

Dear Members of the Dartmouth Community,

We are pleased to announce that the Committee on the Student Life Initiative has submitted a report on its recommendations for enhancing student residential and social opportunities at Dartmouth College. A summary of that report is attached for your review. The full report is available at www.dartmouth.edu, and a forthcoming issue of *Dartmouth Life* will be devoted to it as well.

Last February, we began a process of community discussion regarding the social and residential life of the College. We identified five principles that should characterize the out-of-classroom experience for our students. These included offering greater choice and continuity in residential living, as well as improved residential space; providing additional and improved social space controlled by students; creating a substantially coeducational and inclusive system; reducing the number of students living off campus; and reducing the abuse and unsafe use of alcohol.

In April, we established the Committee on the Student Life Initiative comprised of students, alumni, faculty and staff, chaired by Trustees Susan Dentzer '77 and Peter M. Fahey '68, to analyze the current system and propose improvements. Their report represents many hours of hard work and challenging discussions. They assessed the College's current residential and social programs, met with students, alumni and others to learn from their experiences, and drew inspiration from the committee's common desire to make Dartmouth ever stronger. The Board of Trustees is deeply grateful to the committee members for their efforts and thoughtful recommendations.

The release of the committee's report marks the start of a new phase in this initiative. The Board now invites the entire Dartmouth community to comment on the committee's recommendations over the course of winter term. The Provost, Dean of the Faculty, Dean of the College, and Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations will coordinate the community response.

These discussions will provide us with further opportunities to articulate and refine a vision of the College's residential and social environment that meets the needs of our students and supports our central academic mission. Dartmouth embraces many communities that overlap and interlock. Each course, each team, each recreational and volunteer group, each social and affinity organization, each set of roommates and neighbors—all represent microcosms that exist within Dartmouth. We must promote an environment that allows our students to reach their full potential, that appreciates them as individuals, and that fosters a sense of responsibility to this special place as well as to the wider community. We must encourage our students to become leaders in whatever fields they choose, as have generations of Dartmouth alumni before them. Stimulated by the committee's recommendations, our discussions this winter term will move us closer to achieving these goals.

It is only following this dialogue and a thorough review of the committee's recommendations that the Board of Trustees will begin to take action.

Thank you for your continued interest in the Student Life Initiative. All of us on the Board look forward to participating in this community discussion and hearing your views.

Sincerely,

William H. King, Jr.

Chairman of the Board of Trustees

James Wright

President

CONTENTS

Summary of the Recommendations	<i>Page</i> 1
Part I • Values and Vision	4
Part II • Strengths and Weaknesses of Dartmouth’s Residential and Social System	7
A • Overview	7
B • Undergraduate Housing at Dartmouth	9
C • Dining and Social Spaces and Campus Life	11
D • Graduate Student Needs	13
E • Academic Affinity Programs	13
F • Social Organizations: CFS Houses	13
G • Abuse of Alcohol on Campus	18
Part III • Recommendations	21
Recommendation 1 • Create a Greatly Enhanced System of Residential Clusters at Dartmouth	21
(1) Cluster hardware: What we need to build	21
(2) Cluster software: How the clusters would function	23
Recommendation 2 • Create Other Spaces and Programs for General Use	25
Recommendation 3 • Improve Residential and Social Life for Graduate Students	27
Recommendation 4 • Make Major Changes in the Coed, Fraternity and Sorority (CFS) Organizations	28
(1) Limitations on number of organizations	29
(2) Standards for Recognition	29
(3) Provisions for de-recognition	32
(4) Governance	33
(5) Alcohol use and parties	33
(6) Annual reviews and five-year review in 2005	33
Recommendation 5 • Conduct a Review of Senior Societies and Undergraduate Societies	34
Recommendation 6 • Conduct a Review of Academic Affinity Houses and Programs	34

Recommendation 7 • Introduce New Guidelines for Alcohol and Other Drugs	34
(1) Education, intervention and counseling	35
(2) Rules and regulations	35
(3) Enforcement	36
(4) Other matters	37
Part IV • Ensuring Change: Recommendations for Monitoring and Follow-Up of New Policies	38
A • Sample Summary Chart	38
B • Annual Board Presentations and Reports to the Community	38
C • Conclusion	38
Appendix	41
Exhibit 1: Dartmouth College Mission Statement (1999)	42
Exhibit 2: Prior Committee Reports	43
Exhibit 3: Five Principles to Guide Future Development of the Residential and Social System at Dartmouth College (February 6, 1999)	44
Exhibit 4: Meetings of the Committee on the Student Life Initiative	45
Exhibit 5: Dartmouth’s Principle of Community	46
Exhibit 6: <i>Black Enterprise</i> (January 1999) and <i>Metrosource</i> (Fall 1999)	47
Exhibit 7: Centerbrook Architects and Planners Project	49
Exhibit 8: Residential Life Statement from the Board of Trustees (February 21, 1987)	50
Exhibit 9: Other Proposals	51

Summary of the Recommendations Submitted to the Board of Trustees by the Committee on the Student Life Initiative

**Dartmouth College
January 2000**

On several occasions over the past two decades, Dartmouth College's Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, students and alumni have discussed ways to strengthen the institution's social and residential system. When James Wright assumed the presidency in 1998, he urged the Board to adopt a comprehensive approach to the issue. The resulting Student Life Initiative launched by the Board in February 1999 was to cover all aspects of the social and residential life of Dartmouth students, graduate students as well as undergraduates.

In the spring of 1999, President Wright and the Board appointed a committee to study the issue. Co-chaired by two Trustees, the Committee on the Student Life Initiative consisted of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, administrators and alumni, all of whom brought a diverse range of views and life experiences to the group. The Board charged the committee to consult broadly with the Dartmouth community about the strengths and weaknesses of the current system and to propose to the Board specific measures to enhance the system.

As a result, the committee undertook a thorough assessment of the existing social and residential system and concluded that it could be made considerably better. Accordingly, it has set forth a proposed new vision of social and residential life at Dartmouth. This vision builds on many strong features of the current system and proposes the adoption of many new ones.

The key recommendations are summarized below.

Create a greatly enhanced system of residential clusters. The central feature of the committee's proposal is a greatly enhanced residential system featuring clusters (groups of adjacent residence halls and associated social space). Establishing the system we envision will require both new construction and new methods of organization and operation. In order to achieve a sufficient number of high quality on-campus beds, the committee recommends the immediate construction of the equivalent of two new 350-bed clusters. Additional construction may also be necessary. Both new and existing clusters would have major new common social spaces associated with them. These spaces may take the form of "common houses" or, depending on architectural considerations, adjacent common spaces.

The committee recommends a new, active system of governance and programming for the residential clusters. Students would play a primary role, with elected student representatives serving on Cluster Councils and supported by Cluster Coordinators, College employees who would reside in each cluster. The committee recommends greatly increasing College funding for cluster programming.

The committee also recommends new means of student assignment to clusters as a way to establish a greater sense of continuity and stability in residential life. The committee's ultimate goal is for students to enter a cluster of their choosing, either as first-year students or sophomores, and then to remain at least through their junior year. Prior to completion of the cluster construction programs, the River and Choate clusters would be used as first-year housing for about half of the entering class in order to evaluate the merits of first-year housing. These students would also enjoy focused first-year programming in their residences. First-year students in these residences would also have an immediate affiliation with another cluster to which they would move as sophomores. The remainder of each first-year class would be assigned to mixed-class clusters.

Create other spaces and programs for general use. The committee recommends substantial renovation and expansion of Thayer Hall for improved centralized dining service, as well as the addition of a full service dining facility at the north end of campus. Additional smaller scale snack bars and other food options should be established in various locations. A new, lower cost catering option should be provided. Additional and expanded licensed alcohol outlets should be established.

A flexible flat-floor hall capable of accommodating 1,100 seated students should be built, as well as new small-scale arts spaces and new indoor and outdoor recreation facilities.

The committee recommends that a committee be established to formulate a new World Cultures Initiative. The goal is a commitment by Dartmouth to permanent staffing, funding and space to deliver a variety of programs to the entire Dartmouth community that will foster greater understanding of many cultures in our nation and around the world.

Improve residential and social life for graduate students. The committee recommends additional graduate student housing to accommodate 100-150 students and an associated new graduate student center.

Make major changes in the Coed, Fraternity and Sorority (CFS) organizations. The CFS system as currently constituted requires major improvements.

To achieve them, all selective social organizations would be required to meet new, higher standards in order to earn the privilege of recognition by the College. The overall goal of the standards would be to create organizations that would better contribute to Dartmouth's sense of community and that would fully complement the College's academic mission. The new standards would relate to organizational practices, selection and initiation practices, residence and membership requirements, and physical standards for facilities.

Among many other new standards that the committee proposes are these: organizations would not permit group activities violating Dartmouth's Principle of Community; rush would take place in the winter term of the sophomore year; rush would be made less exclusive; there would be no pledge period; hazing, defined in a more encompassing manner, would be strictly prohibited; residence in CFS houses would be permitted only for seniors and for juniors who are officers; residential organizations would have sufficient membership to consistently fill their beds; the physical appearance and infrastructure of all facilities would be greatly improved and tap systems would be eliminated. As a part of new governance requirements, the separate CFS judiciary system would be discontinued.

Major failures to meet any of the new standards (or new alcohol rules, see below) would result in either de-recognition or loss of residential status. It is unlikely that all present organizations will be able to meet the new standards, with the result that the number of organizations will probably be reduced. This reduction will improve the compatibility of the remaining higher quality organizations with the overall campus environment called for in this report.

Introduce new guidelines for alcohol and other drugs. The committee recommends continuous review and improvement of policies to curb excessive use of alcohol as well as use of other drugs. The best possible professionally designed program for education, intervention and counseling would be established and maintained. New rules would be adopted with the overall goal of reducing alcohol distribution and consumption without unduly affecting the responsible consumption of alcohol by students of legal age. New rules would be simple, would apply uniformly to all campus organizations and would be strictly enforced with severe penalties for violations and for alcohol-related misconduct.

Under the new rules, small gatherings of students of legal age would be permitted to have alcohol with no registration requirements. Larger groups would be required to register. Registered social events would require certified servers and would have strictly defined ending times. To check compliance with these rules,

Safety and Security personnel would have free and continuous access to all areas on campus, including facilities occupied by College-recognized organizations.

Conduct a comprehensive five-year review. The committee recommends that the Board of Trustees undertake a comprehensive review in 2005 of progress made in implementing the Student Life Initiative. This review should consider, based upon the experience of the previous five years and prospects for the future, whether selective social organizations should continue to be recognized by the College. If this review concludes that recognition should continue, it should proceed to consider whether the selective social organizations should be allowed to continue to offer residence.

Conclusion. The committee is pleased to submit this summary of its recommendations to make an already superb institution even better. We now encourage the Dartmouth community to read the entire report.

Susan Dentzer '77, *Co-Chair* Peter M. Fahey '68, *Co-Chair*

Allen V. Collins '53

Thomas C. Csatari '74

Jesse A. Fecker, *graduate student in the Department of Chemistry*

Susan M. Finegan '85

Mary Jean Green, *Edward Tuck Professor of French*

Ozzie Harris '81, *Director, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action*

Edwin L. Johnson '67, *Vice President and Treasurer of the College*

James A. Larimore, *Dean of the College*

Hillary E. Miller '02

Matthew K. Nelson '00

Deborah L. Nichols, *Professor of Anthropology*

Ulf L. Österberg, *Associate Professor of Engineering*

Kyle J. Roderick '99

Margaret W. Smoot '01

PART I • VALUES AND VISION

Being a student at Dartmouth means being encouraged to take one's self seriously as a young scholar—a person of promise who has a rare and valuable opportunity to learn and grow. It means that here students are not merely passive recipients of information, but are active participants in their own learning process. It means also that the out-of-classroom experience complements and supports the central mission of the College.

PRESIDENT JAMES WRIGHT
Inaugural Address
September 23, 1998

For more than two hundred years, students from all over this country—and increasingly the world—have come to spend some of the most important years of their lives at Dartmouth. Here they are exposed to the best that a liberal education can offer: the opportunity to think, to work with a superb faculty, to meet people different from themselves, and to develop a reservoir of skills, knowledge and broad perspective on the world that will sustain them throughout their lives. By design and choice, moreover, Dartmouth is a residential academic community—in effect, a modern-day version of what Thomas Jefferson once described as an “academical village.” The residential and social component of a Dartmouth education is as important as what happens in the classroom. It must simultaneously foster the values of an inclusive community even as it supports and enhances the central academic mission of the College.¹

On several occasions over the past two decades, Dartmouth's Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, students and alumni have discussed ways to strengthen the institution's social and residential system.² When James Wright assumed the presidency in 1998, he urged the Board to adopt a comprehensive approach to the issue. As a result, in February 1999, the Board adopted five principles that it said should govern Dartmouth's social and residential life.³ The President and the Board then initiated a process through which the community would develop ways to enhance the out-of-classroom experience.

The resulting Student Life Initiative covered all aspects of the social and residential life of Dartmouth students, including graduate students as well as undergraduates. In the spring of 1999, President Wright and the Board appointed the Committee on the Student Life Initiative. Co-chaired by two Trustees, the Committee on the Student Life Initiative consisted of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, administrators and alumni, all of whom brought a diverse range of views and life experience to the group. The Board charged the committee to consult broadly with the Dartmouth community about the strengths and weaknesses of the current system and to propose to the Board specific measures to enhance the system.

Beginning in May and extending into December of 1999, our committee held more than 150 hours of full committee meetings as it undertook this challenging assignment. As charged, we met with groups of students, faculty, administrators and alumni. We received written and oral reports from interested individuals and groups, and held several public forums. The committee also consulted with outside experts. In addition to the more than 150 hours of meetings, individual committee members also worked countless additional hours to gather information and to formulate proposals.⁴

¹ See Appendix, Exhibit 1: Dartmouth College Mission Statement (1999).

² See Appendix, Exhibit 2: Prior Committee Reports.

³ See Appendix, Exhibit 3: Five Principles to Guide Future Development of the Residential and Social System at Dartmouth College (February 6, 1999).

⁴ See Appendix, Exhibit 4: Meetings of the Committee on the Student Life Initiative.

This report is the culmination of all of these efforts. It sets forth a proposed new vision of social and residential life at Dartmouth that builds on many strong features of the current system, and that we think will propel the institution to even greater levels of excellence in this new century. We lay out specific features of this new vision in *Recommendations 1-7*, discussed at length in *Part III*. In general, they include a new system of residential “clusters,” or groups of residence halls, that would form a far more stable basis of social and residential life on campus; new and enhanced places campus-wide for socializing, dining and recreation, and more equitable access by all students to such spaces; and new and higher standards for social organizations that on the whole will foster a far greater sense of community at Dartmouth.

This new vision is idealistic but achievable. We have confidence in the resolve of the institution to further excel in the future—in no small part because a wide range of student, faculty and alumni groups asked us for an opportunity to make Dartmouth a better place. As our proposed new vision takes shape on campus, we hope that shortcomings of the current system will be minimized or eliminated. These include a lack of continuity in residential life as students are made to move regularly from one dormitory to another; excessive use of alcohol by many students; a tolerance for uncivil behavior; and other deficiencies that this report discusses in more detail.

