the Houses, especially the role of Associates and Fellows. Attached to each House are some twenty Associates and three Fellows. They are usually senior members of the faculty, but may be distinguished outsiders; in any case they hold Corporation appointments. Many Associates serve without limit of time, and it appears that they seldom resign, nor does a Master often get rid of them, though he certainly has the right to recommend such action to the Dean of the Faculty. Once an Associate, always an Associate, is the general rule. Fellows are usually chosen from the ranks of the Associates and revert to that status when they have served their time. Fellows serve for three years in that capacity, the term not usually being renewable, and receive a token emolument ($500 a year) for their services. Both Associates and Fellows are entitled to a certain number of free meals in the House dining halls. That is, they are expected to eat some meals there.

In the early days of the Houses, the Associates were thought of as unofficial advisers to the Master in setting House policy. They are seldom in fact used in that capacity, except in so far as they are, with the tutors, members of the Senior Common Room of the House, and the Common Room collectively has some influence on House policy. The criteria for their selection as Associates are far from clear. Today they are apt to be professors who are felt to add luster to the House and to be of special interest to undergraduates, or they are former House tutors who are thought to take a special interest in the House and with whom the Senior Common Room does not wish to lose touch. What their special duties or responsibilities to the House may be, how they are properly to be used, if indeed they are willing to be used at all, is vague. What is clear is that there are tenured members of the faculty, who might be interested in, and able to make a contribution to, the Houses who,
largely by inadvertence, are never invited to become Associates of any House.

When the unofficial activity of the Associates as advisers to the Master went into decline, the Fellows were instituted in the hope that they would do what had originally been expected of the Associates and that they would feel a special responsibility for taking an interest in House activities. Their fee was supposed to make them feel guilty if they were idle. Some of the Masters do indeed ask their Fellows to help and support them in setting and carrying out House policy. But the duties of Fellows still remain vague. It is not that they are irresponsible, but it is still not clear just what it is they are supposed to do, and therefore not surprising if they do not do it.

Some Associates never show up at their Houses at all, even though their names are left on the roster. Most Associates and Fellows show up for the more formal House functions, such as House dinners. Many of them appear once a week at the luncheons for the Senior Common Room that most Houses hold. There is no doubt whatever that they often enjoy these occasions — and any institution that will add to the general enjoyment of life this committee will automatically endorse. There is no doubt also that tutors and other junior members of the Senior Common Room often appreciate this association with senior members of the faculty, and in this way Associates add much, though intangibly, to the sense of community among the teaching staff of a House. But none of this does much for the undergraduates.

It is also true, and much to their credit, that Fellows and Associates rarely refuse, and never without good reason, formal invitations to attend meetings of special groups within a House, such as luncheons of “tables” on special subjects, or to talk to meetings of a House on subjects or issues within their special competence. These occasions do bring Associates into contact with undergraduates, but they are relatively formal. It was admirable also how, during the events of last April, Associates were willing to come to their Houses at the invitation of Masters or students and talk for long hours with students and tutors about the issues raised by the occupation of University Hall, the “bust,” and the strike. The devotion is there, and some felt it a pity that it took a crisis to bring the devotion out.

Outside of the occasions mentioned, Fellows and Associates rarely appear in the Houses. Of course there is great variation from person to person and from House to House. Some Associates appear far more often than others, and some Houses manage to get their Associates to show up far more often than others do. The committee examined the records of the House dining rooms in this respect for a period of seven months in the academic year 1967-68 and found that the House with the best score in Associates (Leverett) did more than three times as well as the one with the worst. What is more important, the average number of times an Associate ate a meal in a House was only a small fraction more than once a month, and the vast majority of these meals must have been taken with the Senior Common Room. What is lacking is informal association with undergraduates.

Yet there is nothing that many undergraduates want more, except the presence of women as regular inhabitants of the Houses. At least there is nothing they say they want more. Though they may do so only because they think that something they have a right to is being kept from them, no behavior on our part could be more patronizing than to imply that we know what the students want better than they do themselves. The desire is expressed not only by the officers of undergraduate organizations but also by undergraduates without official position, a number of whom the committee was at pains to interview. Not every undergraduate expressed this opinion. There are students, and those not the least impressive, who wish only to be left alone to pursue their own interests without bothering about members of the faculty except in the classroom, and sometimes not even then. But many undergraduates did express this desire. The desire was not limited to contact with the Fellows and Associates of their own Houses. Any professor prominent in affairs they were concerned with was a target, the sort of professor sometimes called an “eagle.” But of course their own Fellows and Associates were the most presentable targets.

