



# The Student Life Initiative at Dartmouth College

Report Submitted to  
The Board of Trustees  
by the  
Student Response Task Force

Dartmouth College  
March 2000

## CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction and Background .....	6
Recommendation 1.....	10
Create an Enhanced System of Residential Clusters at Dartmouth	
Recommendation 2.....	14
Create Other Spaces and Programs for General Use	
Recommendation 3.....	18
Improve Residential and Social Life for Graduate Students	
Recommendation 4.....	21
Make Major Changes in the Coed, Fraternity, Sorority (CFS) Organizations	
Recommendation 5.....	30
Conduct a Review of Senior Societies and Undergraduate Societies	
Recommendation 6.....	30
Conduct a Review of Academic Affinity Houses and Programs	
Recommendation 7.....	32
Introduce New Guidelines for Alcohol and Other Drugs	
Omissions .....	39
Conclusion.....	40

## **STUDENT RESPONSE TASK FORCE REPORT**

### **March 2000**

(To see a full report or copies of submitted proposals, please contact Mary Liscinsky or Bethanne Tillotson in Room 10 Parkhurst.)

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Student Response Task Force (SRTF) is pleased to present this report to the Board of Trustees. This summary document is the result of a ten-week period of intensive discussion, introspection, creativity, and commitment from Dartmouth students. From the date the recommendations of the Committee on the Student Life Initiative (CSLI) were announced, Dartmouth students dedicated a great deal of time and energy to considering and discussing ways that residential and social life on the campus could be improved. The amount of feedback they managed to generate in a mere term is admirable.

The Student Response Task Force was charged by the Dean of the College Jim Larimore with encouraging and collecting student input and producing a compilation of this feedback for consideration by the Board of Trustees. Students had a variety of avenues for discussion about and response to the recommendations. Many of these avenues, including weekly Fireside Chats, Task Force blitz account, SLI website, and small discussion groups with students, faculty and administrators, were recommended by students during fall term planning meetings. These methods resulted in the submission of 48 proposals totaling more than 340 pages and well over 200 pieces of individual commentary.

The underlying theme of the winter term discussions and commentary was the importance of belonging and community. Dartmouth students are looking for a place where they feel valued, a place where there is recognition rather than anonymity. Some students find this sense of belonging through an athletic team, residential cluster, Greek house, student organization, or other activity. No matter where they find it, this recognition enables Dartmouth students to feel grounded as members of the community, and empowers them to reach out to larger challenges. All of the ideas that students presented stemmed from this premise.

To that end, students embraced the concept of improved residential and social life on the Dartmouth campus. The tenor of discussion was primarily positive and constructive. While some students disagreed with particular aspects of the recommendations, those who took issue with particular recommendations quite often offered alternative suggestions or ideas for possible implementation.

#### **Recommendation 1: Residential Clusters**

Approximately one-third of the student feedback collected through formal proposals, individual responses or Fireside Chats addressed Residential Life/Housing issues. Students were supportive of building additional residence hall spaces and improving and adding amenities in the residential clusters, including kitchens, lounges, study spaces, and

fitness rooms. Students also supported an enhanced menu of housing options, including townhouses and apartments, and some students suggested specific affinity house ideas. There was a sense that for residences to be truly vital places, there needed to be a connection between campus resources and the cluster community.

Improving residential staffing, including the Undergraduate Advisor position, was viewed as positive and seen as a way to improve the general quality of the residential experience.

Cluster continuity and first year housing had both supporters and detractors. Some students liked the idea of having a “home” for more than one year, while others said they enjoyed being able to live in new settings and meeting new people. Many students mentioned that the lack of continuity on campus was not caused by housing, but rather by the D-plan. First-year housing was supported by those who believed it would help students make the transition to college life and develop a strong class identity. Many felt that an essential component of this experience would be an intentional first year program, with significantly enhanced faculty and administrative involvement, and substantial roles for upperclass students. Those who did not support the first year program concept felt it would not allow students the opportunity to learn about Dartmouth from upperclass students. The underlying themes in discussions about both continuity and first year housing seemed to be flexibility, variety, and choice.