Instrumental in devising our new vision was a discussion of values that the committee undertook at the outset of our process. During this session, Dean of the College James Larimore described how Comanche leaders sought to instruct other members in the community way. This led us to an intriguing question: What is the “Dartmouth Way?” More specifically, what should be the hallmarks of social and residential life for students?

We reached resounding consensus on the following features:

- Dartmouth should be a place where learning is paramount. By this, we mean not just learning by absorbing material in the classroom or mastering skills such as critical reasoning. We also mean learning in the sense of coming to know more about one’s self and others, through interactions among students themselves, together with professors, administrators and others.
- The “Dartmouth Way” is based on Dartmouth’s Principle of Community⁵ and on adherence to norms of civil behavior. It assumes that members of the community will be honest, will respect and be fair to others, will be open and inclusive, and will be responsible for their behavior. Dartmouth should challenge its bright and talented students to uphold this principle. It will thus encourage the optimal environment in which learning can take place and enable all to feel at home at Dartmouth.
- Dartmouth should be a place that affords students a rich array of social and residential options and broad freedom to associate with groups and individuals of their choosing. But hand in hand with this freedom goes the responsibility to uphold the Principle of Community. We understand that an inevitable part of learning is making mistakes and wrong choices. Yet we also believe strongly that individuals, groups or organizations who routinely fail to meet their responsibilities to the community must be held accountable for their actions—and must expect to see their freedoms restricted, for the good of the community as a whole.
- Dartmouth should be a diverse community. Over the past three decades, the institution has truly become coeducational; now it must seek to raise gender relations to an even higher level. Dartmouth is also increasingly multicultural, with students and faculty from different ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds. Yet the institution can and should do far more to foster the important learning opportunities that stem from this greater diversity. There is no better place than in a community of learners for people to grow to understand each other better, to learn how to get

⁵ See Appendix, Exhibit 5: Dartmouth’s Principle of Community.

along with one another, and to prepare for lives after graduation in an increasingly diverse nation and world.

- The lives of Dartmouth students should be characterized by substantial continuity and a strong sense of being rooted in a special place. The beauty of our location and the distinctive architectural features of our campus contribute uniquely to this sense. Yet still other features of our institution are in some respects competing against a feeling of stability and rootedness. The Dartmouth Plan and year-round operation, for example, afford students wonderful opportunities to have flexible college careers, to travel and to study elsewhere. But at the same time, they also foster frequent comings-and-goings and a periodic sense of upheaval for students. There is considerable room for the institution to increase the sense of stability, continuity and attachment that students of earlier eras have long prized during their years of residence at Dartmouth.

Once our committee reached agreement on these fundamental attributes and aims for Dartmouth, we began an analysis of the current social and residential system. Our goal was to hold up our “values mirror” in front of the institution to determine where these highest ideals were truly being reflected and where they were falling short. In keeping with the spirit of almost all the students, faculty, alumni and others who came before the committee, we have chosen to undertake a candid and self-critical assessment. The conclusions of this analysis are described in *Part II*.

PART II • STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF DARTMOUTH'S RESIDENTIAL AND SOCIAL SYSTEM

To carry out the Board's charge—to propose changes designed to strengthen Dartmouth's social and residential system—the committee sought to determine which aspects of the current system worked well and which did not. The committee conducted the assessment in three ways. First, we reviewed available studies, surveys, data and other empirical information assembled by the College in recent years. Second, we spent many hours listening to students, faculty, administrators and alumni, as well as outside experts. Third, we toured campus facilities, ranging from residence halls to social spaces to Coed, Fraternity and Sorority houses (referred to as “CFS organizations” in the rest of this report).

Here we present a capsule summary of what the committee learned on a number of fronts. Although the balance may seem to tilt heavily in the direction of criticism, we believed it most useful to summarize the areas where the system was working well and to devote finer analysis to the areas where it was not. We also believed it important to avoid complacency and self-satisfaction and to take an objective look at the system, even at the risk of reporting back information that was not flattering. After all, the institution teaches its students to gather information carefully and to reason critically; the committee could do no less.

A • Overview

The overall quality of the social and residential system is high, and it elicits equally high levels of student satisfaction. In a 1997 survey undertaken by Dartmouth's Office of Evaluation and Research, approximately 70 percent of Dartmouth students reported that their social life was either excellent or good. This approval is echoed in the student satisfaction ratings that the institution receives in outside surveys and reviews. For example, *The Princeton Review: The Best 331 Colleges* gives Dartmouth a 93 out of a possible rating of 100 for “quality of student life,” and the *Fiske Guide to Colleges 2000* gives Dartmouth the highest possible social-life ranking.

For many well-qualified students, the overall campus environment, in addition to the superior academic quality of the institution, is evidently a powerful draw. Admissions data suggests that Dartmouth is attracting an increasingly qualified applicant pool. Average SAT scores for the class of 2003, for example, are 713 Verbal and 713 Math—among the highest in the history of the College, and indeed among the very highest in the nation.

Students' favorable sentiments about the social and residential system stay with them after graduation. The 1994 survey of alumni opinion conducted by the Dartmouth Alumni Council asked respondents to express their current attitude toward Dartmouth. It found that “Attitudes expressed by alumni are overwhelmingly positive, with only a small percentage (fewer than 12 percent) stating negative attitudes.”

Despite this favorable evidence, the committee also heard that some aspects of the campus environment are unattractive to a significant group of current students. For instance, 30 percent of students—almost one out of every three—responded in the 1997 campus survey that their social life was only mediocre or poor. For too many students, Dartmouth is a relatively uncongenial place to attend college, in part because of a paucity of on-campus social outlets outside the CFS system, and limited off-campus outlets in Hanover and its environs. For example, a large percentage of the 30 percent of students who were not happy with their social lives came to Dartmouth from urban settings. What's more, many students told the committee directly that they also consider Dartmouth a place where people are extremely intolerant of pluralism—of African-American, Asian, Latino and other minority students, as well as of gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgendered students.

The committee learned that prospective Dartmouth students share many of these concerns. This suggests that Dartmouth's social and residential life is a critical strategic issue for the College. After all, prospective students *are* Dartmouth's future, and the question of who chooses to attend Dartmouth will ultimately shape the institution that we become.

Karl Furstenberg, Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid and Associate Provost for Planning, met with the committee to discuss the role that overall perceptions about Dartmouth—and about Dartmouth's social and residential life in particular—appear to play in students' decisions to apply to and then to attend Dartmouth. Dean Furstenberg told the committee that those students who are admitted to Dartmouth but choose not to come do so for three principal reasons. They express reservations about Dartmouth's location and relative isolation, as well as the lack of social and other outlets in the local community. They voice financial concerns, suggesting that they prefer to attend institutions with lower cost or merit scholarships. Finally, they express reservations about Dartmouth's social system, its reputation as a conservative party school and the domination of its social life by fraternities.

Dean Furstenberg noted that some admitted students specifically cite concerns that the CFS system undermines the intellectual climate at Dartmouth and encourages excessive use of alcohol. He cited a survey of the Class of 2003, to which 1,601 students who were admitted responded. Of these respondents, 1,011 matriculated at Dartmouth and 590 selected another college. A subset of the students who opted not to come—about 100-120 “high-ability” students with average SAT scores of 756 Verbal and 739 Math, compared to the class average of 713 and 713—rated Dartmouth's social system as an even greater concern. Many of these students expressed strong interest in the humanities and would possibly have brought a rich dimension to the campus. Moreover, had they chosen to attend Dartmouth, these students might well have represented the top tier of their class in terms of academic achievement.

Dean Furstenberg also argued that negative perceptions about Dartmouth affect the racial and ethnic composition of the pool of applicants to Dartmouth. At the other seven Ivy League institutions, students of color constitute 31 percent of the applicant pool on average. At Dartmouth, they constitute only 20 percent of the pool, a statistically significant difference.

The perception that Dartmouth's environment is less congenial to students of diverse backgrounds is borne out by external surveys.⁶ The January 1999 issue of *Black Enterprise* magazine featured a list of the top 50 U.S. colleges for African-Americans. Dartmouth, Princeton and Brown were the only Ivy institutions not to make the list, and Dartmouth was the only Ivy institution not even to earn an honorable mention.

The committee does not wish to sanction the conclusion or methodology behind this interpretation. In fact, a recent issue of *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*⁷ noted that Dartmouth has had considerable success in enrolling and retaining African-American students. For example, the number of Black students enrolled at Dartmouth has risen 10 percent over the past seven years, with the result that we are now in fifth place among Ivy institutions in terms of the share of African-Americans in the class of 2003. The journal also ranked us 12th nationally among top institutions in Black student graduation rates (85 percent at Dartmouth in 1998), placing us behind Harvard, Princeton, Brown and Yale in that category but ahead of Stanford and Duke.

Nonetheless, we do think surveys such as those by *Black Enterprise* reflect perceptions about Dartmouth that, however unfounded, undermine our goal of becoming a more diverse institution. Similarly, the Fall 1999 edition of *Metrosource*, a publication aimed at gay and lesbian audiences, listed 40 colleges and universities deemed “Gay-Positive,” including Brown, Columbia, Harvard and Yale. Another group of 12 institutions and university systems was listed as “Questionable Schools for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Students.” The only Ivy institution included on this second list was Dartmouth.

⁶ See Appendix, Exhibit 6: *Black Enterprise* (January 1999) and *Metrosource* (Fall 1999).

⁷ *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* (Autumn 1999).

Collectively, these surveys and data suggest that Dartmouth faces a critical issue of mixed perceptions among different populations. After many students have had a chance to experience Dartmouth, they report that they are happy with their life on campus. But significant groups of current students and especially desirable prospective students are clearly hesitant about aspects of Dartmouth. The committee concluded that their perceptions about Dartmouth represented a serious issue that could be addressed in part through substantive changes in the social and residential environment.

B • Undergraduate Housing at Dartmouth

The mission of the Office of Residential Life—and the number one priority of its Dean—is to create and maintain a residential system that supports the academic mission of the College. At present, Dartmouth offers a variety of housing options to students under this framework.

The backbone of the residential system consists of the 33 residence halls, in which roughly 2,700 students live each term. Many of the larger residence halls have been grouped together into 11 clusters. In addition, in 1996 the College created the East Wheelock Cluster Program, which will house approximately 314 students as of next year, after the completion of an additional wing. This cluster emphasizes faculty and student interaction through special programming.

Other housing options include:

- Substance-free Butterfield Hall, which houses approximately 55 students.
- 11 academic affinity programs such as La Casa (for Spanish and Portuguese languages and culture), the Native American House, and the Shabazz Center for Intellectual Inquiry (affiliated with the African and African-American Studies Program). Collectively, these houses afford living space for roughly 143 students each term.
- 23 of the 28 CFS social organizations have physical plants, either their own (16) or College-owned (7). On average, more than 400 students live in these social organizations each term.
- Off-campus—approximately 500 students live off campus each fall term and an average of 450 students elect to do so in the winter and spring terms.

The residential system has numerous strengths. In general, students express satisfaction with having a range of choices in their on-campus housing options, and in having the freedom to live in CFS houses or off-campus if they so desire. Among the majority of students who choose to live in the residence halls, there is also widespread satisfaction. In 1999, the Office of Evaluation and Research reported that 91 percent of those students living on campus were satisfied with their housing arrangements. Moreover, the diverse and coeducational makeup of the residence halls provides an environment where students of various ages and backgrounds can meet and learn from each other.

However, close scrutiny of the housing system at Dartmouth also reveals obvious and important deficiencies.

- There are not enough beds in the residence halls to meet existing student demand. For the past several years, the institution has been unable to house all students who wished to reside on campus during the fall term. This past year, the College could not meet the demand for all students who wished to live in the residence halls during spring term as well. This shortage of rooms is a primary reason why many students live off campus. Even if some can obtain a room on campus, they often find that they are not assigned to residence halls of their choosing and opt to move off campus instead.
- Too many rooms in residence halls are too small to suit contemporary living standards and cannot comfortably house students and their possessions—including computers and other electronic

equipment that are now standard accouterments of college life. This “living-standards gap” is in part the result of earlier decisions by the College to defer construction of new dormitories as the student body expanded. During the 1960s through the 1980s, approximately 250 rooms on campus were “compressed” to house more students without building new dorms. This meant that large single rooms were often converted to doubles, two-room doubles to triples, and triples into rooms for four persons. As a result, many students live in residential spaces of as little as 80 to 100 square feet per person, versus the 120 to 140 square feet that is considered the norm for academic institutions in 1999.

- The quality of life in residence halls varies too greatly depending on where the facilities are located and how they were designed. Consider the River Cluster: In part because of its location on the perimeter of the campus, and because of the mediocre quality of its buildings, the cluster remains unpopular with most upper-class students. As a result, it is largely populated by first-year students who are assigned there, or by sophomores with low housing priority numbers. Similarly, the Choate residences are also unpopular with students because of their low ceilings, small rooms, narrow hallways and other unattractive architectural features. These attributes contrast sharply with the attractive features of some older residences, in particular those that recently have been renovated, such as the “Gold Coast” dorms.
- The committee heard ample testimony from students and administrators about the inadequate social spaces distributed throughout the residence halls. Although Dartmouth added lounges and kitchens to many of the dormitories during the 1980s, they often are too small to be used by more than a few students at any time. In addition, the lounges and kitchens are frequently in the basements of dorms and have only artificial lighting. Thus, their location and features make it less likely that many students will congregate there, or that automatic traffic flow through the residence hall will generate spontaneous interactions. This undermines the sense of community that we would hope to achieve in the residence halls at Dartmouth.
- Finally, life in the residence halls is marked by a stunning lack of continuity, resulting in an ongoing sense of upheaval and rootlessness for students. Testimony from students, faculty and administrators alike suggested that a lack of residential continuity and identity is a major reason many students are motivated to seek a sense of community by joining CFS organizations. For example, because of the Dartmouth Plan, year-round operation, and the comings-and-goings of hundreds of students each term, it is not unusual for sophomores and juniors to live in a different room or even a different residence hall each term. Another 300-500 students take a leave term or study abroad, paving the way for them to move yet again when they return to campus.

All of this movement creates significant personal hardship for students as they seek to move their possessions and locate storage space between terms and during off-terms. Most important, this movement also causes a great deal of discontinuity, undermining the sense of home, community and esprit de corps in the residence halls. For example, very little remains of the once-flourishing dormitory-based intramural sports program that drew hundreds of students from residence halls to compete against one another. Intramural sports teams, particularly coed teams, still flourish, but without the grounding of a residency-based competition. A telling sign of this is that the rosters of dorm “championships” in various sports, which for years were posted on signs in dorm hallways, cease recording any results as of the late 1970s and early 1980s.

As a result of its examination of the strengths and weaknesses of residential life, the committee reached these conclusions:

- The overall bed shortage at the institution is unacceptable and contravenes the very purpose of a residential college. The College must build enough new residence halls and create enough new space in the system so that any student who wants on-campus accommodation can obtain it.

- The highest priority should be to create a sense of community in the residence halls by re-instilling a sense of continuity. Although it may not be feasible or desirable to assign students to the same rooms throughout their Dartmouth careers, it would be optimal if they could elect to return to the same residence hall or cluster for at least two years and preferably three—with the possibility of all four years if the student so wished.
- To reflect current living standards and to accommodate students with sufficient space for themselves and their possessions, rooms in residence halls must be “decompressed.”
- The “quality gap” among residence halls must be reduced as much as possible by upgrading those at the low end of the spectrum. This may require the replacement of the River Cluster and Choates.
- All existing residence halls should be retrofitted with significantly improved social and study spaces, and all future residential halls and clusters should be designed with more of these amenities.