What did the students want to associate with members of the faculty for? It is difficult to find words for expressing these intangibles without giving the wrong nuance and, above all, without sounding more pompous than any man has the right to be, but let us try to convey the feel of what was being said to us — and we may be wholly mistaken about it. It was not as if the students had rejected their own parents — and in any event the rejection of parents is one of those phrases people use without knowing what they mean by it — but as if they felt the need for additional parents and of a different kind, ones whose experiences and interests were
closer to what they conceived to be their own future experiences and interests, ones who, more than their real parents, had been around in that conceived world and could tell them what it was like out there, ones who might serve as models of what they perhaps were going to be. Can you imagine it? They were looking for model parents and found professors! And they wanted to talk with these model parents about the things model parents are supposed to know about: not just the technicalities of a particular discipline but what may be broadly called the conduct of life. It is better still to say that, if professors were to be models, not necessarily to be accepted but at least to be entertained as possibilities — entertained with some willing suspension of disbelief — the students wanted to know what the models were like, all around and not just seen from in front on the podium. Moreover, if we must use the family analogy, “parents” may be the wrong word, for parents pretend to a residual authority. “Uncles” is better. For the undergraduates do not want us to “tell” them anything in these areas, and if we did try to “tell” we should probably, to use Mr. Justice Holmes’s word, drool. They want to learn from us without our telling. More specifically, they want to talk with the potential models freely and informally on all sorts of subjects, including subjects that might become sensitive, as they can seldom talk with real parents, or as real parents are seldom able to talk. They want us to listen too, and listen we should, provided that we do not allow them to mistake, as they sometimes do, a failure to agree with them for a failure to listen to them. An uncle is not a psychiatric interviewer: he is allowed to talk back. To talk back is to take seriously what the other man says, not just as a symptom but as an argument.

Among the paradoxes we encountered in talking with undergraduates the most interesting is the parental paradox. On the one hand, students tend to heap scorn on anything smacking of the university’s standing in loco parentis over against them, especially in matters connected with “discipline” but sometimes even in others. Such is the students’ explicit stance. But implicitly, in the other things they say, many students — not all — are asking from senior members of the university a great deal in the way of parental, or at least avuncular, behavior, and they give us little credit for what we do in this way already. They may be asking more than earlier generations of students wanted to ask. In a time when moral standards are in question, they are specially concerned with the conduct of life in the broadest sense of the word. And in a time when the public status of intellectuals has risen — though the intellectuals, who are just as sorry for themselves as the students are, will be the first to deny that it has done so — students may recognize in academics a better model for the conduct of life than an earlier generation was prepared to recognize. This search for a morality may be the real source of the increased value set on the emotions and of the demand for relevance in courses. Detachment is the attitude students have most trouble handling. Courses are not fit places for absorbing what they especially want to absorb, but if they cannot find it elsewhere, they will seek it even in the classroom.

Their confidence in us may well be misplaced. They may be asking of us more than we can give, or should be expected to give. We, senior members of the faculty, conscious as we are of our own defects — or rather, conscious as we are of one another’s defects — wonder whether we could ever reasonably hope to meet the students’ needs in this area. As we look about a faculty meeting we ask ourselves: Are these the people the students would have as models? Among the many things we have failed to teach them the most serious is that we ourselves, no more than other poor erring mortals but surely no less, are miserable sinners — as are the students themselves. What is still more unnerving is that we cannot fairly be expected to be other than miserable sinners. No doubt we can teach physics or even sociology competently if not eloquently — that is our job and that we can be held to. But it is sheer luck if we are able to do more than that, and bad luck cannot be held against a man.

Whether or not professors could provide through informal contact what the students appear to be asking of them, the failure at least of the contact itself is particularly visible in the case of the Fellows and Associates of the Houses. The student reads their names on the list of the House staff and he wonders where they are. Indeed the committee received some testimony that the literature Harvard distributes to prospective students tends to oversell the Houses; students come to expect too much of them and are correspondingly dissatisfied with the reality. It might be better to present Harvard College as a kind of V.M.I. in which only the hardiest could survive. The many that would in fact survive and even manage to enjoy themselves would be correspondingly elated. The student may even see some of the Associates, but usually only at House luncheons and dinners and up on the dais, highly visible there but talking with other
members of the staff and not with him. What are they there for? A good question. The House Masters and the tutors, on the other hand, recognize the deficiencies in the relationship between Associates and students, but recognize also the value of the many of the Associates to the Senior Common Room and, after all, what do they cost the House? Only the time spent in sending them notices of House functions.

The problem is not a new one, though it may have become more salient through the more explicit demands of the present generation of students, and from the very beginning of the Houses, special efforts have been made to bring the senior members of the staff into closer contact with undergraduates. Houses have set rules that a senior member who eats in the House dining hall must not sit down with other staff members but with undergraduates. Special tables and special days have been set aside, at which staff members would be expected to appear, prepared to eat and talk with any undergraduate who chose to join him. Special "tables" on special subjects have been set up, and Fellows and Associates with an interest in these subjects, invited to join.

But one finding is clear: so far none of these efforts has been very successful for very long. After a few years, interest wanes, or the tutor who organized the experiment and whose enthusiasm made it work for the time being leaves Harvard. Then something else must be tried. The effort must be continually renewed. None of the experiments has maintained enough success to become an institution. Now one of the views of one of the members of the committee is that a well designed society is one that can be operated by ordinary damned fools—or, if you like, by miserable sinners. If it requires extraordinary abilities or extraordinary efforts to make it work, it is not viable, for no one can count on these extraordinary things being in adequate supply. This view holds good especially of institutions designed to meet needs that, however important, are no one's central responsibility. So far it seems to require extraordinary efforts to maintain regular contact between senior staff and students.