#### Recommendation 2: Social Space and Programs

Students overwhelmingly supported the creation of more social spaces and options, as well as student-controlled spaces, believing that it would be wise to create these new opportunities before downscaling or removing any other social options. It was suggested that the focus for social life be on addition and change.

Proposals and other feedback indicate a desire that the College create more studio and performing arts venues, additional recreation spaces (both inside and outside of the athletic complex), a larger student center with more student meeting and gathering spaces, and additional licensed alcohol settings. The concept of a large, flat floor hall received extensive support. A space clearinghouse would help facilitate access to these spaces.

Although centralized dining was supported and seen as a means of developing and sustaining community, there was also much support for creating smaller, limited dining in other settings. Accommodations for kosher dining were suggested, as were ethnic food kiosks or dining areas.

The World Cultures Initiative (WCI) captured the attention of many students. Most students were supportive, although many said the WCI needed to be more expansive and embraced at a higher institutional level. Full time staffing in the areas of support for Latino; Asian Pacific American; Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgendered; and African American students was viewed as a necessary first step toward the establishment of the World Cultures Initiative.

### Recommendation 3: Graduate Students

Graduate students widely support all of the graduate student recommendations in the CSLI report. They believe that increasing available graduate student housing and social spaces will decrease the sense of isolation that many students report, bolstering the graduate community, and facilitating recruitment of top caliber candidates to the graduate programs. In their submissions to the committee, many graduate students expressed concern regarding the relative priority that will be given to graduate projects, urging the College to implement the improvements immediately.

### Recommendation 4: Coed, Fraternity, and Sorority Organizations

This recommendation garnered the most feedback. The most common theme was that houses should be given the opportunity to remain, but needed to be improved in a variety of ways, and this improvement should be complemented by additional campus social options.

Students and others who expressed support for Greek organizations said that they provided a source of continuity, a group of friends, and the chance to develop leadership abilities. Some asserted that these organizations enhanced cross-cultural communication. Criticisms of Greek organizations cited their dominance on campus, poor gender relationships, issues of racism and heterosexism, and transmission of destructive alcohol mores.

The Task Force received a wide range of opinions and suggestions on every item in this recommendation. While these responses are detailed in the Task Force report and in the proposals themselves, ideas that received general acceptance were: the organizational statement of purpose; having a sexual abuse peer advisor, drug and alcohol peer advisor, diversity and leadership educator, Tucker liaison, and Inter-cluster council liaison in residence; budget submission; and advisory boards. Improvements to physical plants were supported, especially if the College could provide financial relief for this endeavor. Students agreed that hazing should not be tolerated, but noted the distinctions between hazing and pledge period, which was seen as an important time for education of new members.

Topics that drew some criticism were the moratorium on single-sex residential organizations (primarily as it would impact sorority membership), the non-member UGA, winter rush, and summer residency. Some took issue with only junior officers and seniors being allowed residency. Some disagreed with the perception that the CFS system is exclusive, suggesting that open parties make the system an egalitarian force on campus. The five-year review was seen as a concern, primarily due to the possible pressure put on houses to achieve these new standards in the absence of any assurance about their future.

Some argued for a reduction in the proposed membership number requirement, especially as it might affect coed, traditionally Black, and Latino organizations. Students were somewhat divided on removing taps, and provided wide ranging feedback and suggestions concerning the continuation of the CFS Judicial Council. New ideas presented included forming affiliations between single-sex organizations and a wide variety of campus groups, and upgrading basements rather than converting them.

Recommendation 5: Senior Societies and Undergraduate Societies and  
Recommendation 6: Academic Affinity Houses and Programs

NOTE: Recommendations 5 and 6 are two distinct items in the CSLI recommendations. However, students tended to refer to them as a single item.

The community, in general, supported a review of these organizations and programs. It was suggested that Academic Affinity Programs would be successful only when combined with an overall institutional commitment to the relevant academic programs. Some concerns were expressed about the roles played by these programs and organizations, including their perceived exclusivity and confusion about their respective participation or membership criteria.

Recommendation 7: Alcohol and Other Drugs

A majority of students clearly stated that there is a cultural acceptance of alcohol abuse on campus that needs to be addressed. Questions arose about how best to alleviate this problem. Students felt that no matter what rules are made, students will drink, so the focus should be on how to promote an environment where this happens safely and moderately.