C • Dining and Social Spaces and Campus Life

Both dining and social activities take place in numerous spaces distributed throughout the campus. Many facilities, such as Thayer Hall, have been in use for decades, and some important new ones have been created in recent years. Foremost among these is the Collis Center, renovated in 1993. The opening and subsequent expansion of the Collis Center was a vital step in enhancing student life and community at Dartmouth. In 1998, the administration expanded its hours of operation to 3 A.M. every night to serve the significant numbers of students who now use the facilities well after midnight.

The committee heard from students that the centralized nature of student dining is a real strength of the current system. Although the dining experience is far different from the one that many alumni remember—a time when virtually all students ate all meals at Thayer during limited hours—students today value the fact that much dining occurs in central spaces on campus. A student survey undertaken in connection with the current Centerbrook planning group⁸ effort confirmed this impression.⁹ Because of the discontinuities in residential patterns from term to term, students feel it is important to have a central place where they can routinely see one another. Once again, for all the strengths in Dartmouth’s current social system, the committee nonetheless noted a number of deficiencies, both in terms of “hardware” (facilities) and “software” (programming). These are as follows:

- There are both an insufficient number of social spaces on campus and inadequate programming to create and support the truly diverse, multicultural, multiethnic, and multiracial environment that exists at Dartmouth and that will become an even more prominent hallmark of the institution in the future.
- While the conversion of Webster Hall to the Rauner Special Collections Library has created a wonderful new academic and cultural asset, it has left the campus without a suitable venue besides Spaulding Auditorium in the Hopkins Center for large group meetings, speeches, concerts and dances. The campus is in need of a flexibly configured, “flat-floor” programming space that can accommodate approximately 1,100 seated persons.
- Student organizations need space for meetings and social functions. The prime potential space for many functions, Collis Common Ground, is booked virtually at all times and well in advance. This means that there is often no opportunity for spontaneous social activities to take place.

⁸ See Appendix, Exhibit 7: Centerbrook Architects and Planners Project.

⁹ “Dartmouth College Dining Services Masterplan Market Research Study,” The Ricca Planning Studio, Inc. for Centerbrook.

- There is a shortage of arts and performance space on campus. The arts facilities in the Hopkins Center are heavily used and almost fully occupied at all times. Students need smaller arts spaces, including performance and rehearsal areas, as well as studio and design space for arts, graphic arts and crafts.
- Many existing spaces that could be used for student social activities are either controlled by academic departments or other divisions of the College, such as the Hopkins Center, which controls access to Alumni Hall, or the Tucker Foundation, which controls access to Rollins Chapel. Student groups have trouble gaining access to these spaces. In addition, other areas, such as the Bema and the Green, are governed by stringent guidelines that limit their optimal use by students. A mechanism should be created to make such existing space available for student use.
- Most prime smaller social spaces on campus are in the control of the CFS system and, therefore, there is a strong perception among students that they are off-limits for use by other student organizations. The Coed, Fraternity, and Sorority Council (CFSC) has recently required CFS organizations to allow other campus organizations to use their spaces, a development that the committee saluted. The committee does not, however, believe that this important step will solve the broader issues of inadequate social space on campus.
- The Centerbrook study has recommended refurbishing and substantially reconfiguring Thayer Hall, which has outlived its economic life. The committee concurs with this finding and endorses in principle the Centerbrook group's idea of creating an array of new dining and social spaces within Thayer—or possibly, within a new student center comprising Collis, Robinson and Thayer combined.¹⁰
- Notwithstanding the desire for centralized dining, students, faculty and administrators alike also sense the need for more and varied distributed dining options around campus. As Dartmouth builds more academic and residential facilities north of Baker Library, there will be a need to serve these areas. Students and faculty recommended that the College create a new dining option at the north end of campus where people could have breakfast, lunch and dinner extending into late-night hours. In addition, the tendency for students to eat later in the day and at less uniform times suggests a need to review traditional models. There is real need for kosher dining to serve the needs of many students. Some students expressed a desire for a wider variety of “food themes,” such as Tex-Mex or Asian cuisine.
- The Lone Pine Tavern in Collis has provided an outlet for responsible alcohol consumption by students of legal age. Its small capacity and manner of operation, however, cannot accommodate broad student demand. More and larger venues are needed that are licensed to serve alcohol, that are attractive to students and that afford an alternative to drinking in CFS houses.
- There is a pronounced need on campus for new recreational space. The Centerbrook group identified the following list of desired facilities: court space for volleyball and basketball, areas for fitness activities using exercise machines, indoor arena courts, dance studios, a bowling alley, and a climbing wall.¹¹ A fitness center and/or smaller fitness facilities distributed around the campus are also priorities for students. Even after moving out varsity athletes, the Kresge Fitness Center in Berry Sports Center is very heavily used.
- Finally, Dartmouth has not taken full advantage of its environment. Some students have expressed the desire for a well-lit running path around the campus and its environs. The Connecticut River

¹⁰ “Dartmouth College Dining Services Masterplan Market Research Study,” The Ricca Planning Studio, Inc. for Centerbrook.

¹¹ The Centerbrook group has also called for the substantial renovation of the Alumni Gymnasium.

waterfront also represents a largely untapped and underused recreation and social area that could be developed further.

D • Graduate Student Needs

Among the committee's key findings was the need to improve facilities for graduate students and to do a better job of integrating them into the Dartmouth community. In addition to the 840 students who attend the institution's three professional schools—Dartmouth Medical School, Thayer School of Engineering and Tuck School of Business Administration—Dartmouth educates roughly 550 masters and doctoral students in a range of fields from the sciences to liberal studies. These programs and students are an important part of the Dartmouth community and of its academic mission in particular, but the institution has not provided adequate housing and social amenities for these students. What is more, the institution has not taken adequate steps to facilitate interactions among graduate students, who are enrolled in relatively small and separate programs. In addition, potentially useful and educational interactions between graduate students and undergraduates should be promoted.

These deficiencies are particularly evident in contrast to our peer institutions with larger graduate programs. The committee has no empirical evidence to suggest that these deficiencies constitute a barrier to attracting the best-qualified graduate students to Dartmouth, but strongly suspects that they may well be.

The committee noted the following specific deficiencies with respect to housing and social options for graduate students:

- **Insufficient housing.** At present, on-campus housing generally is not available for graduate students. Housing is available for some 130 students at Sagem Village, but this site's distance from campus is a drawback. There is also a shortage of apartment-style housing for graduate students on or close to campus. The existing graduate student complex on North Park Street houses only 30 students in facilities built four decades ago.
- **Lack of social space.** At present, there is no substantial social space devoted to Arts and Sciences graduate students, and no real graduate student center where these generally older students can meet one another and socialize. This is a particular drawback at Dartmouth, where limited social options in Hanover might discourage older students from applying to the institution in the first place.

E • Academic Affinity Programs

Dartmouth has 11 academic affinity programs with houses in which roughly 143 students live each term. Since these are intended to be primarily academically oriented facilities, since they house limited numbers of students, and since they are not primarily social organizations, the committee did not review them extensively. However, we do think that these houses and programs warrant further examination by the College, as set forth in *Recommendation 6*.

F • Social Organizations: CFS Houses

There are currently 28 CFS organizations at Dartmouth: 17 fraternities, 8 sororities and 3 coed houses. All but five of these organizations have their own houses or occupy houses leased from the College. These organizations provide a principal social outlet of the campus, and the houses they occupy represent much of the available social space for students. Approximately 1,700 students are CFS members—representing 43 percent of the total student body, or roughly half of eligible students. This total includes approximately 920 fraternity members, 670 sorority members and 80 members of coed houses.

These organizations make important contributions to campus life. This observation was repeatedly stressed to the committee during its deliberations. The committee received a report and recommendation from the CFSC; consulted with CFSC representatives and system members, both individually and collectively; obtained comments from alumni individually and through the Alumni Council and its College

Relations Group; and met on several occasions with a group that termed itself the CFS Alumni/ae Board. In addition, students concerned about the fate of the CFS system constituted a large share of attendees at the committee's public forums and took these opportunities to convey their views.

The committee agrees that there are a number of strengths in the CFS organizations, as follows:

- CFS houses are popular with a large segment of the student body. Roughly half of all eligible students (sophomores, juniors and seniors) elect to become members. CFS houses satisfy many students' needs for socializing and for making meaningful and lasting friendships. A November 1999 survey of roughly 2,000 students sponsored by *The Dartmouth* showed that a substantial majority of students favor continuation of single-sex fraternities and sororities on the campus¹²
- Membership in CFS houses has been a substantial and meaningful part of the Dartmouth experiences of thousands of alumni, and a growing number of alumnae as well. The committee and the College administration together received oral comments, letters and other correspondence from alumni to this effect.
- For many students, membership in a CFS house provides an important opportunity to interact and live with others as part of a group and to learn skills in the areas of cooperation and organization. For the leaders of these organizations especially, CFS houses are important training grounds for learning how to guide others in meeting their responsibilities. It is of particular note that a number of alumni involved in leadership activities on behalf of Dartmouth were members of CFS houses.
- The CFS organizations also provide an important source of continuity for students amid the upheavals of the Dartmouth Plan, year-round operation and rapid turnover of housing within residence halls. In fact, the large membership of the CFS system may be at least partly due to the fact that these organizations provide a "home" for students who are constantly on the move.
- CFS houses at Dartmouth, although selective in terms of membership, are relatively open and democratic in the sense that the events they sponsor are usually free of charge and widely accessible. With some exceptions, social events at houses are open to all affiliated and nonaffiliated students. There is apparently much less of a sense of exclusivity among CFS houses at Dartmouth than at comparable institutions at many other colleges and universities.
- CFS houses are a prime venue for social activities on campus because they offer student-controlled spaces that are considered more congenial than spaces within residence halls. Moreover, alcohol is usually freely available. As a result, many CFS houses have borne the burden of social life at Dartmouth for years, a fact that has contributed to the deterioration of some facilities.
- CFS members have made contributions to the community in the form of volunteer activities. There are varying estimates as to the size of these contributions. Many national sororities represented on campus and also certain historically Black organizations have had community service as a central focus since their inception. Survey data compiled by the Office of Evaluation and Research suggests that this community service focus is not universal. This data shows that approximately 3 percent of CFS members spend between 6 and 11 hours per term in some sort of community service.

Through its own assessment and from testimony it received, the committee also identified the following weaknesses within the CFS organization:

¹²“Support for Modified Greek System plus New Options Dominates Student Opinion,” *The Dartmouth*, Wednesday, November 17, 1999.

- **Selectivity and sense of exclusiveness.** Notwithstanding the open nature of social activities in CFS houses, the system itself is selective in ways that many committee members believe is not in keeping with the spirit of community and Dartmouth's institutional values. Furthermore, some non-affiliated students told the committee that they were so fearful of rejection that they chose not to apply to CFS houses for membership.
- **Less diversity.** CFS membership is less socio-economically diverse than the overall student body. The College's surveys show that CFS members on balance are more often white, more often come from families with higher incomes, and are less likely to receive financial aid, than the student body as a whole. These factors are even more true of sororities than they are of fraternities.

Among women, 81 percent of sorority members are white, versus 68 percent of the overall female student population. Similarly, 45 percent of sorority members come from families with annual incomes of \$150,000 or more, versus 32 percent of the student body. About 45 percent of sorority members receive financial aid, versus 55 percent of upper-class students overall. Among men, 77 percent of CFS members are white, versus 69 percent of all male students; 35 percent are from families with incomes over \$150,000, versus 32 percent of all students; 50 percent receive financial aid, versus 61 percent of non-affiliated students as a whole. These disparities are generally not characteristic of other campus organizations, with the exception of intercollegiate athletic teams, which also have higher proportions of white students.

- **Single-sex makeup.** CFS membership is predominantly single-sex, with a preponderance of all-male organizations. At present, there are roughly 920 members of all-male fraternities and 670 members of all-female sororities. Some members of our committee think the single-sex nature of these institutions is inconsistent with the overall philosophy of a coeducational college and may not be the best preparation for the pronouncedly "coed" personal and professional worlds that Dartmouth students will inhabit after college.

In the course of its work, the committee heard powerful defenses of these single-sex institutions. Some members insisted that although the organizations were largely single-sex, most social activities they sponsored were coed. They argued that CFS houses should therefore be understood to be prime underpinnings of a "substantially coeducational" social life at Dartmouth. In addition, members of sororities made a strong case that they needed a "safe place" or "haven" on a campus that remained a substantially "male-dominated" environment. They argued that they needed organizations where women could rise to positions of leadership and not lose out in a power struggle with men. They also viewed sororities as places where they could be physically safe; in fact, some female students told the committee of their need to pair up in a "buddy system" in order to watch out for each other while socializing in fraternities. Finally, they described sororities as places where they could feel emotionally secure and broadly supported by other women.

Some members of the committee interpreted these various arguments in favor of single-sex houses as not necessarily representing strengths of the CFS system. In fact, some committee members reasoned, women would not need to seek such sanctuary in a truly coeducational environment where the principles of community operated. They questioned whether CFS organizations as a whole were contributing positively to good gender relations on campus.

Although other committee members disagreed, this first group concluded that the predominantly single-sex CFS system probably undermines coeducation in a number of ways. Most notably, some of these organizations tolerate or even promote conduct that is inconsistent with the Principle of Community and with the academic mission of the College. Single-sex organizations may also give students the ability to take the less challenging path, encouraging them to spend time with their own sex within established organizations, rather than developing ways to understand, work and socialize with persons of the opposite gender.

- **Behavioral issues.** Some CFS members behave, at least on occasion, in ways that clearly violate norms of civilized behavior and the College's Principle of Community. Indeed, students observed to the committee that membership in CFS houses seems to confer on many students the idea that they can operate outside these norms on a regular basis. An episode they pointed to frequently was the "Ghetto Party" that took place during the 1998-99 academic year. On that occasion, a fraternity and sorority teamed up to throw a party in which students were invited to come wearing ghetto attire and to party in a simulated ghetto environment, offending a broad swath of the campus community.

The committee noted with surprise and dismay that departures from community norms of behavior continued even as we undertook our scrutiny of the CFS system this past fall. For example, early in the fall term of 1999, several students with electric bullhorns or microphones climbed onto the balconies of at least two fraternities. These students then heckled and made sexually suggestive remarks to female students walking up and down adjacent sidewalks. When the committee subsequently questioned the leadership of one of the fraternities about what had been done in the aftermath of this incident, it was assured that the bullhorn had been removed from the fraternity. There was apparently no further attempt by the fraternity to discipline the students involved in the incident.

Also this past fall, a group of pledges of still another fraternity broke into two sororities. They went through the personal belongings of the residents and removed several items, including underwear. They also damaged some belongings. The College found them guilty of violating two standards of College behavior. To its credit, the fraternity responded by showing a film highlighting issues of gender relations at Dartmouth, and held a discussion at its house with the director of the Women's Resource Center.