Let us not blame anyone. Or rather, let us distribute the blame so evenly that no one need feel slighted by the share he gets. Most professors are busy men. Going down to lunch at a House on the chance of meeting students is not one of their more salient responsibilities. It is not that they cannot talk with students. When a professor works directly with a student on a matter of mutual intellectual interest—when, for instance, he works with a student who is writing an honors thesis—excellent relations may build up quite naturally. This sort of relationship may be the best human one the Harvard experience can provide. Not enough professors are ready to enter into it, or are asked to do so, but there is a great deal of variation between departments, and some have excellent records in this respect. But what about relationships outside of immediate and shared intellectual interests? Given the mores, not just of Americans but of humanity at large, it is embarrassing to a professor, as it would be to anyone, to go down to a House for lunch and thrust himself upon one or more unfortunate undergraduates. "What," he asks, "would I have to say to them anyway?" The question is a very modest and natural one to ask, and whatever be the answer to it, in itself it does the professor a great deal of credit. It is even more embarrassing for a professor to go down for lunch to a special table at a House, a table where it has been advertised that he will be available, only to find that no undergraduate will join him. But this has often been the experience of professors. What has even been known to happen is that, after a professor has joined undergraduates for lunch, the undergraduates have at once gotten up and left.

One of the paradoxes we have encountered in talking with students is the contrast between the needs expressed collectively by their official organizations and what they individually are willing to do to meet those needs. Again and again members of the committee asked students who vigorously expressed a need for more contact with professors what they had done about it themselves. Had they phoned a professor and asked him down to lunch at a House? Had they gone to see him at his office? We assured them—and in this we think we are correct and certainly ought to be correct—that no professor would fail to respond to such an appeal. The answer, not just usually but invariably, was that they would not dream of doing such a thing, and indeed it goes against an almost universal rule of social behavior which says it is the social superior, and not the inferior, who takes the initiative in inviting "social" or informal interaction between the two. One officer of an undergraduate organization, who expressed great pleasure that he had, as head of his House Committee, established the best of relations with his House Master and Senior Tutor, vehemently expressed the desire for still more contact with professors. He was an obviously intelligent and energetic man, but what had he done about it? Nothing.
It is true that official undergraduate organizations exist to make demands, and would be felt to be derelict in their duty if they did not make demands on the rest of the university. Nor do we imply in the least that the demands they make are not sincerely felt by some undergraduates. But the contrast between official demand and unofficial behavior raises the question, at least in this case, whether the real demand is as widespread and strong as it is put forward as being. Certainly some of the actions that would put an end to conditions undergraduates complain of are within their own hands to perform, and they do not perform them. Perhaps it is more fun to make "the administration" take action on one's behalf than to take action oneself. This behavior would make more sense if it were clear—and in the present case it is not clear—what action "the administration" could take that would be more effective than the students' own.

Even more important is the realization that undergraduates are very like the rest of us, and much more like undergraduates of earlier generations than they are said to be. After all, if we are reluctant to thrust ourselves upon students on informal occasions—especially when we thrust ourselves upon them on formal ones—the undergraduates are just as reluctant to thrust themselves on professors, and with reasons at least as justifiable. But if this is the case, that the students are just men, after all, and nothing superhuman—not that being a man is a bad thing to be. Why then do we go on saying that this is the most intelligent, mature, and energetic undergraduate generation that ever existed? If the students were such paragons, surely they would be capable of asking a professor they were interested in down to lunch at a House. If they did so, they would show, more effectively than in any other way, that they were the men of the world, whatever the professor might be. If, after all, it is they and not the professors that demand more contact—though we are sure that many professors would also welcome more—why should not they take some initiative in the matter? They take plenty of initiative in other ways. Why not in this? But no. However intelligent, mature, and energetic the students may be, they are still no more or less human than earlier generations.

What is the upshot of all this discussion? There is an expressed need on the part of many, though not all, undergraduates for more contact between them and senior members of the university. The need is for a kind of association, outside of the narrowly academic sphere, in which senior members become available as models for students in what we have vaguely called the conduct of life, models not necessarily to be accepted but at least to be present, models—if the phrase does not lead to misunderstanding—that can be played with. We believe that this is a legitimate need. Whether or not most professors can meet the need, certainly some can, and it would be good for the educational process if they did so. What is more, we have rightly or wrongly committed ourselves to trying to meet the need. Specifically we committed ourselves when the Houses were founded, for when we say that the Houses should be real intellectual and social communities, we say that this need, among others, is one they should address themselves to. More specifically still, there has been from the beginning an unstated assumption that this was one reason for setting up the jobs of House Fellow and Associate. The students feel the need; it is one worth meeting; whether or not it can be met, we have committed ourselves to trying.