Education, specifically for first year students and members of Greek organizations, and increased counseling services were seen as avenues for changing the campus culture around alcohol. Students felt that new settings for alcohol service should be created, along the lines of the Lone Pine Tavern, but perhaps without the three-drink limit. There was support to keep drinking a public activity, since that was seen as a way to detect students who were drinking in an abusive manner. There was also support for non-alcoholic programming and stricter enforcement of the current regulations for both individuals and groups.

Students were somewhat divided on the role that tap systems play in the campus alcohol culture. CFS organizations were relatively happy with their current relationship with Safety and Security and asked that it remain as it is. Feedback about the “yellow light, green light” requirement and a party curfew was generally critical, with many students feeling that both were somewhat arbitrary and invasive. Most proposals supported student bartenders over professional bartenders, although one group said that it would support such a requirement if the College would provide financial support.

In terms of other drugs, it was suggested that limiting campus alcohol availability would increase the use of other, “hard” drugs. One group asked that attention be paid to the increase of tobacco use on campus.

Omissions

Concerns were expressed about a number of areas not discussed in detail in the CSLI report. The two topics that were mentioned most frequently were gender relations and the D-plan. These and a variety of other topics that are presented in the Omissions section of the report may warrant further attention.

## INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

On January 10, 2000, the Committee on the Student Life Initiative released its report and recommendations to the Dartmouth community. These recommendations addressed seven major areas: residential life; social spaces and programs; graduate students' residential and social needs; changes in Coed, Fraternity and Sorority (CFS) organizations; the review of senior societies and undergraduate societies; the review of academic affinity programs; and alcohol and other drugs. The Board of Trustees asked the Dartmouth community to engage in a period of contemplation and discussion that would result in formal feedback on the recommendations. Three mechanisms were put in place to collect feedback: Provost Susan Prager and Dean of the Faculty Ed Berger were responsible for the faculty response; Vice President of Development and Alumni Affairs Stan Colla '66, Tu '86 organized the alumni response; and Dean of the College Jim Larimore coordinated the student response.

To that end, the Student Response Task Force was formed, convened by Dean Jim Larimore, Graduate Student Council co-chair Andy Mengshol, and Student Assembly President Dean Krishna '01. Other members of the committee were Liz Agosto '01, Emily Anadu '00, Amit Anand '03, Lauren Foley '03, Kevan Higgins '00, Kate Laswell '02, Special Assistant to the Dean of the College Mary Liscinsky, Dean of Residential Life Marty Redman, Dean of Student Life Holly Sateia, and Jon Sussman '02. Both Student Assembly and three co-chairs chose the student members from a pool of volunteers and nominees.

The Task Force met for the first time on January 27, 2000. The committee's charge was as follows:

- To encourage and gather student input concerning the recommendations of the Committee on the Student Life Initiative;
- To monitor the process for the collection of student input; and
- To produce a descriptive summary report for President Wright and the Board of Trustees by the end of winter term 2000.

Members of the Task Force set the date of February 25, 2000 as the deadline for submitting proposals to the Task Force for inclusion in its report to the Trustees. That date was chosen so that members of the Dartmouth community would have time to formulate their response to the CSLI recommendations, while ensuring that the Task Force would have adequate time to compile the responses before the beginning of the Winter term reading period.

### **Outreach Efforts**

The Task Force firmly committed itself to creating multiple forums for feedback. Members felt that each and every student should have an easily accessible and comfortable means of communicating their thoughts about the recommendations. The Task Force also realized that a variety of avenues for feedback would encourage a variety of opinions. The various methods of information collection used are described in detail below.

January 10th Discussion Groups—Students, faculty, and administrators facilitated thirty-one discussion groups on the night of the release of the recommendations (see appendix). The purpose of these groups was to promote discussion and to encourage students to engage in the process throughout the term. The groups were held in residence halls, CFS houses, and academic buildings. Approximately six hundred students participated in these lively and meaningful discussions.

Opinion Boards—Opinion boards (sheets of paper on which students could record their reactions to the recommendations) were available for two days in the Collis Center and one day in Thayer Dining Hall.