These anecdotes underscore a fact of life about CFS culture that some CFS members themselves described to the committee. There is a large disconnect between leadership of the CFS system and at least some of its membership. Although CFS leaders say they despise offensive behavior and do their best to stamp it out, they think that they have little leverage against the offenders. What is more, testimony to the committee suggested that the CFS internal judiciary system, which passes judgment on organizations that violate CFS rules and regulations, has been largely ineffectual. Peer pressure in the direction of leniency appears to be enormous, and virtually precludes the system from effectively sanctioning itself.

Moreover, the committee learned that many past efforts to improve behavior, especially around the excessive consumption of alcohol, had worked for a time, only to be followed by periods of recidivism. Again, the committee learned with dismay of hazing rituals that took place during the 1999 fall term that, although mild in comparison to some past activities, were puerile at best and demeaning at worst. In one ritual, pledges from one fraternity walked naked through the 1902 Room in Baker Library as other students studied.

- **The abuse of alcohol.** The problem of excessive alcohol use on campus will be dealt with more thoroughly below, but it deserves some mention in the context of the CFS system because of the widespread abuse that takes place within some CFS organizations. For many years, CFS houses have served as the primary alcohol dispensaries on campus. Since most students are below the legal drinking age of 21, this suggests that flagrant violation of New Hampshire law is routine. Even more disturbing is the range of activities within CFS houses that encourage excessive alcohol use. They include drinking games such as "beer pong" and the widespread acceptance of the repugnant practice of "booting and rallying"—consuming excessive amounts of alcohol, vomiting deliberately or involuntarily and then consuming still more. Students described to the committee how offended they were by this practice when they first arrived at Dartmouth, but how they had come to accept it over time as a Dartmouth cultural norm. Echoing that perspective, one committee

member noticed a sign during the course of the fall term that seemed to sum up this strange cultural acceptance: “We boot Green.”

The deleterious effects of excessive alcohol use in CFS organizations are evident in other aspects of College life. Largely because of alcohol consumption, Wednesday night house meetings for many CFS organizations amount to little more than boisterous parties that preclude some students from attending Thursday morning classes. Moreover, institutional research demonstrates that “binge drinking,” together with the adverse consequences suffered from drinking (e.g., blackouts and public vomiting), occur at a higher rate among CFS members than among the student body as a whole.

- **Lagging physical standards in some organizations.** A tour of CFS houses suggests wide variations in physical facilities. Some houses, especially those of sororities, are typically clean, well kept and reasonably well appointed. Others are in much worse physical condition and poorly furnished, if at all. The committee’s tour of CFS houses offered a first-hand view of several fetid fraternity basements in which the stench of bodily fluids was pervasive. As one committee member, a former fraternity member, described it, some of these basements have the appearance of bomb shelters, and are complete with drains built into the floor to accommodate any runoff.
- **Uneven membership.** Excluding the sororities, which if anything are oversubscribed, several individual CFS organizations have very low memberships. For example, in the fall term 1999 rush period, fewer than ten individuals joined certain houses. Low membership statistics raise the question of whether some College-owned CFS facilities could better serve the community if converted to other uses. Low membership and resulting low income has also undoubtedly reinforced the difficulty for some organizations in adequately maintaining their physical facilities.
- **Dominance of system.** The committee noted that fewer than a fifth of students report that they are likely to join a CFS organization when they are surveyed before matriculation, but in fact half ultimately do join. A potential explanation for the much higher percentage that ultimately joins is that the dominance of the CFS system at Dartmouth has led to a lack of other social options—or that the absence of any consistent effort to create other options has reinforced the dominance of CFS organizations. Whatever the case, many students believe that they have little choice but to join.

In effect, the system’s dominance creates a psychic divide and a pervasive sense of two cultures at Dartmouth: the affiliated and the unaffiliated. This division seemed especially evident during this past year, as the committee conducted its work. Even unaffiliated students who generally liked the Greek system, yet were aware of its shortcomings and eager to see problems redressed, felt stifled about voicing criticisms lest they be ostracized by affiliated students.

For example, a group of unaffiliated students met with the committee. As with all who came before our panel, we kept these students’ comments confidential, but they subsequently told *The Dartmouth* that they had called for abolition of the CFS system. After *The Dartmouth* published this information, the students received a large number of harsh and accusatory e-mails. Other students were told that they were no longer welcome at Greek houses.

Aside from our concerns about these polarizing incidents, the committee has serious reservations about CFS organizations’ dominance of Dartmouth’s social fabric. We think the commanding role that these organizations play may well stifle the creation of other social options that are more in step with the academic values of the institution, and that might prove even more desirable to many students. As discussed above, the CFS system’s dominance in the social life of the College is also clearly a negative to some desirable prospective students. Especially in an era when society is becoming increasingly diverse, this may militate against Dartmouth attracting a richly varied student body.

Having heard and sifted through the above evidence and testimony, the committee reached a strong consensus that an overhaul of CFS organizations is absolutely necessary. In fact, some members of the committee believed that the system's weaknesses were so profound that these organizations should be de-recognized by the College. However, in the interests of preserving student choice, they agreed to support the idea that selective social organizations could and should be allowed to continue, provided that they undergo substantial change and that the Board of Trustees conduct a comprehensive review in five years. Hence our consensus that overhaul is necessary, even if there remains some difference of opinion as to whether it is achievable. We set forth these proposed reforms in *Recommendation 4*.

A final note on this section: The majority of the committee also took the position that even if reformed CFS organizations continue to exist and to be recognized by the College, they should probably not be residential over the long run. They cited a number of reasons why they felt selective residential social organizations should simply not be part of the long-term future of the College.

Some members contended that selective social organizations should not be allowed to constitute a significant portion of the residential space at the College. They argued that allowing the continuation of residency in these houses would undermine efforts to shore up social and residential life for all students in the new residential clusters. And they contended that residency in selective social organizations appears to confer on some members a sense that their special status frees them from responsibility to meet community behavioral norms.

Taking a different view, a minority of the committee expressed the belief that the current CFS organizations would rise to the challenge of reforming themselves—and that as a result, residence in selective social organizations would remain an appropriate part of the overall residential experience of the College.

G • Abuse of Alcohol on Campus

The excessive use of alcohol is prevalent at Dartmouth, as it is at virtually every college and university in America. Although in the past, such drinking may have been considered part and parcel of the typical college experience, societal awareness has changed drastically in recent years. For example, health concerns about heavy drinking are receiving more attention than ever. And according to the federally funded Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, an estimated 30 college students a year die nationwide in drinking-related incidents.

Although institutions such as the University of Pennsylvania and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have recently been riven by such incidents, Dartmouth has been lucky of late. No student has died in such an incident since 1991. There have, however, been serious injuries, as in 1994, when a student fell out of the window of a fraternity house and spent seven weeks in the hospital.

Beyond these life-and-death issues, institutions across the country face growing issues of legal liability when their students are injured while drinking. The nationwide legal drinking age of 21 ties the hands of many academic institutions; we are obligated to abide by the law, even as the behavior of many of our students challenges it at every turn. In effect, for anyone other than students of legal drinking age, we are in many respects proscribed from actively encouraging an environment where moderate use of alcohol is the norm.

Perceptions of Dartmouth hold that it has an even more serious problem of abusive drinking than the typical college or university. In fact, Dartmouth's own institutional research suggests that many Dartmouth students drink responsibly—while the heavy drinking that occurs is at rates at or slightly above the national average. However, these facts were cold comfort to the committee. A comprehensive review of statistics on drinking at Dartmouth, and of existing policies to minimize abuses, yielded the following observations:

- A key parameter used to gauge heavy drinking on campuses is the rate of so-called “binge drinking.” This measurement is interpreted as meaning five drinks at one sitting for a man on at

least one occasion within the previous two weeks, and four drinks at one sitting for a woman. According to the Harvard Alcohol Study—an effort to profile drinking on U.S. campuses—the national average rate of binge drinking was 43 percent in 1998. That same year, a Dartmouth survey found that 48 percent of students had engaged in “binge drinking” within the previous two weeks, up from 43 percent in 1997.

- Nationally, a smaller subset of students—approximately 20 percent—is considered to be very heavy “episodic” drinkers. Dartmouth is about average in this category. In 1998, 22 percent of Dartmouth students reported that they had consumed at least ten drinks in one day during the previous two-week period. It is instructive that this is a common drinking profile within the CFS system. Fifty-four percent of CFS male members drank in this fashion. As a result, the CFS male was three times more likely to drink at this level than the next highest group—unaffiliated males, of whom 17 percent reported drinking ten drinks or more in the previous two-week period. Women have much lower rates of very heavy episodic drinking—10 percent of CFS women and 8 percent of unaffiliated women.
- The Harvard Alcohol Study has identified a nationwide trend of campuses bifurcating into students who drink heavily and students who do not drink much, if at all. This split is also evident at Dartmouth. In 1998, for example, more than one in four first-year students said they abstained entirely from alcohol use, while almost two in four said they were heavy drinkers. One-third of all first-year students reported that they had been heavy drinkers even before coming to Dartmouth, which also squares with a national trend of heavy binge drinking in high school.
- Similarly, in Dartmouth’s own surveys, students report widely varying attitudes about the importance of alcohol in social life. Many say they are receptive to the idea of creating more social spaces and organizations that are not heavily dependent on consumption of alcohol. For example, the 1997 survey conducted by the Social Life Task Force revealed that 42 percent of students believed it was important to have alcohol available at a party. By contrast, 30 percent of students believed it was not important to have alcohol at a party, and another 27 percent were neutral.
- Heavy drinking takes an academic toll on students. In a recent survey, one in three Dartmouth students reported that alcohol consumption had a negative effect on his or her academic life. One in three reported having missed class due to alcohol use. Students who were CFS members were more likely to report academic difficulty because of alcohol (37 percent) than were unaffiliated students (24 percent). Significantly, those reporting the greatest academic difficulties were “non-leader” members of CFS organizations, half of whom reported academic problems due to alcohol.
- Overall, 14 percent of students reported having injured themselves due to drinking. Among CFS men, 27 percent said they had injured themselves; that number dropped to 17 percent for CFS women and 10 percent for unaffiliated women and men. Almost one in three Dartmouth students reported in 1998 that they had experienced blackouts, or loss of memory, as a result of drinking.
- Half of Dartmouth students vomited at least once in the past year due to excessive alcohol consumption, and more than one in four had done so in a public setting. Twenty-seven percent said they had vomited deliberately to get rid of alcohol in their systems, the practice known as “boot and rally.” Half of CFS males reported engaging in this practice, followed by CFS females (24 percent), independent males (22 percent) and independent females (13 percent). In addition, one-fifth of all students reported urinating publicly due to alcohol consumption. Among CFS males, 44 percent reported they had done so at least once in the past year, followed by independent males (28 percent), CFS females (14 percent), and independent females (8 percent).
- Excessive alcohol use plays a major role at Dartmouth in incidents of sexual abuse. According to statistics from the Sexual Abuse Awareness Program office, in roughly 90 percent of incidents reported to Dartmouth officials, one or both parties to the assault said they were intoxicated.

- Dartmouth students spend a considerable amount of money on the purchase of alcohol. Statistics based on Dartmouth's 1998 Risk Behavior Survey suggest that in three terms that year undergraduate students spent approximately \$647,000 on alcohol. Male students in fraternity or coed houses spent more than double what sorority members spent on alcohol and more than seven times what independent males and females spent.

Having considered these data and observations, the committee turned to evaluating the track record of alcohol education and prevention at Dartmouth, as well as the enforcement of alcohol-related rules and regulations. Here is what it found:

- **Education and prevention.** Dartmouth has at times had excellent programs in these areas, some of which have been at the forefront of trends in higher education. At other times, regrettably, these programs have received less emphasis. An important move was increasing resources in July 1999 to enable the hiring of a full-time coordinator for alcohol and drug education.

Under the coordinator, Margaret Smith, the institution recently launched a "social norms" campaign. This approach is designed to curb excessive alcohol use by reinforcing for students that actual rates of drinking are often substantially lower than they think. Another strategy is the use of "peer counselors" to educate students about excessive alcohol use.

In discussions with the committee, both Ms. Smith and the College Committee on Alcohol and Other Drugs affirmed that far more could, and should, be done. However, it is well known in the field of alcohol control that few abusers lack education about the dangers of excessive alcohol use—and therefore education alone is not a sufficient strategy.

- **Enforcement of rules and regulations.** In recent years, alcohol rules on campus have been complicated, poorly enforced by the College and widely ignored by students. There are multiple requirements for registering parties with alcohol and strict keg-use formulas that appear to be circumvented with great regularity. In addition, parties with alcohol have been banned from residence halls, a fact that appears to have driven more students to drink heavily within the CFS system.

Mixed messages have accompanied enforcement of the existing rules and regulations. One complication has arisen from a matter of College practice: unless a given party in a CFS house has been registered, Safety and Security staff have not been allowed to inspect CFS houses to determine whether they are complying with the rules. The committee concluded that it is not desirable that Dartmouth become a police state. However, we also deemed it unlikely that the problem of excessive alcohol use can be dealt with effectively without stepped-up involvement by Safety and Security staff.

PART III • RECOMMENDATIONS

As a consequence of its review, the committee proposed a comprehensive set of recommendations, which are discussed below. Many of these recommendations are expressed in considerable detail and with rather specific timetables. However, the committee recognizes that whatever program the Board enacts will require many years to complete. Naturally, that program will evolve and adjust to circumstances over time. In particular, the reader should be aware that the committee has for the most part not considered the effect that any financial constraints might have on its suggested timetables.

Recommendation 1 • Create a Greatly Enhanced System of Residential Clusters at Dartmouth

The primary focus of the committee's proposal to change the social and residential life at Dartmouth is to move as quickly as possible to a greatly enhanced residential system featuring improved residential clusters. Such a system would far exceed anything that is currently in place at the institution, and would serve as the bedrock of social and residential life on campus. As noted above, Dartmouth nominally already has 11 residential clusters, but these clusters have not realized their full potential.

Creating a comprehensive cluster system is an idea that has circulated at Dartmouth for a number of years. This was the chief proposal put forward by the Ad Hoc Committee on Residential Life, a committee appointed by the Board of Trustees in the late 1980s. The 1987 report of this group had this to say about clusters:

The central element in the residential life system is the cluster. We believe that the current system reflects tremendous progress over the last several years in terms of improved physical facilities and in the development of the cluster concept. The next phase must be for the clusters to provide a greater sense of continuity and stability for students.

It is not an accident that fraternities and sororities have come to play such a dominant role in the social life of students. These organizations provide, better than most places on campus, a sense of continuity and stability, a sense of belonging to a fixed and predictable and supportive place. Only when providing these things are explicit objectives of the cluster system and only when these objectives are largely being met will fraternities and sororities return to their proper place in the residential system.

More than a decade later, the Committee on the Student Life Initiative came to the same conclusion. We think that advancing clusters to the next phase of their development will create a very attractive new environment and at the same time deal with a number of weaknesses in the current social and residential life of the College that were identified in *Part II* of this report. The committee strongly believes that a comprehensive cluster system can increase the sense of community at Dartmouth, and, in particular, afford considerable new opportunities to weave multicultural learning experiences into residential life. A cluster-based system that would allow students to live in the same cluster for two or three years would provide them a far greater sense of stability and continuity than they currently have. And by increasing the vitality of social life in the residences, clusters could help to diminish the role on campus of the current CFS organizations.

Bringing about a true cluster system at Dartmouth would require substantial investments in both "hardware"—the building of new facilities—and "software"—additions to programming and staffing, as well as new systems of governance. We begin by describing the "hardware" components.