What sort of conditions will allow such a relationship between professors and students to develop? The students individually will not take much initiative in developing it, and neither individually will most members of the faculty. What are needed are social institutions, but institutions of a peculiar kind, the most difficult of them all to devise—formal institutions that will produce informal, unforged, and natural results. For our assumption is that the kind of relationship envisaged cannot develop if the two parties are constrained to enter into a shotgun wedding. Indeed the relationship best develops through participation in activities that have some purpose other than the self-conscious maintenance of the relationship itself. Perhaps House courses, if many Associates participate in them, will be such activities. Outside of participation in common tasks, the committee feels far less certain of what will work, and its suggestions may seem to fall ridiculously short of the height of the problem. What it can best do is help Houses see the nature of the institutions needed, and to encourage them in further experimentation.

The recommendations of the committee with respect to Fellows and Associates are the following:

1. Every tenured member of the Faculty should be offered an opportunity to be associated with some House and to be a member of its Senior Common Room. He need not avail himself of
the opportunity unless he is really interested, but the opportunity should be offered him. Some House would be required to accept each such tenured member. The committee recognizes that, if any large number of men availed themselves of this opportunity, a House might have trouble finding places for all its staff at House functions. But the committee feels that the participation in the Houses of all senior faculty who are interested is so important that the experiment ought to be tried. Non-tenured members of the faculty should also be offered an opportunity of expressing an interest in being associated with a House, but both because of the number of persons already admitted to Senior Common Rooms and because junior scholars are already strongly represented on tutorial staffs, there should be no guarantee that every such non-tenured member of the faculty will be accepted by some House.

2. At present many appointments of House Associates are without limit of time. House Masters no doubt may ask Associates who have not made much contribution to their Houses to resign their positions, but Masters are reluctant to do so. In order to make the contingent nature of this position more clear, the committee recommends that, for all persons who become House Associates in the future, the term of tenure in the position be five years, with the possibility, but not the guarantee, of renewal.

3. The effort to get Associates to come regularly to the Houses should be made a more formal duty of House staffs than it is now. A resident tutor in a particular department may be expected to know the Associates of his House and other members of the faculty who belong to that department. He should have the explicit duty of getting such Associates and other members of the faculty to the House for meals or other meetings, other than the regular staff luncheons, perhaps as often as once a month. Nothing in this recommendation should be held to prevent the Master's also inviting Associates to the House, and nothing to prevent Associates from coming to the House more often on their own hook. The equivalent duty for other Associates, such as members of departments not represented in the House by a resident tutor, should be accepted by the Master or assigned to a particular Assistant Senior Tutor. The assumption behind this recommendation is that Associates and other professors will come to a House if they are invited, but that an organized effort to invite them must be made.

4. It has been said that there is no problem at Harvard that cannot be solved by money and liquor. The committee has a recommendation that will require both, if they can be found. One of the problems in establishing contact between professors and students at meals is the reluctance of either party to thrust itself upon the other. In order to lower the threshold of reluctance, to break the ice between student and professor, and to attract Associates to the Houses, the Houses should experiment, if the money can be found, with holding gatherings before lunches or dinners on certain days of the week in the Junior or Senior Common Rooms, gatherings at which sherry or the like would be served and to which all students and members of the Senior Common Room would be automatically invited.

5. If contact between professor and student, or between students themselves, is once established, it should not be rudely broken up. At present the serving lines in the House dining halls are closed at 7 p.m. and shortly afterwards persons eating or talking together are hurried out by the dining hall staffs. This is not a civilized way of living. The committee recommends that the dishes be cleared away at the usual hour, but that those present and those who wish to come in be allowed to stay and that a coffee machine be kept in operation.

6. The committee believes that more Associates would be attracted to the House dining halls if their amenities were improved. The university should work towards improving these amenities, including the installation of screens around the serving lines, washable rugs, better soundproofing, tablecloths at certain meals, etc. The committee notes that the non-physical amenities of the dining halls ought to be improved also. The committee believes that there has been a decline in standards of civility here as elsewhere. One member of the committee brought to its attention an incident he witnessed when eating in a House dining hall. A student went to the piano that was in the hall and started banging out some kind of jazz. Two others joined him and accompanied him by striking knives on glasses. This behavior effectively prevented others who were present and wished to converse quietly from doing anything but pay reluctant attention to the performers. Nobody, certainly no member of the House staff who was in the room, asked them to stop or called them to task in any way. The incident may not be important in itself, but the behavior is
contemptuous of the conditions in which civilized — or civilizable — people can live together, and such incidents may be becoming more common. The committee has no recommendation to make in this area: the problem is not one that legislation can easily address itself to. But the committee does wish to point out, both to House staffs and to students, that, if such incidents do become more common, it is idle to expect that senior faculty members can be induced to participate more fully in the life of the Houses. They simply will not go to the Houses under such conditions.

VII

HOUSE COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS

The committee turns now to matters which may stretch its terms of reference but which were strongly brought to its attention in discussion with undergraduates. From the very beginning of the House Plan, the undergraduates in each House have elected every year a House Committee. These committees do a great deal of useful work in providing services of practical convenience to House members and in trying to promote activities that may add to their pleasure and cultivation. To finance these activities the House Committees must collect dues from the members, and sometimes, in order to support activities of greater worth, they find themselves organizing others, such as “mixers,” which they recognize as somewhat less worthwhile but which at least have the advantage of bringing in money.

