Pros, Cons, Desires, and Concerns about the FSILG Facilities Assessment Project -
Responses from November 2017 AILG Plenary exercise

Pros
  • Good to know what we need to do - roadmap going forward (never-ending renovation cycle)
  • Taking care of our buildings is important
  • Could create parity among FSILGs in terms of facilities
  • Learn what you don’t know
  • Clean, useful, detailed assessment
  • We can use data from assessment to encourage donations from chapter alumni
  • Great! Helpful for capital planning and fundraising!

Cons
  • High cost, low value
  • MIT has access to the data
  • Lack of transparency into vendor selection process
  • “One size fits all” nature of costs/analysis
  • MIT has access to data
  • Report does not provide directly actionable information
  • House could spend money on maintenance instead of report
  • Cost
  • Cost of $7500 is expensive if repeated every few years
  • Having information is not enough - needs to be an actionable plan
  • It’s mandatory

Desire
  • Support from MIT in responding to deficiencies and repairs
  • Customization: allow individual groups to target areas
  • Get information on state of house and improvements, not just an overview of what’s up to code
  • 50% cost DSL; 25% IRDF; 25% house
  • Help with donations
  • Support from the MIT Alumni Association for fundraising
  • MIT pays for 50% of upgrade costs
  • Allow houses to customize reports to add value
  • More than a report of what’s up to code
  • ADA [?]
  • External facilities manager
  • Support in implementation and continuing maintenance
  • Coordinated project management - oversight; vendors to use for specific tasks
  • Pride of ownership by residents
  • Compete with the dorms
• FSILGs to be more appealing than dorms from a facilities perspective
• AILG would respect the ability of each group to plan and budget in ways that work for them

Concern
• AILG should bear higher portion of the cost, given that they will receive the majority of the value from MIT
• Value of these inspections over other options
• Doubtful usefulness
• Cost (high fee, especially given value)
• Lack of depth of inspections
• ARUP was the least capable of pilot vendors
• Report may be used by municipal authorities as justification to shut down a house (x5)
• Would grandfathered conditions be forced into compliance with current code?
• Will building code violations be identified and enforced?
• While a minimum quality should exist, that presumably is already satisfied by annual safety and health inspections
• From a legal perspective, assessed without a plan poses a liability if an “event” occurs
• AILG believes this will provide value for fundraising efforts but this is unlikely to be true for all groups (x3)
• Sororities do not have as large alum donor base and are at a disadvantage in ability to cover expenses
• Small houses pay as much as large houses when their houses are less complex
• Connection to Accreditation? What does this mean? (x3)
• Could this be used against us during Accreditation?
• How will this impact Accreditation?
• Inspection may not reveal state of wiring and plumbing behind walls
• Privacy of data from assessment - would data be used against us? (x5)
• How will MIT use this information?
• How much of these reports does MIT get?
• The level of info MIT and the community needs for aggregate assessment and planning could be acquired much more cheaply by asking some basic questions about renovations history
• Does MIT want to tell us how to manage our properties?
• Sets precedent of MIT DSL requiring FSILGs to spend lots of money with short notice (x2)
• AILG keeps coming up with new expensive mandatory things and imposing them on everyone
• Report is not useful to a house which just completed major renovations (x3)
• Upon any renovation project, a current assessment and estimate needs to be done, so no big benefit to doing one much earlier
• Can MIT work with an existing analysis?