(1) Cluster hardware: What we need to build. Based on its analysis of current and future needs, the committee concluded that the Board of Trustees should adopt a long-term goal of having approximately 3,000 high-quality beds in its residential system. This number would allow approximately 90 percent of students enrolled in the heavily attended fall term to live on campus. At present, the comparable figure of high-quality

beds is at best 2,650. However, this number includes beds in the River Cluster and Choates, which as currently configured may not merit the “high quality” designation.

- **New clusters.** A target of 3,000 high-quality beds implies a net increase of 350 beds from the current level. In reality, actual construction would have to be greater than this number, since the committee also assumes that a number of beds will be eliminated from the current system as rooms are “decompressed” or eliminated in the process of renovation. The precise number of beds so eliminated must be carefully re-examined in light of all of the recommendations of this report. An approximate goal for the next five to seven years is to build the equivalent of two new 350-bed clusters as soon as practicable. Moreover, to achieve a reasonably uniform quality system, the River Cluster may need to be replaced, and the Choates as well, unless conversion of the latter complex to become predominantly singles can be demonstrated to make it attractive to students. If the Board were to vote to eliminate student residency in CFS houses, another cluster of 250 or so beds would also be needed.
- **Improvements to existing clusters.** In addition to building new bed capacity or cluster complexes, the committee recommends making substantial improvements to the existing residential clusters. Almost all of these involve adding new spaces within or adjacent to the clusters that could be used for social activities and dining. Note that such spaces added within the residences will increase the bed construction requirements, but those that are added on to the residences will not. The spaces the committee recommends are set forth below.
- **Cluster-based “common houses.”** For the cluster concept to work, the committee deems it essential that one new “common house” or large common space be built in or near each cluster. These should be of sufficient size to allow all students living in the cluster, as well as some students living in other clusters, to attend cluster-sponsored social events. These spaces or houses would be used for lectures, parties, periodic dining and other gatherings. If a common house were created, its “upstairs” could also include spaces set aside for lounging or studying. The house might also have a very limited number of residence rooms (five at most) intended for the Cluster Coordinator (see below) or cluster student leaders. A rough analogy is the faculty associate’s house located at the East Wheelock complex. However, rather than having faculty advisors live in this complex, it would be used primarily for social gatherings.
- **Smaller social spaces.** A number of smaller social spaces should be created and distributed throughout the clusters, to be used for lounging and studying. These spaces would be student controlled and maintained with continual student input. A particularly noteworthy idea is to build new computer facilities within the residence halls, a need identified in Dartmouth’s recent Institutional Self-Study Report for reaccreditation.
- **Cluster storage.** New student storage space should be created within clusters so that students can leave their possessions behind between terms and during off terms.
- **Food service in the clusters.** Snack bars and kitchen facilities should be created at each cluster, preferably within or near the common houses or smaller social spaces. Although dining would remain generally centralized at Thayer Hall, students would be able to eat light meals in their clusters, as at the East Wheelock snack bar. As kitchen facilities are built around campus, large all-cluster events could be catered within the common spaces.
- **Housing for Cluster Coordinator.** Living spaces, as described below, should be created in each cluster to house a Cluster Coordinator.
- **Senior housing.** New “townhouses” or other living spaces should be constructed solely for use by seniors. The precise construction requirements for these facilities should be determined after the cluster system begins operating and needs can be better identified.

(2) **Cluster software: How the clusters would function.** For the clusters to function as the primary basis of social and residential life on campus requires the College to do more than simply build new residence halls and add new spaces. A programming infrastructure must also be created. The committee anticipates that this would require a new system of cluster governance and programming. In order for this infrastructure to function effectively, the College must provide students with continuity in residential living.

The committee's recommendations regarding governance and programming for the new cluster system include the following:

- **Cluster Councils.** It is critical that students living within the cluster be empowered to plan programming as much as possible. To this end, the committee proposes the creation of a Cluster Council within each cluster. The Council would be composed of students elected by others within their cluster. In addition, an Inter-Cluster Council would be created to link the clusters together in devising events and programming of interest to the broad College community.
- **Cluster Coordinators.** Each individual cluster would have a Cluster Coordinator who is an employee of the Office of Residential Life. This person would work with the students on the Cluster Council to enable them to plan and supervise social and academic programming within the cluster. Various students told the committee that they frequently lack sufficient time or skill to plan events themselves, so the committee concluded that considerable support in the form of a Cluster Coordinator is very much needed.
- **Cluster Advisory Board.** Each cluster would also have a dedicated group of non-student advisors, composed largely of faculty and administrators. The committee deems it critical that the clusters have close linkages to faculty, and that new programs or systems need to be created to encourage and motivate the considerable involvement of faculty members. These could take the form of reduced teaching loads or newly created and revolving "chairs" that would allow faculty to focus for a time mainly on student affairs. The committee recommends that the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the College coordinate efforts to devise such incentives.
- **Funds for programming.** Clusters will need substantial funding for programming if they are to succeed in supplanting a large share of the social activities that currently go on elsewhere on campus. The administration and Board of Trustees can best decide how to fund this effort—for example, whether through a sizable increase in the Student Activities Fee or through the general College budget. However, the committee's work has made clear that this area of College life requires significantly increased spending.
- **Undergraduate Assistants.** The committee recommends reorganizing the current system of Undergraduate Advisors (UGAs). Under the new system, the UGAs would have a broader set of responsibilities than current UGAs. One or more UGAs would be assigned to each dormitory or living unit within the cluster. Areas housing more first-year students would have more UGAs. UGAs would also be compensated for their services at higher levels than today, either through significant stipends or reductions in room and board.

The committee's recommendations on improving continuity in residential living include the following:

- **Continuity.** As new clusters are built and beds are added to the current system, it will become possible to afford Dartmouth students something they have not had for years—the ability to live in the same cluster for the bulk of their Dartmouth careers. The committee sees a student's residential career evolving along the following lines. Ideally, each incoming first-year student would initially be assigned to a cluster, to the extent possible by his or her choice. The student would then live in this cluster through the junior year. In the senior year, the student could remain in the cluster; move on to live in a new group of townhouses or smaller units built specifically for residency by seniors;

move to an off-campus house or apartment; or move into the house of a selective social organization.

- **First-year housing.** The committee discussed at length both the pluses and minuses of moving to a system in which all first-year students would be housed together. Although the committee reached no conclusion, there are enough arguments in favor of first-year housing that such a system should be given careful consideration. In fact, because the River Cluster and the Choates house substantial numbers of first-year students already, the College has an opportunity to conduct an objective evaluation of this practice over the next several years while the expansion of bed capacity is underway.

Accordingly, the committee proposes that both the River Cluster and the Choates be used for the next several years exclusively as first-year housing for approximately one-half of each first-year class. This would allow the College to provide concentrated programs in both of these clusters that would be devoted to the needs of first-year students. The committee recommends that sophisticated research and analysis be carried out to monitor the effectiveness both of housing first-year students separately and of targeting special programs to them. The conclusions of this analysis could be made part of the Board's review in 2005 of the implementation of the Student Life Initiative.

The committee also recommends that first-year students who elect to live in the River Cluster and Choates be given two advantages. First, each would be given priority to move as a group into a designated high-quality cluster in the sophomore year. To this end, several high-quality clusters would house few, if any, first-year students and would therefore have a large number of rooms available for incoming sophomores. Second, first-year students living in the River Cluster and Choates would not only have the benefit of the special first-year programming but would also be able to affiliate immediately upon matriculation with their future clusters and to attend all cluster-related events.

- **Mixed-class housing.** Under the committee's proposal, the remaining half of the first-year class would be assigned to available mixed-class clusters. We recommend that many of these first-year students be housed in a particular building, in dedicated wings or on specified floors of clusters, and that they receive concentrated support and programming similar to those provided to first-year students housed in the River Cluster and Choates. Other first-year students could be spread throughout the clusters alongside upper-class students. Here again, a program of research and analysis would be carried out to evaluate the different experiences of these sets of first-year students.

Once in a cluster, students would be given top priority to remain in that cluster through the end of the junior year. Students could also exercise a one-time "opt-out" option to switch to another cluster anytime during these three years. As above, these arrangements would be carefully evaluated after several years and the conclusions made part of the Board's review in 2005. As a result, when progress has been made on the building of new residential beds and facilities, a rational basis will have been created for selecting the plan that best advances the goal of residential continuity.

- **Reduce fall-term enrollment.** The committee recommends a further change that may minimize the extent of the building program required to achieve continuity and the amount of time needed to carry it out. This would involve the College developing programs to attract more enrollment to winter and summer terms, and shift some enrollment away from fall term. These might include breaks on room rent or other financial incentives, or academic programs designed to make these other terms more desirable. Another such program would be moving CFS rush to winter term as recommended below. Additionally, the committee recommends that admission of the first-year class should adhere to the target number of 1,075 students.

- **CFS houses non-residential during the summer.** The committee proposes one change involving the summer term. To enable CFS houses to undertake necessary refurbishment and regular maintenance, no residency would be allowed in these facilities during the summer.
- **Options for seniors.** The committee proposes that seniors be given the choice of staying in the clusters that they had been in since their first or sophomore year or of moving to housing that might be better suited to their needs as older students. Such housing could include the Maxwell/Channing Cox residences or additional facilities similar to this that could be built in the future. Another option that should be considered is to renovate the Choate complex and convert it predominantly to singles for use by seniors. A number of students who appeared before the committee described a vision of townhouses where seniors could live in groups. The committee recommends that such facilities be provided depending on evolving needs as the pattern of operation of the cluster system becomes more clear over time.

Recommendation 2 • Create Other Spaces and Programs for General Use

Although the committee believes that a great deal of social life on campus could shift to clusters under the approaches described above, we think there will be additional needs for new social spaces across the campus. The committee has made no effort to specify the precise siting or architectural design of any facilities. Rather, our objective is to present the conceptual view of a new integrated residential and social life system for Dartmouth.

Prior to the announcement of the Student Life Initiative, the administration retained Centerbrook Architects and Planners to study and present alternative preliminary architectural designs of facilities to replace Dartmouth's aging dining (Thayer Hall) and recreation (Alumni Gymnasium) buildings. The Centerbrook project has also considered student needs but has not been charged with the full breadth of the committee's task. In particular, residential life has been outside the purview of the Centerbrook project. Therefore the siting and architectural decisions of the Centerbrook project should be reformulated after the adoption by the Board of Trustees of its plan for the Student Life Initiative. In particular, the committee's recommendation of major additions to social space associated with residences, especially the common houses, may allow for a smaller and less dense central facility than that presently conceived by Centerbrook.

- **Central dining.** Large dining capacity in the center of campus should continue as a prominent feature of the Dartmouth dining system. The precise configuration of the central dining facilities will change from today's as part of the necessary remodeling and modernizing of Thayer Hall and its possible incorporation into an expanded central student center effectively combining Collis, Robinson and Thayer. The central dining facility should offer a variety of styles of dining and should remain adaptable to changes in student preferences over time. The central dining facility should remain open during most of the day and evening. It should feature contiguous gathering spaces to facilitate its role as a campus crossroad.
- **Secondary dining facility for the north end of campus.** An additional full service, though smaller, dining facility should also be created to serve the north end of campus. This new facility would replace and greatly improve on the existing Café North and would provide an additional campus dining option analogous to the existing Collis and Courtyard options. In order to invite its use by the broadest possible population, it should not be incorporated into any new cluster or other building.
- **Additional dining options.** While most main meals may continue to be consumed in these large facilities, other new food options should also be created especially for hours other than main meal times. These options should be available at places where students tend to be at those hours. Locations for such snack bars might include residence cluster common houses, certain academic departments (especially those that remain active late at night) and certain libraries (such as the snack bar already planned for the new Berry library addition). Snack carts at high traffic locations

and times should also be considered. In addition, more options and support for kosher dining should be provided.

- **Enhanced College catering.** Aside from dining spaces, a lower cost alternative to the Hanover Inn catering system should be devised. This capability would facilitate affordable group dinners, teas, etc. on a periodic basis for residence clusters, clubs, academic gatherings and other groups.
- **Licensed alcohol venues.** The committee supports the establishment of additional locations for the licensed sale of alcoholic beverages. Collectively, several such outlets would provide much more opportunity than exists today for the responsible and legal consumption of alcohol. In the long run, we suggest at least three new venues: a new facility larger than the Lone Pine tavern in any expanded student center, a tavern in a new graduate student center (see below), and possible alcoholic beverage service along with evening meals at a new north campus dining location. Since none of these alternatives will be available soon, we suggest the immediate, but temporary, opening of a new licensed alcohol outlet attractive to students of legal age, perhaps in the former Hanover Inn Tavern (now known as The Drake Room). In addition, licensed sale of alcohol should be available on a catered basis in conjunction with large social functions involving significant numbers of legal age students.
- **Large flat-floor hall.** The committee recommends the establishment of a large hall to accommodate up to 1,100 seated students. The space should be flexible, with no permanent seating and with moveable partitions. It should have a stage and audio/visual equipment for entertainment performances and presentations, but should normally not require especially skilled crews for its more general use. Students should be involved in the scheduling and management of this facility. The hall could be either free standing or incorporated into an expanded student center, but should definitely be centrally located on the campus.
- **World Cultures Initiative.** One of the central goals of the Student Life Initiative has been to “provide opportunities for greater interaction among all Dartmouth students.” The value in this interaction is for students to learn about the many different cultures that they will meet in our increasingly diverse nation and as they travel our seemingly shrinking world. Many provisions of the committee’s recommended program are intended to promote these interactions. However, relying solely on casual interactions may be inadequate in at least two respects. First, the interactions may be too diffuse for significant learning to occur. The committee heard from students that such reliance burdens the few representatives of minority cultures within each setting (not only residences and social settings but also classrooms) with the constant responsibility for teaching others about these different cultures. Moreover, the ability of campus programs to respond to inevitable periodic incidents of cross-cultural misunderstanding would be greatly facilitated by additional resources.

For these reasons, the committee recommends that a committee be established immediately to formulate an appropriate program to promote cultural understanding. For the sake of ease, we will refer to this as the proposed World Cultures Initiative. Without pre-empting this new group’s charter, the committee has several guiding suggestions garnered from its deliberations. The initiative should not be housed in a free-standing building, although it would almost certainly require some space in a central location. The committee received ample feedback that such buildings at other universities had generally failed to achieve the goal of weaving diversity into the fabric of these institutions. The committee recommends that the programming *not* be directed toward minority groups, but rather that it be directed toward helping the entire community—students, faculty, administrators and townspeople—learn about world cultures. Such cultures might include national, religious, racial, ethnic or gender groups.

In essence, the World Cultures Initiative would represent a commitment by the College in the form of permanent staffing, funding and space to continuously provide enriching programming for the

benefit of the entire community. The programming might include exhibits in a central space, lectures, discussions, performances, meals and social functions. The initiative would also work with Dartmouth's academic departments to seek ways in which diverse cultural perspectives might be further incorporated into courses and research. It might develop a multifaceted survey program that could be offered for credit toward a revamped physical education requirement in a manner parallel to that suggested below as an alternative for alcohol education.