The House Committees work hard and get little recognition for doing so. They are, moreover, paid little attention as organs for the expression of undergraduate opinion, though they are as close to the grass-roots as any groups in the college. They are treated simply as people performing useful, even essential, but rather mundane services. The chairmen of the House Committees would like to organize themselves as a body meeting regularly to discuss, and to try to reach agreement upon, issues within their common sphere of interest, and to express their views on policies concerning undergraduate life in the Houses. The committee received testimony that the chairmen of House Committees do not now command the facilities that would enable them to convene, to get together, easily.

The present committee looks with favor on groups which contribute so much in unobtrusive ways to the amenity of life in the Houses, which have proved their worth over a long period of time, which work so hard, and which are popularly elected and so presumably representative of undergraduates in the Houses. The present committee is almost ready to advance in connection with these groups the general principle: to those who do the work should belong
the power. At any rate, the committee would like to strengthen the
hand of the House Committees and to set them a little more free,
to give them a little more room for maneuver, in developing activi-
ties that may turn out to be of higher value than those they are
sometimes forced to undertake now. In this area, the committee
makes the following recommendations:

1. The Dean of Harvard College should encourage the forma-
tion of a committee to consist of the chairmen of the under-
graduate House Committees. He and the Committee on the Houses
should pay close heed to the views of this committee. The commit-
tee should enjoy the right of receiving secretarial support for con-
vening meetings, for conducting correspondence, for keeping
records, etc. from the office of the House of which the current
chairman of this committee (the chairman of the chairmen) is a
member.

2. The Dean of the Faculty should grant yearly to each House
Master a sum amounting to about five dollars for every under-
graduate who is a member of his House, over and above the funds
put presently at the disposal of the Master. This sum should be
earmarked for the support of activities chosen and conducted by
the undergraduate House Committee, but given final approval by
the Master. This sum should be able to provide a House Com-
mittee with a little risk capital for trying out activities of a better
sort and freeing it to some extent from the need of promoting
activities, such as mixers, which are merely certain to make money.
This recommendation does not imply that other current means
of raising money for the use of House Committees, such as House
dues, should be abandoned.

The question of the House Committees leads us further into the
organization of the Houses and to possible means of engaging all
those who in their different capacities are members of the Houses
in a joint effort to improve the quality of life there. Perhaps the
best thing the committee can do is not to suggest innovations itself
but to bring experiments that are already being tried to the attention
of all parties concerned.

This last year Eliot House instituted what might be called a House
Council, including undergraduates, tutors, Fellows, and Associates.
The committee recommends that the other Houses try the ex-
periment of forming Councils with a similar composition. The details
should be left to the individual Houses, but some members, perhaps
all, of the undergraduate House Committees should be included in
such Councils, together with representatives of the resident and
other tutors, Fellows, and Associates—in short, representatives of
all elements connected with the Houses. Note incidentally that
service on such Councils would provide one more means of bringing
Associates fully into the life of the Houses.

Such a House Council should be broadly charged with recom-
mending to the Master action that might improve the quality of life
in the House. No doubt many of the needs that it might meet are
being met now through informal consultation. Yet the committee
recommends that the process be formalized, if only as the outward
and visible sign that a House seriously believes that all its elements
have a right to be consulted. Specifically, the House Council might
review the program of House courses in order to insure that sooner
or later they represented the chief current interests and enthusiasms
of House members and brought in a variety of types of instructors.
It might be charged with recommending to the Master how the Ford
Foundation grant to the House (but not the so-called Master’s dis-
cretionary fund) should be spent. It should certainly advise the
Master in the choice of tutors, Fellows, and Associates. The ques-
tion of what other powers might be wielded by such a body may
well be left to the individual Houses and to the Fainsod Committee
on the governance of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, on whose
field of competence this committee is now in danger of encroaching.

Note well that this committee intends that a House Council should
recommend action to the Master and not force it on him against his
better judgment. Although we are charged with examining the role
of the faculty in the Houses, we have had nothing to say about the
most important members of the faculty present in them—the Mas-
ters themselves. However much they vary in style, we have nothing
but praise for their dedication, especially in view of the vital but
ill-defined nature of their duties in setting the tone of the Houses.
The College may have better Masters than it deserves. We do not
wish to tell them what to do. Rather we wish to be tender of them
and not to set further formal restrictions on their freedom of action.
As a group they work themselves hard, and there is a real danger that,
if the burdens of their office were not balanced by the opportunities
offered by discretionary power, the sort of men we should like to
have serve as Masters would be unwilling to accept the job, to the
very great loss of the College. But this committee believes that a House Council such as we have envisaged would be more apt to provide support for the Master and a further opportunity for him to accomplish what he would like to see accomplished than it would be to lay further fetters upon him.