Dinners with administrators—Eight dinners, attended by a total of 117 students, faculty, and administrators, were hosted at the homes of five campus administrators and their partners, providing a relaxed and welcoming environment for discussion about the recommendations.

Blitzmail and website feedback—A significant quantity of feedback was received through the Task Force’s blitzmail account and the SLI website. As of March 3, one week after the deadline to submit proposals to the Task Force, the Student Response Task Force blitz account had received 120 messages and 104 messages had been submitted through the student-dedicated portion of the website.

HB Newsletter—The Task Force sent a newsletter to all undergraduate and graduate students’ Hinman boxes (see appendix), publicizing the charge of the Task Force, the deadline for submitting proposals, and the various options for student feedback. The mailing, with the return address of the Student Response Task Force’s Hinman box, also functioned as a feedback form, as it gave people space to express their opinions in writing. As of March 3, the Task Force had received 17 responses to the mailing.

One-on-one interaction—The Task Force felt that private, one-on-one interaction should complement the public forums that were taking place. Members of the Task Force conducted a series of “office hours” in the Big Green Bean café for three hours each night from January 31 to February 3, and from February 7 to February 9, 2000.

Open meeting times—The Task Force set aside the last thirty minutes of its weekly meetings to host an open session where any student representing a group or speaking as individuals could discuss their thoughts and present their response to the entire Task Force. Two groups (the Dartmouth Rainbow Alliance and members of the Organic Farm) took advantage of this option.

Student “Presidential” forum—As the deadline for submitting a response approached, members of the Task Force organized a “presidential forum,” where leaders of campus organizations were invited to discuss the ways in which they were gathering input from their constituents. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the procedure of collecting student opinion rather than to discuss the opinions themselves.

Student organization feedback—The Task Force also reviewed feedback received from various student organizations that responded to the request for feedback by the Council

on Student Organizations (COSO). A total of 24 documents were submitted as part of the COSO packet. While most of these were not formal proposals, they were valuable pieces of information.

Cluster discussions—Cluster discussions were organized by members of the Student Assembly and co-sponsored by the Task Force (see appendix). At least one member of the Task Force was in attendance at all but two discussions. The discussions were publicized through a banner in Thayer Dining Hall, posters in each cluster, and cluster-wide blitz messages.

Fireside Chats—The first Fireside Chat was held on Tuesday, January 11, 2000, at the Top of the Hop. President Jim Wright, Trustee Peter Fahey, and Dean of the College Jim Larimore facilitated a discussion with approximately 125 members of the Dartmouth community. The next Fireside Chat, with President Wright, Dean Larimore, Trustees Nancy Jeton, David Shribman and Kate Stith-Cabranes was held the following Tuesday. Subsequent Fireside Chats were held on Monday evenings in the Collis Common Ground. The Fireside Chats focused on topics ranging from the alcohol culture at the College to student-faculty interaction. Students served as co-facilitators at three of the Fireside Chats. The Fireside Chats were publicized through advertisements in *The Dartmouth*, on the SLI website, and through inclusion in the various student activity calendars (see appendix). Attendance ranged from about 125 to ten, with an average attendance of 40.

The Task Force publicized the deadline for submissions as well as the various outreach efforts in two advertisements that were placed in *The Dartmouth* (see appendix). Members of the Task Force also sent a campus-wide blitz that alerted people to the deadline and reminded them of the Task Force open hours and other channels for providing feedback.

Members of the Student Response Task Force are confident that students had many opportunities to have their voices heard. The quantity and quality of both formal proposals (48 received) and individual commentary through other forums indicates that students felt encouraged to respond to the recommendations. The extensive feedback students have given has resulted in this summary document.

The Student Assembly Report (SA) bears special mention (38). As the undergraduate student governing body, their task was quite broad. In order to capture campus opinion, they undertook the complicated process of conducting a campus poll, canvassing a representative sample of Dartmouth undergraduates. Their recommendations are recorded in the body of this report.

Each section of this report was written by a group of two or three Task Force members. Thus, there may be stylistic differences between the sections. Some Task Force members chose to use quotes to illustrate their thoughts, while others did not. Each idea drawn from a formally submitted proposal is identified with an assigned number that corresponds with a document listed in the appendix. Individual feedback, defined as web or blitz feedback, fireside chat and discussion group comments and information from the opinion boards is not identified in this way. Names were not always available and since

no general statement was made informing students that their comments would be forwarded with their names attached they were kept anonymous. However, we believe that the spirit of their remarks has been captured.