- **New arts spaces.** New spaces for small-scale art and music performance and rehearsal should be created. Included among these should be areas for film-viewing, small dramatic and dance performances, as well as graphic arts and design studio work. These spaces could be located in an expanded student center and/or in selected common houses, but should be available for use by all students and be controlled by students.
- **New recreational space.** The committee recommends a new recreation and fitness center as part of the necessary rebuilding of Alumni Gymnasium. This center should include expanded fitness equipment, an indoor track, gymnasium space (basketball, volleyball, etc.), racquetball courts, bowling lanes, improved swimming and diving facilities, and additional climbing walls. In order to enhance student interaction surrounding these activities, a snack area should be incorporated into the fitness center.

Consideration should also be given to placing one or two smaller installations of fitness equipment closer to where students live. These areas would be available for use at hours when the fitness center is not open and for occasions when students have time limitations but want to exercise.

A variety of opportunities exists to better utilize Dartmouth's appealing outdoor environment for recreational and fitness use. These opportunities include lighted jogging paths, outdoor basketball courts, hiking and mountain biking trails. Opening the underutilized College Park section of campus (the high wooded area bounded by the Bema, the physics and chemistry buildings, and North Park Street) might assist these efforts. In view of the use of the campus during the summer, further development of the Connecticut River waterfront should be pursued.

- **Space-use clearinghouse.** Both existing and new social spaces must be controlled in a manner that is responsive to student needs and that makes them available to most student groups on campus. To make this a reality, students must be readily able to identify appropriate spaces for their functions and should not be excluded from using space that is underutilized. The committee recommends the formation of a central space clearinghouse to identify availability of alternative spaces and the appointment of a space coordinator to oversee facilities usage.
- **Programming coordination.** Especially with the creation of large new social "organizations" in the form of the new residence clusters, there will be a multiplicity of programs available for students on many days and nights. A mechanism is needed to coordinate programming and funding for students. To this end, the committee recommends formation of a student-run committee with representation from the various groups that produce campus social programs. This committee would maintain an evolving program calendar and would discuss and resolve developing conflicts or holes in the schedule.

Recommendation 3 • Improve Residential and Social Life for Graduate Students

Earlier we noted some significant deficiencies that the committee believes must be addressed in both the residential and social life of graduate students. To tackle these, we propose the following:

- **Graduate housing.** The College should build new apartment-style housing for approximately 100-150 graduate students. In refining these numbers, the Dean of Graduate Studies and others will obviously wish to consider how many family units may need to be created for students with spouses

and/or children. Logical possible sites for this new housing include a location on the north end of campus in view of the number of graduate students in the sciences, as well as at or near the site of the current graduate student housing on Park Street. Given that the land underneath the River Cluster may eventually be used by the Tuck and/or Thayer Schools, it may be appropriate to consider siting additional graduate housing in this area as well.

- **Graduate student center.** To foster more social interaction among graduate students and the rest of the College community, the committee also proposes that a new graduate student center be constructed at the site of this new housing or on the north end of campus. Determining the components and program of this center should be the purview of the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Graduate Student Council.
- **New transportation and pathways.** New transportation options and “pathways” should be created to improve graduate students’ access to the main campus. The committee proposes that regular shuttle service be created between the campus and Sagem Village, where a number of graduate students live. We also propose that the area separating the current graduate student housing on Park Street from the main campus, College Park, be made more accessible. This could be accomplished by constructing a new path or sidewalk through College Park that might have the additional benefit of opening up this attractive area to greater use.

Recommendation 4 • Make Major Changes in the Coed, Fraternity and Sorority (CFS) Organizations

The committee unanimously believes that the CFS organizations, as presently constituted, require major improvements and a review in five years to determine its future in the new Dartmouth social and residential system. The deficiencies enumerated in *Part II* above are too significant for the Dartmouth community to tolerate the system as it currently exists.

Therefore, if it is to survive, the system must change significantly. To achieve the required improvements, the committee recommends that the CFS organizations meet new higher standards that are outlined in the remainder of this section. These standards are not for the mere purpose of creating evaluations, but are true standards that must be met to earn the privilege of recognition.

We recognize that some of the new standards we propose may sound unreasonably stringent and overly specific. However, readers of this report should understand that there is already an existing body of very specific regulations that apply to CFS houses. By and large, we have judged these existing rules and regulations to be inadequate, and we have also noted that they are frequently not enforced. Thus, we propose a new set of regulations that will hold CFS houses to higher standards and that are designed to be backed up by new enforcement by the College.

It is unlikely that all current CFS organizations will be able to meet the higher standards, with the result that the number of organizations will probably be reduced. This reduction is desirable in order to eliminate the historical dominance by the CFS organizations of Dartmouth social life. A reduction in the number of CFS organizations would also complement the enhanced cluster system and the other recommendations of this report. The selective social organizations of the future will constitute a very different, higher quality but secondary component of the overall Dartmouth social system.

A majority of the committee also supported the elimination of residency for selective social organizations for reasons set forth in *Part II* above. However, the committee concluded that elimination of residency is not now practically feasible because of the overall shortage of beds in the campus housing system. As a result, the committee proposes that those CFS organizations that can meet the new higher standards continue to be residence-based organizations until June 2005. At that time, as part of a major five-year review of the system of selective social organizations, the Board of Trustees should consider whether to permit residence-based selective organizations.

(1) Limitations on number of organizations. The committee proposes that no new selective residential social organizations be recognized. If any currently recognized organization fails to achieve recognition for any reason, it could not be replaced by another new organization. Any single-sex organization, however, may change itself into a coed organization and maintain recognition without being deemed to have closed. The overall cap on the number of selective social organizations effectively adopted by the Board of Trustees in the mid-1980s (30) should be retained. New non-residential selective social organizations could be established and existing selective residential organizations could become non-residential but subject to the overall cap. The purpose of these limitations is to assure continuing balance between selective social organizations and other campus institutions.

(2) Standards for Recognition. The committee recommends new Standards for Recognition, listed below. The overall goal of these new standards is to create improved organizations that will contribute to Dartmouth's sense of community, that will complement the central academic mission of the College, and that will be compatible with other recommendations in this report. These standards will apply to any selective social organization whether residential or non-residential (except where not applicable, based on context).

- **Standards relating to organizational practices.** The Dean of the College should review and revise the current CFS Minimum Standards for leadership, membership, budget, program development and behavior. In the course of this revision, the standards should be upgraded to "Standards of Excellence." The application of the standards should also be changed from the present evaluative system of minimum standards to higher standards that must be met in order for organizations to achieve continued recognition (see *Provisions for de-recognition* below). The new standards for recognition should include the following requirements:
 - Each organization would adopt, maintain and honor a statement of purpose that sets forth how it intends to contribute to the community and the College's academic mission. The statement of purpose would include a commitment to achieving diversity of membership.
 - Each organization, and the system as a whole, would organize itself in the manner described below under *Governance*.
 - Any recognized organization would not permit any activity by a group of its members that violates Dartmouth's Principle of Community.
 - All recognized organizations would adopt a redesigned membership contract that includes at least the following commitments by each member: to honor a new code of personal conduct (including alcohol-related behavior); to comply with the new alcohol policy; and to refrain from participation in any hazing or abusive initiation rites (see *Selection and initiation practices* below).
 - A revised programming standard would include a standard for community service, designed in consultation with the Tucker Foundation, to assure that selective social organization members' average participation in community service places them in the top tier among all Dartmouth undergraduates. This standard is intended to continue the laudable trend of increased community service by selective social organizations and to assure that these activities are more than just talk. Consideration should be given to replacing pledging rituals (see below) with a community service project for new members that would contribute toward this new standard.
 - Each single-sex organization would create formal affiliations with either coed organizations or single-sex organizations of the opposite gender. Whereas the committee decided to preserve the choice of organizations to remain single sex, it does wish to promote coeducational activities.

- Each organization would be required to have among its residents (or members, if non-residence based) at all times at least one of each of the following: (a) a sexual abuse peer advisor, (b) a peer advisor on alcohol and other drugs, (c) a designated Tucker Foundation liaison, (d) a designated liaison to the new Inter-Cluster Council, and (e) a person devoted to diversity and leadership training.
- As with other College residences, each selective social organization with a residence would be required to make a room available for a non-member UGA who would serve the needs of the entire organization.
- Each residence-based organization would be required to open its facilities for use upon reasonable request by other College-recognized organizations for meetings or other functions.
- Each organization would prepare a detailed budget that would be formally presented to members for approval in the presence of the organization's advisory board members (see *Governance* below). This standard would promote awareness by the entire organization as to its purposes and how its resources are being utilized. Every purchase of alcoholic beverages would be recorded in the regular books and records of the organizations. The committee believes that the present prohibition of alcohol purchases with organization funds has promoted the undesirable and hypocritical practice of off-the-books purchases, which it wishes to stop.
- All residence-based organizations would permit free access at all times to their premises by Safety and Security personnel and other College officers on the same basis that such access is allowed in the College's residence halls. This measure is necessary to allow equitable treatment of all students and to permit appropriate enforcement of College rules, particularly related to alcohol.
- **Selection and initiation practices** would be changed materially. The overall goal would be to require organizations to offer membership in the most inclusive way possible while still permitting them the freedom to select members.
 - Rush would be moved to the beginning of winter term of the sophomore year in order to reduce somewhat the fall housing crunch and allow more time for students to experience the new enhanced cluster system.
 - Rush will be conducted simultaneously for all single-sex and coed organizations to maximize the chances for success of both existing and possible new coed options. The new system of rush must be made less exclusionary such that any student who, in good faith, considers membership in a specified number of organizations will be assured a place in at least one of these organizations. The details of the new rush procedures will be designed by the successor to the CFSC in consultation with the Dean of the College.
 - In order to minimize any financial discouragement for seeking membership, financial aid must be made available by the organization to any student in need. We encourage that no services to organizations beyond those expected of any new member would be required in exchange for this aid.
 - There will no longer be any "pledge period." Students chosen to join an organization will be admitted as full members, subject only to reasonable education requirements and participation in constructive group projects. The committee concluded that the pledge period encourages practices which are demeaning and uselessly time consuming to students, while not being highly valued even by most of the organizations.

- There will be no hazing of new members. The Dean of the College would set forth a new definition of hazing that is substantially more encompassing than the present standard of New Hampshire State Law. There would be no abusive or demeaning initiation rites, especially those requiring or encouraging the use of alcohol or physical abuse.
- **Residence and membership requirements** applicable to all selective residence-based social organizations should be enhanced to ensure that each such organization is strong enough to sustain itself financially, is a viable component of the College's housing system, and attracts enough members to well utilize scarce house facilities. Aspects of these new standards should include the following:
 - Residence in houses of selective social organizations would be allowed only for seniors and up to four junior house officers (President, Treasurer, Social Chair and House Manager), all of whom must meet minimum GPA and disciplinary-record requirements to be determined by the Dean of the College. These measures are designed to maximize the responsible management of valuable house facilities.
 - A thorough evaluation would be made as to the optimum number of residents who should live in each house, taking into account measures of square feet per bed, study space, library space, computer facilities, bathroom space, etc. This review should be akin to that conducted by the Office of Residential Life to determine decompression requirements in residence halls. Once the optimum number of residents was determined, each house would be required to fill each bed. Therefore, there would have to be at least as many senior members as the number of residence units (at least for the fall term).
 - Non-member residents, except for the aforementioned UGA, would not be permitted to live in the house of any selective social organization. Such living arrangements do not promote organizational health and are likely to be uncomfortable for the outside residents.
 - To assure that the residency requirements would be met in the future, the total membership immediately after winter rush of each selective residence-based organization would exceed three times the number of residence units. Any house not now in compliance with this standard would need to demonstrate class by class compliance, beginning with the rush class of winter 2002. The Dean of the College would allow reasonable exceptions to this timetable, especially in the case of co-educational organizations.

The committee recommends that failure to meet any residence or membership standard should cause the organization to lose its privilege to be a residence-based selective social organization. In the event of such a failure, the organization could continue as a non-residence based organization if it were in compliance with all other applicable standards for selective social organizations.

- **Physical standards** should be enhanced and should form the basis for a major improvement in the facilities of the selective social organizations. The sequence of these improvements would be as follows: the setting of new standards; the undertaking of a College-paid audit of the facilities; the drawing up of cost estimates for necessary renovations and repairs; fundraising by CFS organizations to finance the repairs; construction; and periodic inspection to maintain compliance with new standards.
 - New standards of physical quality would first be established by the administration in consultation with an outside professional engineering firm. These standards would include internal and external cosmetic features, furnishings and grounds, as well as structural, utility and safety features.

- The standards would also specifically provide that all tap systems together with associated large open refrigerator units must be removed prior to September 2000 and that basements must be converted to general purpose uses, such as kitchens, lounges, study/computer space, storage areas, exercise rooms or workshops. This standard is intended to eliminate the regular large-scale distribution of alcohol as a central function of the selective social organizations. It is also recommended that permanent bars be eliminated in such conversions.
- The overall objective of the physical standards is to bring and maintain all houses to a quality level that is at least equivalent to that now met by the best of the CFS houses and by the residence halls, and to maintain them at that level over time. Implementation of the new physical standards would thereby create a uniformly clean and comfortable environment in which all Dartmouth students could live and learn, and be proud to host friends and family.
- Town building code requirements would also be met, including those of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- An independent, College-paid audit would determine for each house the nature and cost estimate of work required to meet the standards. The audit would be completed before March 2001. Each organization electing to continue as a residence-based organization would, by June 2001, submit to the Dean of the College a plan for executing the necessary work. This plan would include realistic financial projections, including any necessary fundraising. Loans from the College, secured by the property, could be made for these purposes, but only after external options have been exhausted, and only if analysis supports a high likelihood of repayment. Any required loans or fundraising commitments would be completed by June 2002, by which time construction would also commence. All necessary construction would be completed by September 2004.

The committee proposes that failure to meet any of these milestones would cause the organization to lose the right to use its house (whether privately or College-owned) as a residence. Any such organization could continue as a non-residential entity if it were in compliance with all other applicable standards. If the house in question were privately owned, the owners would have several alternatives, including commencing negotiations for the College to acquire the house. Proceeds from the sale of any such house could be used to sustain the organization as a non-residential entity. Upon acquisition, or in the case of an already College-owned house, the College would execute the necessary construction to meet the standards and convert the house for use as senior, coed residences in the Office of Residential Life system.

Under this proposal, houses would immediately become subject to unannounced inspections for compliance with present physical Minimum Standards. Once the above-described construction programs were complete, these inspections would enforce maintenance of the new physical standards. Inspections would be conducted by a team including representatives of the House Corporations Organization (see *Governance* below), the College administration and Hanover-area residents. This system of regular inspections is intended to assure that all houses continuously maintain the specified high level of quality. In the future, houses of selective social organizations will not be used as residences during the summer term. This provision is meant to permit the necessary construction for initial compliance with the new standards and continued maintenance thereafter.

(3) Provisions for de-recognition. The committee proposes that Dartmouth adopt a new philosophy for Dartmouth's selective social organizations. The new policy would stipulate that recognition by the College is a privilege that would only be granted in return for ongoing organizational responsibility, as evidenced by compliance with the above-described standards. As previously noted, failure to meet residence and membership requirements or physical standards would result in loss of an organization's privilege to continue as a residence-based entity. Failure to meet any of the other Standards for Recognition or to comply with the new alcohol rules and regulations (see below) would result in de-recognition of the organization in the event of two such failures in any year or three over any three-year span. Any major behavior in violation of the

College's Principle of Community by any group of members of a selective social organization would constitute such a failure.