Finally, to descend from the sublime—not to the ridiculous but to the merely convenient, the committee has had brought to its attention that, to facilitate the expression of opinion and its wide dissemination on paper, it would be well if every House were provided with a nickel Xerox machine. Without further comment, the committee so recommends.

The committee ends its report with a shortened summary of its recommendations.

1. Each House should be assigned, in addition to its present staff, a half-time tutorship for administrative purposes, to be distributed as the Master sees fit among those tutors entitled Assistant Senior Tutors.

2. Secretarial services should be made available in the Houses to resident members of House staffs on a part-time basis.

3. Each Allston Burr Senior Tutor should be granted an extra half-year’s leave of absence with pay after at least three years of service in that capacity.

4. The offering of House courses should be allowed, provided that no single House offers a large number of such courses, that courses be frequently changed, and that every House course must receive the approval every year of the Committee on General Education, which is financially responsible for such courses.

5. Each House should experiment with a system similar to that set up in Quincy House, whereby every sophomore is assigned as an advisee to some House tutor.

6. Masters should specify clearly to tutors the duties the latter are expected to perform.

7. When the money to do so can be found, all Houses should be provided with at least three suites each, suitable for occupancy by married resident tutors.

8. Each House should be assigned a “Master’s Quota” not exceeding five per cent of the number of students assigned to the House. The Master should be allowed to let this number of students “live out,” and he should be allowed to fill the places thus made vacant in the House with graduate students from all parts of the university and not just from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.
9. With the advent of Mather House, the deconversion of student rooms should be pressed, the goal being a single bedroom for at least every junior and senior.

10. Every House librarianship, with its stipend, should be assigned to a resident tutor of the House in question, except when the result would be a too rapid turnover in the office.

11. Every tenured member of the faculty should be offered the opportunity to be an Associate of some House and to be a member of its Senior Common Room.

12. For all persons who become House Associates in the future, the term of tenure of the office should be five years, with the possibility, but not the guarantee, of renewal.

13. A resident tutor should have the explicit duty of getting members of his department, especially those who are Fellows or Associates of his House, but also others, down to the House at least once a month for meals or meetings other than regular staff functions. The same duty for other Associates should be assumed by the Master or assigned to an Assistant Senior Tutor.

14. If the money can be found, Houses should experiment with holding a sherry party or the equivalent before luncheon or dinner on at least one day of the week, and to this party all members of the House, including undergraduates, should be automatically invited.

15. The House dining halls should not be closed shortly after seven p.m. as they are at present. The dishes should be cleared but the room left open with a coffee machine in operation.

16. The physical amenities of the House dining halls should be improved.

17. The Dean of Harvard College should encourage the formation of a committee to consist of the chairmen of the undergraduate House Committees, and this committee should have the right of secretarial support from the office of the House to which its current chairman belongs.

18. The Dean of the Faculty should grant yearly to each House Master a sum amounting to about five dollars for every undergraduate who is a member of the House, over and above the sums now put at the disposal of the Master, this sum to be set aside for the support of activities chosen and organized by the undergraduate House Committee, but given final approval by the Master.

19. Every House should experiment with the formation of a House Council to include representatives of Fellows, Associates, tutors, and undergraduate House Committee members.

20. Every House should be provided with a nickel Xerox machine for the use of all its members.

Respectfully submitted,

G. Richard Allison
Fred L. Glimp
Richard J. Herrnstein
Arthur Maass
William P. Reinhardt
F. Skiddy von Stade
Dean K. Whitla
George C. Homans, Chairman

November 1969
27F-06. House Renewal Subcommittees Appointments Act

SAC Chair Tamar Holoshitz (Quincy '10)
CHL Vice-Chair Ben Schwartz (Winthrop '10)

WHEREAS the college has undertaken the ambitious task of conducting major internal architectural changes to all twelve undergraduate houses, and

WHEREAS if any recommendations regarding changes are to be salient it is necessary for there to be significant student input,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Council support the creation of two House Renewal subcommittees, each to be composed of 6 students and co-chaired by a student and senior house official, and each focused on either “Neo-Georgian” or “Modern” architecture;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Student Affairs Committee appoint the following students to the two student subcommittees:

Neo-Georgian Subcommittee
Laura Dean
Josh Stein
Tian Feng
Rebecca Resnick
Mohindra Rupram
Lauren Schwartz

Modern Subcommittee
Seema Amble
Dan Kroop
Siri Uotila
Colin Donovan
Marcella Marsala
Jacky Kwong
Author’s Note:

The charter of the committees is as follows:

“As part of the College’s ongoing effort to enhance undergraduate life, we are in the early stages of examining all aspects of the Harvard residential experience. To that end, two new subcommittees are being formed; one that will focus on House Renewal as it relates to the Neo-Georgian Houses and one that will focus on House Renewal as it relates to the Modern Houses. These subcommittees will have a total of three to four dinner meetings each between November and December to discuss issues related to the House Renewal project. They will explore the future direction of learning activities, teaching, faculty involvement, and sustainable practices in the Houses, taking into account the House system’s history and current status. The House Renewal project is in the early planning stage, and these subcommittees will provide input to this process. Specifically, they will each develop a set of recommendations through the course of their meetings, which will then be integrated into the final House Renewal planning report.”