The members of the task force made a concerted effort to include the entire range of campus opinion, so that anyone who engaged in the winter term discussion process can feel that their thoughts, concerns, and hopes are represented in this document. We believe that this report provides excellent support for the next phase of the Student Life Initiative. We are thankful to the members of the Dartmouth community who contributed in so many ways to an exceptional period of campus discussion.

## **RECOMMENDATION 1**

### **Create a Greatly Enhanced System of Residential Clusters at Dartmouth**

#### **General Response**

Approximately one-third of the student feedback collected through formal proposals, individual responses or Fireside Chats addressed Residential Life/Housing issues. Student opinion was quite divided on issues of first-year housing and continuity. Larger and better appointed social spaces, improved residence hall and cluster staffing, and a greater menu of housing options received student support. There was an overall sentiment that in order for any type of residential setting to be successful, it must have substantial programmatic, personnel, and fiscal resources. For example, it was suggested that the “Older and Wiser” program be linked to the residential clusters, as well as a variety of residence based education, either curricular or co-curricular.

This section does not address Coed, Fraternity and Sorority housing, except in terms of summer residency, as that topic will be discussed under Recommendation 4.

#### **Specific Recommendations**

##### First-Year Housing

Slightly more than half of the students who commented on the perceived advantages or disadvantages of first-year versus mixed-class housing expressed a desire to move in the direction of first year housing. Student opinion appeared to be at least partially based upon the student’s own experience in either a predominantly first year area or mixed-class housing area. Those students in the Choates or the River Cluster truly enjoyed the camaraderie associated with these predominantly first-year environments, expressed a greater sense of belonging in their residential communities, and felt a connection to other members of their class. Many students who lived in predominantly upper-class housing such as Mass Row or Topliff felt that they did not interact frequently with upperclass students and did not get to know many members of their first year class. Those in locations such as East Wheelock or the Fayerweathers where the population is equally proportioned between first year and upper-class students enjoyed the opportunity to become close to members of their class, as well as some upper-class students. (1, 3, 6, 12, 28, 32, 33, 35, 38).

Several of the proposals expressed the sentiment that housing first year students together without a programmatic focus should not be pursued and endorsed the concept of first year housing only when a programmatic focus was added. Several reports suggested options for programs such as first year housing linked to first year seminars with the faculty member serving as advisor to the students in the seminar and an on-going orientation program which would focus upon wellness and adjustment issues (5).

##### Choice

Students generally expressed a strong desire to retain as much flexibility and choice in the housing system as possible. The CSLI recommendation that students remain in a cluster for more than one year met with some student opposition. Many suggested variations on a system that would allow students to remain in a cluster if that was preferable, but to also have the option to move to another cluster or housing option. The Student Assembly report viewed cluster continuity from a different perspective,

advocating an “opt-in” system which would allow students the opportunity to decide how long they remained in a cluster (38).

One response suggested that priority be given to students who desire to remain in a cluster by using a “squatters rights” or returning resident priority system. This option was perceived as offering continuity of living arrangements for those who sought that type of stability and flexibility for those who were seeking different experiences. Choice and flexibility were also strongly expressed by those who wanted to associate with an Affinity Housing program, Greek organization, or live off-campus. (3, 6, 10, 12, 28, 32, 33, 35)

#### Undergraduate Advisors/Professional Staff

Many students commented favorably on the addition of professional staff to the residence halls and making significant changes to the Undergraduate Advisor (UGA) program. Those suggesting professional staff or other non-students in residence shared the opinion that these individuals would greatly improve the quality of residential life by planning community events and activities, as well as offering students personal guidance and support. In addition, professional staff would be able to assist the UGAs and other residential peer groups in meeting the individual and group needs of their residents.

Most students commented that the UGA program should be improved and that offering additional compensation would be necessary to achieve this goal. The UGA program should offer services to all residents, not just first-year students. Most students agreed that they need assistance within the residential community beyond what their peers currently offer. (1, 33, 28, 43).