Violation of the prohibitions against hazing or abusive initiation rites or any voluntary withdrawal from recognition would result in immediate (i.e., at first offense) and permanent de-recognition. De-recognition would result in the permanent revocation of all privileges, including residence (if applicable), all College support services (billing, accounting, insurance brokerage, funding), participation in rush, and ability to conduct registered social functions.

The Dean of the College would devise a new system of sanctions for first offenses and for infractions deemed to be short of violation of the Standards for Recognition or of the alcohol policy. A specified number of such minor violations could also result in de-recognition.

(4) Governance. The committee proposes that each selective social organization have an Advisory Board, which would include alumni, faculty and College administrators. The Advisory Boards would meet at least quarterly. At least three of these meetings each year would continue into a meeting of all of the organization's members.

The House Corporations of residence-based selective organizations (or their equivalent in the case of occupants of College-owned houses) would join and actively participate in an organization of all such House Corporations (the "HCO"). The HCO would organize itself so that member organizations could share ideas with each other, set common goals and act as a sounding board for the Dean's office as it deals with residential issues on campus.

The committee endorses changes to create a more coordinated student oversight of selective student social organizations, as recommended by the CFSC in its proposal submitted last spring through the Nelson Task Force. These changes would foster greater collaboration and interaction among the CFSC and its four sub-councils that will be especially necessary as the system adapts to a new set of standards.

The separate CFS judicial system will be discontinued. Infractions of standards, codes of conduct, or other judicial matters affecting organizations or individual members will be handled by a unified College-wide judiciary system. Individual organizations, however, will be encouraged to exercise discipline over their members since certain misbehavior by individuals can have adverse consequences on their organization.

(5) Alcohol use and parties. Alcohol use by selective social organizations will be covered by a uniform campus-wide system of rules set forth under *Recommendation 6* below. Only one such proposed rule is specific to selective residence-based organizations and deserves mention here. Registered parties (by definition any gathering of more than 15 people with alcohol present) in a selective residence-based organization's facility may only be conducted on the ground floor. The intent of this rule would be to change the nature and atmosphere of campus social functions in the houses of selective social organizations.

Two additional matters related to alcohol are discussed in this section: Wednesday night house meetings and drinking games. In the end, the committee decided, for strictly pragmatic reasons, not to propose specific rules to change the time of house meetings or to ban "pong" or other drinking games. However, the committee believes that both large-scale, organized drinking late on Wednesday nights and widespread games designed to promote rapid drunkenness are inimical to the community that Dartmouth wants to be. The committee hopes that the re-formulated social organizations will amend these behaviors.

(6) Annual reviews and five-year review in 2005. The committee proposes that each year, beginning in June 2001, all selective student social organizations submit a formal report to the Dean of the College setting forth progress made on all the above fronts. These reports would also summarize information on each organization's membership, grade point averages, disciplinary history and compliance with all standards. These reports would be publicly available for student consideration prior to each year's rush process. Any

omissions of information required in these annual reports of any individual organization could be grounds for de-recognition or other sanctions.

The Dean of the College would compile these reports, together with his or her own assessment of the progress being made. If, after any year, the Dean of the College believed that the system-wide progress achieved was below expectations, he or she would recommend that the College no longer recognize the selective residence-based social organizations. This consolidated annual report would form a part of the annual report to the Board of Trustees on all aspects of the Student Life Initiative (see *Part IV* below).

The committee recommends that in June 2005, the Board of Trustees organize a five-year review of all campus selective social organizations. This review should consider, based upon the experience of the previous five years and prospects for the future, whether selective social organizations should continue to be recognized by the College. If this review concludes that recognition should continue, it should proceed to consider whether the selective social organizations should be allowed to continue to offer residence.

Recommendation 5 • Conduct a Review of Senior Societies and Undergraduate Societies

Senior Societies and Undergraduate Societies do not fit neatly into any pre-conceived system. Among them, they cover the full panoply of selective, non-selective, single-sex, coed, residential and non-residential organizations. We propose that over the next year or two, the Dean of the College conduct a review of each of these two types of organizations to determine whether they should be reformed in any way. These reviews would determine which of the above-developed standards properly apply to these organizations and would then create a process in which the standards are systematically and equitably applied. If this process suggests major changes in the nature of these organizations, either as classes of organizations or as individual organizations, the Dean would promptly recommend and implement the appropriate changes while keeping the President and the Board of Trustees informed.

We propose that, pending the above-suggested reviews, no new Senior Societies or Undergraduate Societies would be formed and no existing such organizations would change their mode of operations (e.g., selectivity, residency, facility), except that any single-sex organization could convert to coed. The Dean should take care that, prior to his review, these organizations are observing the new alcohol policy and that no undesirable activities are effectively pushed by the new rules out of CFS-type houses into these organizations.

Recommendation 6 • Conduct a Review of Academic Affinity Houses and Programs

The committee proposes that a new committee appointed jointly by the Dean of the College and the Dean of the Faculty be created to oversee the academic affinity houses and programs. This committee would first undertake a thorough review of the present academic affinity programs. The Committee on the Student Life Initiative makes the following suggestions as to factors that should be considered in this review. Over time, all programs should be required to maintain a bona fide sponsorship by, and interaction with, a Dartmouth academic department. Programs that control associated affinity houses should have a sufficient number of interested residents to fill the beds, as necessary to play their part in maintaining adequate available on-campus housing especially in the fall term. (Randomly assigned residents are not appropriate to meet this requirement.) At least one non-student mentor (e.g., visiting faculty or graduate student) should reside in each house. We propose that if any of these standards are not met, the facility operated by the affinity house should be reallocated by the Dean of the College to another preferred use.

Recommendation 7 • Introduce New Guidelines for Alcohol and Other Drugs

The committee recommends that multiple approaches be pursued to reduce the adverse effects of excessive use of alcohol and other drugs on our students and the Dartmouth community as a whole. The recommended programs are not meant to be panaceas. The committee recognizes that there are no easy solutions to reducing alcohol consumption to more reasonable levels on this or any college campus. Rather, a range of programs is suggested, which collectively should have some positive effect at the margin.

From its consultations with a number of experts, the committee drew several important conclusions that the institution as a whole and the Board in particular should keep in mind. First, all programs designed to reduce alcohol abuse must be constantly reviewed and revised when necessary to maintain maximum effectiveness. Moreover, reshaping the campus environment is crucial. Many of the recommendations elsewhere in this report (e.g., enhanced cluster system, additional central social spaces including expanded licensed alcohol venues, major changes in the CFS organization) should also help to promote a healthier, less alcohol-dependent student social life. Although programs and an enhanced environment should help, there is also a need for rules and enforcement.

The committee thus recommends a new set of rules that should be strictly enforced, with severe penalties for violations. Although these rules may sound overly stringent and specific, it is important to recognize that they would replace a number of very stringent and specific rules that are currently in place at the College, but that are not being widely observed or enforced. This has led us to propose what we believe to be a simpler, reasonable, uniform set of rules that has a better chance of both being observed and enforced.

Finally, the committee emphasizes that all aspects of its proposed new alcohol policy would apply to all campus organizations, all students and even all academic-oriented campus events (such as a departmental wine-and-cheese reception to which students are invited). These proposals are meant to engender a “level playing field” in the area of alcohol and drug rules and not unduly affect one group of students over another.

(1) Education, intervention and counseling. Our goal for alcohol education is to consistently offer the best professionally designed programs on any campus in America. These programs would have to be continuously monitored and evaluated for effectiveness through institutional research. Education programs should involve an optimum mix among pre-matriculation communications, preferably from the President and Dean; first-year orientation programs; sessions in residence halls throughout the first year; and possible formal courses on alcohol and other health concerns, perhaps as part of a revised physical education requirement. The committee also recommends continuation of the social norms campaign that was introduced in the fall of 1999. Another approach that should be evaluated involves early screening and follow-up counseling for students who already have an alcohol problem upon their arrival on campus.

The alcohol peer counseling program should be expanded so that every major residence facility on campus has at least one such counselor. The existence of an enhanced cluster system and an improved CFS system should facilitate this action.

(2) Rules and regulations. The goal of these rules is to minimize alcohol abuse and reduce overall distribution and consumption, without imposing undue restrictions on students of legal drinking age.

- **Licensed sale of alcohol.** The committee recommends expansion of outlets for licensed sale of alcohol (see *Recommendation 2* above). These areas would create attractive environments for the responsible consumption of alcohol. At the same time, we recommend that no tap systems be permitted anywhere on campus except at these licensed venues. We believe that moving drinking from areas of excessive consumption to those of responsible consumption will help achieve our goals.
- **Private consumption of alcohol.** To allow students considerable freedom while still controlling alcohol use among large groups, the committee proposes a two-track system that could be thought of as “green light” and “yellow light,” as with a traffic signal. The “green light” track would acknowledge that students of legal drinking age should be able to drink on campus provided that they are not bothering anyone, and that they are drinking within a relatively small group. The committee proposes that this freedom apply to students in groups of 6 or fewer who are drinking in a residential room on campus, in groups of 10 or fewer in a residential suite, and in groups of 15 or fewer in any campus social space. There will be no obligation on the part of students drinking in these small groups to register their gatherings in advance.

- **Registered social events.** A second track, the “yellow light” system, would recognize that students of legal drinking age should also be able to drink in larger groups, but with some controls in place to make sure that alcohol use stayed within reasonable bounds. All campus gatherings falling into this category would have to be registered with a designated College office. Such gatherings would include any that exceed the parameters laid out in the “green-light” section above—in other words, groups of 16 or more persons in a social space, 11 or more persons in a residential suite, or 7 or more persons in a residential room. Any such larger student group would be required to register any event where alcohol is served whether it took place in a residence lounge, a reserved College space or the house of a selective social organization. Unless such an event were registered, neither common sources of alcohol (such as kegs or punch bowls) nor general service of alcohol (cans of beer, bottled liquor or wine) would be permitted.
- **Registration procedures.** The committee proposes that registration procedures for such social events should be made as simple as possible, preferably on-line, and with minimal lead times.
- **Licensed servers at registered events.** At any registered social event, alcohol should be dispensed (whether in containers or from a common source) only by a College-certified, trained, non-student server in a designated social space and with an associated certified non-student who would check student IDs and place wristbands on students of legal drinking age. The services of these attendants would be paid for by the event sponsors. The College would conduct a program to train an adequate number of certified servers and attendants.
- **Serving hours.** The committee proposes that alcohol service at any registered social event would be required to end by 2:00 A.M. on any day with no classes the next day, or 12 midnight on any day with classes the next day. Any entertainment would be required to end no later than one hour after these times.
- **Alternative refreshments.** Attractive non-salty food and non-alcoholic beverages must always be served at a registered social event.
- **Compliance.** Safety and Security personnel must have unlimited and continuous access to all spaces except quiet, closed residence rooms to check compliance with all of the above.
- **Record keeping.** As noted above, in a reversal of present practice, the committee proposes that alcohol no longer be purchased through any off-the-books fund of any organization. Any alcohol purchased for an organization-sponsored event would have to be acquired with regular organization funds. The purchase would have to be reflected in the organization’s books and records.

(3) Enforcement

- **Serious violations.** Under the committee’s proposal, failure to register, failure to comply with certified server requirements, violation of curfew, or off-the-books alcohol purchase would be deemed serious offenses. Two such serious offenses in one year or three within a three-year span would subject the sponsoring organization to de-recognition or individuals to separation for one year. Alcohol offenses would be counted cumulatively along with other transgressions, such as failures of organizations to meet the Standards for Recognition.
- **Minor violations.** A system of graduated sanctions for more minor violations would be devised by the Dean of the College, such that a larger number of smaller violations could also result in severe penalties.
- **Violations by new entities.** The Dean would also devise appropriate sanctions for violations by new entities, such as cluster organizations.

- **Alcohol as aggravating factor.** In general, in any disciplinary matters involving individuals, use of alcohol would be deemed to be an aggravating, not a mitigating factor.

(4) Other Matters

- **Non-alcoholic events required.** All campus organizations would be required to sponsor events that do not include alcohol service.
- **Academic measures.** The administration and faculty should consider academic measures (e.g., early morning scheduling of over-subscribed courses, Thursday exams, generally more demanding course requirements, etc.) to break current alcohol habits and discourage consumption.
- **Other drugs.** Excessive alcohol use appears at present to represent by far the most serious substance abuse problem on campus. However, any use of illegal drugs is unequivocally prohibited on campus. Institutional research should continuously review the necessity of redirecting education and regulation programs toward any drugs that become more of a problem than they seem to be today.
- **Language for the *Student Handbook*.** The preamble to the Student Alcohol Policy section in the *Student Handbook* should be rewritten as follows:

Preamble: This policy aims to deepen student awareness of the problems that abuse of alcohol and other drugs can create, and to involve the College and students in helping to alleviate these problems wherever possible. The College's primary goals in this area are: to develop and maintain the most effective possible education, intervention and counseling programs; to develop rules as to alcohol service and consumption that are clear, readily understood, consistent and equally applicable to students in all venues and uniformly enforced; to create a social environment that promotes moderation, safety and individual accountability for those who choose to drink and that does not encourage those who do not drink to start; and to maintain a community where alcohol abuse and the problems of behavior associated with it are minimized to the greatest possible degree.

A primary concern is the health and safety of members of the College community, including their preparedness to pursue the College's challenging academic program at the highest level. All members of the community need to be mindful of their responsibility to lend assistance to others in need of help because of a problem relating to alcohol. Students are accountable for their own decisions regarding alcohol use; they are also responsible for knowing, understanding and complying with applicable College policies and with state and local laws related to alcohol.

PART IV • ENSURING CHANGE: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP OF NEW POLICIES

The committee is aware that after this report is made public, the Board intends to seek comments from the broad Dartmouth community on our recommendations during winter 2000. After this process is completed, the Board intends to adopt the recommendations that it deems to be in the best interests of the College. As a committee, we strongly recommend that the plans then be enacted carefully, and that new policies be systematically pursued, so that a comprehensive reform of social and residential life is in fact carried out.

The Board's actions will commence a process of campus development that cannot be static, but rather must adapt to changing circumstances over time. In this spirit, the committee fully recognizes that the Board and administration must retain some flexibility in implementing any program. Although we were specifically urged by the Board not to dwell on the financial implications of our proposals, we realize that costs and competing priorities will clearly influence the timing and staging of steps that the institution undertakes. Carrying out such a complex program will be particularly dependent on the availability of financial resources over time. To the extent that funding is plentiful, the time schedule can be aggressive and it can even be accelerated. If funding is scarce, the timetable may need to be extended. That said, we recommend the following additional measures to help ensure that changes take place and that progress can be monitored.

A • Sample Summary Chart

We recommend that a checklist similar to the one depicted below be published at the time that the Board adopts a comprehensive Student Life Initiative plan. We stress that our version of this chart is included for illustrative purposes only, based on the recommendations of our report. Any chart issued by the Board would of course reflect the actual substance and timeline of actions that it considered most appropriate. Such a chart would then be used over the next several years by the Board, the administration and the broader Dartmouth community as a reminder that progress would have to be made in stages. It would also enable the community to identify delays in carrying out agreed-upon changes.