UC President Matt Sundquist (Mather '09)
SAC CHL Vice Chair Ben Schwartz (Winthrop '10)
UC Communications Director Daniel Kroop (Pforzheimer '10)
SAC Secretary Senan Ebrahim (East Yard '12)

WHEREAS the FAS Dean has announced a forthcoming house renewal,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Council adopts the following position paper on the House Renewal Process to be circulated to the appropriate parties.

Introduction:

The conversations and planning of the House Renewal process now happening in various committees are of the utmost importance for the future of Houses and the College. In order to contribute to this process, we propose in this paper a number of specific suggestions based on our experiences and impressions from having seen and lived in Harvard housing. This paper is by no means an exhaustive report or set of recommendations on the House Renewal process, but is rather an initial attempt to open discussion on a variety of facets of the Harvard house. We purposely abstained from discussions on the philosophy of life in the houses or more abstract questions as such matters are more complex and require more significant discussions and research. We believe the opinions of many students informed by their own rooms and the architecture in which they live, and for that reason we focus a good deal of our discussion on these topics.

Process:

It's clear that a variety of people will need to be involved at every stage of the planning and renovation process. It will be important to ensure that students, housemasters, tutors, and resident deans be brought into the preparation for the renovations, and that these individuals continue to work with architects and construction crews the duration of the building process. Besides having these individuals involved, it will also be essential to involve house staff in the process. House staff can provide recommendations on house and work-spaces, and this will facilitate the important work that the house staff does to keep the house functioning. Ideally, it seems that there could be a group of 4 or 5 people who would continually oversee everything from the time the planning has been finalized through the implementation process and who will also oversee last minute touch-ups. We would recommend this be a tutor, Resident Dean, student or two, housemaster, and staffer (probably the Superintendent for that house).

In order to create institutional memory, we believe it will be important to establish and continually update a set of best practices. Before renovations and planning begins, those overseeing the process ought to canvas formally and informally the members of the Yale
and Princeton communities specifically, but also anyone else at a school which has recently undergone this same process. Such solicitations will serve to inform our own efforts. During and after the renovations in the first few houses and beyond, the people involved with the process should compile information with advice, lessons learned, and guidelines for how to manage renovations and the swing year. These best practices should include information on how to foster community for individuals living in swing space, as well as information on how to oversee and be involved in the planning and renovation process. These best practices should be updated every year and available for anyone involved with the renovation process. Such recommendations could include tips from students to other students living in a swing space to advice from Resident Deans on how to ensure that students maintain contact with their tutors and advisors.

We suggest three or four open meetings with members of each house where architects are made aware of the needs and limitations of the houses. At these meetings architects can gradually present more and more specific ideas while taking suggestions. After each meeting, a refined floor-plan and architectural plan can be made available to members of the house for discussion and suggestions. In order to provide the most information, the architects should tour the houses while spaces and rooms are actually in use. A useful way to gain information would be to hold a poll or vote in each house on what resources students would most like to have available in their house, such as a game room, performance area, or theater. We also recommend that the Cambridge Historical Commission be consulted early and often so as to preserve the character of the houses and also to avoid potential delays in the renovation processes of the houses.

Communications about matters of House Renewal should be conducted as early and often as possible, and we suggest that final meeting for the House Program Planning Committee be an open meeting. We suggest that in order to encourage participation in this process, that these meetings be open to the Crimson as well as the general student body. It is tremendously important that any decisions regarding Allston be made openly and with input from students. As this will be an important decision to be made early in the process, it would set a most unfortunate tone for the entire process if a decision on this topic came as an announcement rather than a discussion.

Architecture:

Harvard architecture can be intimidating and isolating, and for this reason we recommend that there be ample open space and glass walls be used when possible so as to facilitate community within the houses. Common rooms should generally not be walk-through rooms, but instead could make use of glass doors and be positioned near trafficked areas in the house instead of as trafficked areas. This would allow anyone to easily identify what is going on in a given room without needing to disturb the room by opening a door. On the other hand, common spaces, such as game rooms or casual hang-out spaces should be walk-through areas which naturally facilitate casual interactions.

Hallways should not be long, straight corridors, but instead should utilize a distribution of common rooms, singles, and suites throughout and should take advantage of corners to build larger social suites. Tutor rooms should be easily accessible but not so close to student areas so as to make them unappealing to tutors, and this could mean placing tutor suites near the end of a hallway or entryway. The rooms for the tutors should be nice, but not unreasonably created, and they should also be specifically made for tutors. There are many instances of houses simply placing a tutor in a double or triple and using potential student residential space. It would be ideal to provide spacious and quality rooms certainly, but these rooms should be delineated beforehand as tutor rooms.