B • Annual Board Presentations and Reports to the Community

The committee proposes that each year the administration make a formal report to the Board of Trustees on progress in implementing the Student Life Initiative. These reports would detail actions underway, compare actual progress to the Board's original timetable and identify reasons for any changes or delays in planned actions. We recommend that the administration also issue these annual reports to the Dartmouth community so that it remains apprised of the status of the Student Life Initiative. In addition, the committee recommends that the Board conduct a major review in 2005 of progress in implementing the entire Student Life Initiative.

C • Conclusion

We are pleased to submit these recommendations to the Board, and we appreciate having had the opportunity to open the conversation about the future social and residential life at Dartmouth College. We are proud of this report and we believe that adopting our recommendations and carrying out our proposed changes will make an already superb institution all the greater.

At the same time, we think it is instructive for all who care deeply about Dartmouth to be reminded of the outcome of many previous reports and assessments of social and residential life at the College. During the course of its work, committee members sifted through many of these earlier reports. We were struck by the

SAMPLE ANNUAL PROGRESS CHECKLIST

	June 2001	June 2002	June 2003	June 2004	June 2005
Initial Continuity Plan	Fully implemented				
Final Continuity Plan		Evaluated	Chosen	Implemented	
River Cluster	Used for first years	Used for first years	Replaced		
Choates	Future fate determined				
New Cluster I	Construction begun	Opened			
New Cluster II	Planning complete	Construction begun	Opened		
Common Houses	Conversions complete New buildings planned	Some complete Others begun	Most complete	All complete	
Cluster Organizations	Fully implemented	Improved	Improved	Improved	Improved
New Dining Facilities	Planning in progress	Planning complete	Under construction	Complete	
New Large Flat-Floor Space	Planning in progress	Planning complete	Under construction	Complete	
Temporary Tavern	Open	Open	Open	Closed	
New Licensed Alcohol Venues	Planning in progress	Planning complete	Under construction	Complete	
World Cultures Initiative	Fully planned	Under organization	Organization complete	Final location available	
New Recreation Center	Design underway	Fully planned	Under construction	Complete	
Graduate Student Housing/Center	Site approved	Plans complete	Construction begun	Opened	
CFS Facilities Standards	Audit complete Plans complete	Construction begun	Construction continues	Construction complete (9/04)	
Other CFS Standards	Fully implemented				
CFS Progress Report	Annual report	Annual report	Annual report	Annual report	Five-year system review
Senior/UG Society Review	Underway	Completed			
Affinity House Review	Underway	Completed			
Alcohol Education	Fully implemented	Evaluated/improved	Evaluated/improved	Evaluated/improved	Evaluated/improved
Alcohol Rules	Fully implemented	Evaluated/improved	Evaluated/improved	Evaluated/improved	Evaluated/improved

numerous similarities between past and present critiques of the social and residential system—as well as by the fact that many recommendations set forth by earlier committees were virtually identical to our own. A statement by the late James Epperson, Professor of English, at a faculty meeting in 1977 seemed remarkably apt: “The reforms that have periodically been attempted, as I’ve tried to explain, have lasted a few years and perhaps served the purpose for that time and then have been forgotten. At least they didn’t correct permanently the abuses or change Dartmouth’s image.”

Ten years later, in February 1987, the Board of Trustees issued a statement¹³ in support of a then-forthcoming report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Residential Life. Portions of that statement read as follows:

[W]e have not yet succeeded in reducing the fraternity system’s dominance of social life on campus; in reducing the role that alcohol plays as part of the social environment at the College; in creating an integrated residential system that breaks down the fragmentation between dormitories and fraternities/sororities; in encouraging meaningful interaction among many of the various interests and elements on campus; and in obtaining the full commitment of the faculty to our efforts to create a social life that promotes intellectual pursuits beyond the classrooms....

[T]he Board is convinced that the College’s residential life system needs major restructuring to remedy these shortcomings and believes that it would be in the best interests of the College to accomplish this restructuring as soon as practicable.

Our committee recognizes fully that competing institutional priorities, and in particular financial limitations, can frequently result in good ideas and proposals being put on the back burner. We know that previous Boards, presidents and administrations felt as strongly about needed changes as we do. We also take heart from the oft-voiced sentiments of President Wright and members of the Board of Trustees that they sincerely seek change. We also believe that opportunities for making comprehensive changes are often fleeting at best. We are unanimous in our conviction that the changes we are recommending are long overdue. We urge their adoption now in order to speed the institution on its way to even greater excellence in this new century.

¹³ See Appendix, Exhibit 8: Residential Life Statement from the Board of Trustees (February 21, 1987).

APPENDIX

Exhibit 1: Dartmouth College Mission Statement (1999)

Dartmouth College combines the best features of the undergraduate liberal arts college with those of the research university. It is dedicated to providing undergraduate, graduate, and professional education of the highest quality, and to fostering a love of learning and discovery in every member of its community. Founded as an undergraduate institution more than two centuries ago, Dartmouth also offers select graduate programs within the Arts and Sciences, engineering, and medicine, and professional degree programs in business, engineering, and medicine. These professional schools are among the very oldest in the nation in their respective fields and have a historic role in defining Dartmouth's intellectual values.

Dartmouth has a special character and is committed to fostering the unique bonds that exist between the institution and those who learn, teach, and work here. This character is rooted in the following essential elements:

- A devotion to a vital learning environment rooted in the liberal arts tradition. This environment depends upon: a faculty dedicated to outstanding teaching, scholarship, and research; a talented, highly motivated, and intellectually curious student body; and a staff committed to the institution and its purposes.
- A conviction that one of Dartmouth's strengths is providing students with close contact with faculty, and an appreciation that the quality of the educational and research experiences Dartmouth offers students is one measure of its success.
- A commitment to enriching the Dartmouth educational and social experience by attracting and retaining gifted and talented students, faculty, and staff of diverse backgrounds, experiences, races, and economic circumstances.
- A commitment to sustaining an academic residential community of learning that nurtures and supports the social, emotional, moral, and physical well-being of its members—a community that values individual talents and initiatives in areas as diverse as academic and intellectual endeavors, community service, athletics and outdoor activities, religious life and artistic expression, and political and social activism.
- A recognition that its location offers Dartmouth unique advantages and special traditions related to exploring and understanding of the self and society as they relate to the natural and physical environment of northern New England.

Exhibit 2: Prior Committee Reports

1. Report of the Committee on the Quality of Student Life (April 7, 1980)
2. Ad Hoc Committee on Residential Life Report and Recommendations (April 24, 1987)
3. Task Force on Undergraduate Social Life Report and Recommendations (April 1997)

Exhibit 3: Five Principles to Guide Future Development of the Residential and Social System at Dartmouth College (February 6, 1999)

On February 6, 1999, the Board of Trustees issued a statement identifying the following as principles that should characterize the residential and social system at the College:

- There should be greater choice and continuity in residential living and improved residential space;
- There should be additional and improved social spaces controlled by students;
- The system should be substantially coeducational and provide opportunities for greater interaction among all Dartmouth students;
- The number of students living off campus should be reduced; and
- The abuse and unsafe use of alcohol should be eliminated.

Exhibit 4: Meetings of the Committee on the Student Life Initiative

Dates:

May 20-21, 1999
June 19-20
July 9-11
July 21-23
August 27
September 8-10
September 15-17
September 21-22
October 29-30
November 12
December 7-8

Individuals and Groups with whom the Committee and Co-Chairs met:

President James Wright
Provost Susan Westerberg Prager
Karl Furstenberg, Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid and Associate Provost for Planning
William DeJong '73, Director of Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse
Prevention
Alumni Reunion Classes of 1969, 1974, 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1994
Alumni Council
Arts and Sciences faculty members
Centerbrook planning group members
Coed, Fraternity, and Sorority Alumni Board members
Coed, Fraternity, and Sorority Council members
College Committee on Alcohol and Other Drugs
College Relations Group of the Alumni Council
Dean of the College area staff
Participants in the Dartmouth Leadership Weekend, September 17-18, 1999
Representatives of the Nelson Task Force
Student Assembly representatives
Students of Color
Trustees Emeriti
Unaffiliated students
Women's Resource Center Group representatives

Exhibit 5: Dartmouth's Principle of Community

In June of 1980, The Board of Trustees endorsed the following "Principle of Community" for Dartmouth College:

The life and work of a Dartmouth student should be based on integrity, responsibility and consideration. In all activities each student is expected to be sensitive to and respectful of the rights and interests of others and to be personally honest. He or she should be appreciative of the diversity of the community as providing an opportunity for learning and moral growth.

This statement provides a basis for interaction between and among all members of the College, and each of us is expected to be mindful of it in pursuing our own interests as members of this community. (From the *Student Handbook, 1999-2000, Dartmouth College.*)

Exhibit 6: *Black Enterprise* (January 1999) and *Metrosource* (Fall 1999)

Black Enterprise/DayStar (January 1999) Top Fifty List

Spelman College, Atlanta, GA
Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA
Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL
Clark Atlanta University, Atlanta, GA
Howard University, Washington, DC
Xavier University, New Orleans, LA
Hampton University, Hampton, VA
Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL
North Carolina A&T University, Greensboro, NC
Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA
Georgetown University, Washington, DC
Oberlin College, Oberlin, OH
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, NY
Columbia University, New York, NY
Emory University, Atlanta, GA
Amherst College, Amherst, MA
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, NC
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC
Duke University, Durham, NC
Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD
Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT
Fisk University, Nashville, TN
Tennessee State University, Nashville, TN
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA
Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL
Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach, FL
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA
North Carolina Central University, Durham, NC
Morris Brown College, Atlanta, GA
Southern University, New Orleans, LA
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
Williams College, Williamstown, MA
George Washington University, Washington, DC
Dillard University, New Orleans, LA
Jackson State University, Jackson, MS
Grambling University, Ruston, LA
Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA
Yale University, New Haven, CT
University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA
New York University, New York, NY
Smith College, Northampton, MA
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA

Lincoln University, Lincoln University, PA
South Carolina State University, Orangeburg, SC
Alabama A&M University, Normal, AL
Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

Metrosource (Fall 1999) Questionable Schools for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered Students

Baylor University, Waco, TX
Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH
Emporia State University, Emporia, KS
The entire Florida State University system
Hope College, Holland, MI
United States Naval Academy
University of Missouri, Columbia, MO
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA
University of Richmond, Richmond, VA
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN
Yeshiva University, New York, NY

Exhibit 7: Centerbrook Architects and Planners Project

In winter of 1999, following an administrative report on the condition of Thayer Hall, the Office of Facilities Planning commissioned Centerbrook Architects and Planners to conduct a study to look at options for upgrading Thayer Dining Hall. Shortly thereafter, the Board of Trustees expanded the project to include an athletics/recreation component as part of Centerbrook's charge.

To assist in the planning effort, an athletics programming and planning firm, a retail and marketing consultant, and a food service master planning firm were added to the Centerbrook effort.

As much student input as possible was obtained through a series of six workshops and focus groups. Additionally, an e-mail questionnaire was sent to the entire student body. Core groups on dining and athletics and a plenary group met a half dozen times.

Out of the effort by the consultants, the administration and hundreds of students, came architectural schemes for dining and athletics. These were presented to the Board of Trustees by Centerbrook in November 1999.

Exhibit 8: Residential Life Statement from the Board of Trustees (February 21, 1987)

The Board of Trustees reaffirms its commitment to developing a residential life policy that supports and enhances the educational mission of the College through promoting and accommodating a healthy interaction and understanding among the diverse elements on campus.

While we have made progress in the last four years with the introduction of minimum standards for fraternities and sororities and the creation of clusters, interactive space and a faculty master program for the dormitories, the Board believes a faster pace of change is needed. To achieve our objectives for residential life in an intellectually challenging community, we need to hasten aggressively our progress and not rely on the evolution of the system.

In that regard, we have not yet succeeded in reducing the fraternity system's dominance of social life on campus; in reducing the role that alcohol plays as part of the social environment at the College; in creating an integrated residential system that breaks down the fragmentation between dormitories and fraternities/sororities; in encouraging meaningful interaction among many of the various interests and elements on campus; and in obtaining the full commitment of the faculty to our efforts to create a social life that promotes intellectual pursuits beyond the classrooms.

With the administration having consulted a broad cross-section of the community, including students, faculty, and alumni, the Board is convinced that the College's residential life system needs major restructuring to remedy these shortcomings and believes that it would be in the best interests of the College to accomplish this restructuring as soon as practicable. The Board has, therefore, requested the President to establish a special ad hoc committee on residential life consisting of faculty, students, alumni and administration, and with Trustee support and involvement, to examine the relationship between fraternities/sororities and dormitories and their impact on social and intellectual life; to review the quality of interaction between the diverse elements on campus and how to relate to the educational mission of the College; and to determine the optimum role of the faculty in residential life and how this can be achieved. The Board has requested that the committee provide its recommendations to the Board through the President not later than June 1987.

In further response to the report of the Council on Diversity, the Board will appoint a Trustee review committee to take a broader institutional look at diversity on campus. This committee will review programs, practices and facilities in the context of the Planning and Priority efforts in order to recommend to the Board changes that will support and reinforce the value of learning that takes place in a diverse educational setting. As part of this process, the committee will determine if adequate recognition and provision have been made within the institutional plans to encourage and promote the positive contributions that people with different backgrounds and ideas can make to a liberal arts education at Dartmouth. This Trustee committee will be asked to report its recommendations to the Board by June 1988.

Exhibit 9: Other Proposals

In the course of its deliberations, the Committee on the Student Life Initiative received many thoughtful proposals, and we wish to sincerely and gratefully acknowledge all of the input that we received. These proposals came from individuals as well as groups of students, alumni, faculty and administrators, and ranged from narrow and concise to broad and sweeping. Some were advanced orally and some in writing, through letters, e-mails and formal reports.

All the ideas received in these communications provided crucial advice to the committee as we formulated our recommendations. While the committee adopted none of these in its entirety, many provided important contributions to our thinking—even in instances where no particular proposal may be readily identifiable in our final report. More than anything else, the range of proposals received helped the committee to achieve a better balance in our report by representing and reconciling the views of various voices in the Dartmouth community.

Certain of the proposals contained specific requests—for example, for space or other resources from various campus groups. The committee decided that its proper role was to conceive a broad vision for the future of Dartmouth residential and social life and to avoid addressing most of these group-specific requests. Nonetheless, because many of these proposals have considerable merit, the committee has passed on all of them to the administration for future consideration.

Among these proposals and/or their subjects were the following:

- 2002 Class Council
- Afro-American Society
- Alcohol Policy Revision
- College Committee on Alcohol and Other Drugs
- Coed, Fraternity, and Sorority Council
- Dance Facility Proposal
- Dartmouth Community Service Council
- Dartmouth Organic Farm
- Dartmouth Outing Club
- Dean of the College Area Working Group
- Environmental Studies Recommendations
- Film space
- Five Principles Working Group
- Gabfest
- Graduate students
- Hood Museum
- Hopkins Center
- Improving campus climate
- Japan/Korea Affinity House
- La Alianza Latina
- Ledyard Canoe Club
- Office of Residential Life
- Outdoor Office
- Palaeopitus
- Pan Asian Council
- Panhellenic Council
- Programming Board

Proposals by individual undergraduate students

Structure for Dartmouth Student Life in the 21st Century, Ronald B. Schram '64 and Robert V.
Bartles '64

Student Assembly

Verde Grande, Jeannie Eisberg '01

Women's Resource Center

Writers' House Proposal, Julie Kalish '91