As many students as possible should have both a single and a common room available for their suite, and a single should be
prioritized over a larger common room. However, in cases when doubles are necessary, the double should be large enough that someone would not consider moving into their common room. In order to achieve such a balance, we suggest that singles be between 90-110 square feet in size, and doubles be between 140-170 square feet in size. “Walk-through” rooms, wherein a student must walk-through another room in order to reach a bathroom or egress, ought to be eliminated if possible. Instead rooms should be located off of a hallway within a suite. To optimize efficiency and privacy, both private single-unit bathrooms and larger communal bathrooms could be available. Each large suite should at least have one full private bathroom with a shower, and each floor could also have one communal bathroom with several showers. This provides privacy for students that value it, as well as efficiency for those that need it. Alternatively, large suites could have two smaller bathrooms and smaller suites could have just one bathroom. In cases where singles are off of a hallway, there will obviously still be a need for hallway bathrooms.

We also recommend that in all cases, housing be gender neutral both in design and in practice. It would be ideal for every room and suite to be built in such a way that any room or suite could be occupied by any grouping, regardless of the gender of the occupants. In addition to creating equity in housing, this will also ensure a fair housing lottery. In order to facilitate this, we recommend that bathrooms be unisex in public places and that singles, whenever possible, are equipped with locks on the doors.

The houses of the Resident Dean residents are of immense importance, and these spaces should be spacious and afford a certain degree of privacy, as well as provide guest spaces for the Resident Deans to make use of. The perks of the job are currently lacking, and providing quality housing with a space to potentially host students, as the Masters can in their houses, would be ideal.

The basements of buildings should be large, and the connection of spaces in adjoining houses so as to create more spaces and pool resources should be attempted whenever possible. Every house should have a game room, weight room, library, dining hall, and performance area. However, some resources could be shared, such as a printing press, art room, pottery room, or photo room could be shared. We also recommend that the most up-to-date technology support systems be installed in every house, including cable television and high-speed wireless. In order to facilitate the most efficient use of space for both use and the support of such apparatus, we recommend that whenever possible pipes and wiring be installed beyond the areas located directly below a house.

The offices of the Resident Dean, House Staff, and House Master should be as close to high-traffic areas such as the dining hall or main entrances to the house as possible. These areas in particular should be handicapped accessible, as should unquestionably the dining hall and library. Whenever possible, we recommend that common spaces and residential space be handicapped accessible so as to allow everyone within our community access to the resources and spaces available within the house.

**Swing-Space:**

We believe that a house to be used as a swing-house should be constructed, or some alternative space should be acquired to accommodate the residents of houses under construction. Distributing students throughout various campus locations, hotels, and other spaces would erode the house community.

It is not necessary that the swing space have a dining hall, but displaced residents of the house under construction should have a certain number of catered meals available on a weekly basis, as well as a constant supply of snack foods. Having kitchens could create liability and unnecessary risk and they might not be universally used, but some rooms should be outfitted with kitchens so that interested
students could use these spaces. Additionally, it would be valuable to make microwaves and fridges available in every room.

Swing houses should provide common spaces, and residents of the swing house should be accommodated as best as possible by trying to energize the SCR members for that house that year, having as much advising as possible available for that house, and making sure that an active group of tutors be available in the house. It would also be helpful to provide additional funding for the HoCo for houses in swing for that year, and the Masters and Resident Deans ought to be given an extra sum of money for their yearly budgets. This would facilitate extra activities, taking trips, etc, and might help offset the lack of housing available.

Finally, we recommend that residents of the swing house be able to have a commencement ceremony in the courtyard of their own house. This could create problems and might be inconvenient, but whenever possible we recommend that the commencement exercises for each house be held within that house.
One impetus for undertaking House Renewal was overcrowding in areas of the House system. While there has been a slight creep in enrollment numbers over the years, the underlying cause for overcrowding is that more and more students are choosing to live on campus instead of living in off-campus housing. Indeed, areas of overcrowding in the residential Houses have existed for many years. Since 1978, four reports (Friedman, W., 1978; Howe, J., 1983; Columbus, E., 1993; and the 2006-2007 Space Assessment study undertaken by the Dean of the College) have highlighted this problem and proposed possible solutions. In 1991, DeWolfe was brought on line to offer some relief. Presently, about 260 students reside in DeWolfe housing.

In the late 1960s and into the 1970s, the in-residence rate was roughly 90% of the enrolled student population. In addition to off-campus apartments, there were also more co-ops in which students could choose to reside. Presently, with the exception of the Dudley Co-op, all have either been decommissioned or, in the case of the Jordans, been converted to student residences affiliated with a House. Further, present housing policies require that all freshmen live on campus. For all undergraduates, Harvard’s housing policy is such that all students who wish to do so are able to live on campus. The result of this policy is that, with more students choosing to live on campus than when the Houses were built, the College is housing more students in the same amount of space. Today’s in-residence rate is approximately 99% of enrolled students.

Over the past two years, efforts have been made to decompress the crowding that currently exists in the Houses. The 2006-07 Space Assessment initiative identified spaces with the most acute overcrowding and sought to redistribute populations among the House system (by reducing the number of Tutor suites and Resident Scholar apartments) to alleviate acute overcrowding.