### Housing Type/Affinity

Almost all of the student responses expressed a desire to retain and add to the diversity of housing options that are available, in addition to building new facilities. Many different room types from singles to apartments, large facilities to small should all be part of the housing program. There was overwhelming support for continuing to allow students to live off campus, as well as for the construction of townhouses or additional apartments for seniors or other upper-class students. Several groups of students expressed a desire to create more Affinity Housing. The Organic Farm, the Dartmouth Japan Society, and LBGTQ students described in detail the benefits to their groups from this type of residential experience. (14, 28, 31, 34, 38).

### Continuity

Most students expressed a desire to increase housing “continuity” while retaining as much choice and flexibility as possible. However, consistent definition of “continuity” did not emerge from the student responses. Several students stated that they enjoyed moving every term, which provided the opportunity to meet other students. Others expressed utter frustration at making multiple moves, and felt very disconnected from their friends. Some expressed the view that the continuity they are seeking is not caused by housing but rather the coming and going of their friends as a result of Off-Campus Programs (FSPs/LSAs) and leave-terms.

Greek houses were described as offering continuity, despite the fact that people move in and out of each house as often as they do in residence halls. Students indicated that the difference is that a Greek organization has many members, only a few of whom live in the house. At any given time, a student can go to a particular house and find both resident and non-resident members present; the expectation is that a student will find someone familiar when they enter the building. This is not a common phenomenon in residence halls. However, the opportunity to live in one place for more than one year, combined with enhanced staffing, student leadership, and intentional programmatic efforts, may offer a similar experience. Many also expressed the opinion that lack of continuity is not as much a housing problem as it is a problem with the D plan and suggested that changes in the D-plan be explored (see **Omissions**). (12, 32, 33, 38, 43)

### Social/Amenity Space

An overwhelming majority of students expressed a desire to improve existing facilities by adding kitchens, studies and lounges on each residence hall floor near where students live rather than in one central location such as a common house. Students also expressed a desire for larger spaces for group events. Given a choice between large common house space and amenity space on floors, students would choose amenity spaces close to their room and use other college spaces for larger events. The CFSC proposed that cluster-based social spaces be accessible from within associated residences, and have full kitchens, snack bars, public printing facilities, television, small scale sound systems, exercise and weight lifting spaces, and blitz mail areas. The Student Assembly supported the concept of common houses as long as they were created in concert with other residence hall improvements (12, 32, 38, 43).

Despite this sentiment, it was clear that students generally feel the College needs more, larger social spaces than currently exist. Many students also expressed a desire for snack bars similar to the one in East Wheelock, but not necessarily in every building.

#### Governance

Few students mentioned cluster governance; those who did suggested that less is more. A concern was expressed by several students that the governance structure recommended by the CSLI report is too cumbersome and involves too many people. Some students felt that persuading faculty to participate would be difficult. However, involving faculty more in out-of-classroom interactions with students was viewed as highly desirable. (3, 12, 38, 43)

#### CFS Summer Residency

The overwhelming majority of those who expressed an opinion on the topic opposed the recommendation to end residence in CFS houses over the summer term. The most common concerns that were brought up were that no residency over summer term would deprive houses of revenue and would prevent bonding among members of each organization's sophomore class. One proposal, however, supported the recommendation and noted that living in CFS houses causes separation amongst affiliated and non-affiliated students during sophomore summer. There was also a concern about the fiscal impact of disallowing summer residency.

## **RECOMMENDATION 2**

### **Create Other Spaces and Programs for General Use**

#### **General Response**

There was overwhelming support for the creation of more student social options and greater student control of social spaces. Students provided specific and general social needs, presenting arguments for spaces of varying size and purpose, including a large, flat-floored, flexible hall. It was also made clear that additional space would be most useful if a mechanism was put in place to make it easily accessible to students.

There was concern about the perceived void that might exist if CFS houses ceased to function as a social outlet before improved programming and spaces (including alcohol service venues) were developed. Some students stated that if the College really wanted to expand options, it should provide appropriate options in addition to allowing the CFS system to exist.

#### **Specific Recommendations**

##### Arts Spaces

Ideas mentioned in proposals 15, 22, 25, 28, 33, and 38, and through the website and blitz feedback involved the creation of more venues and greater access to space for students who have an interest in the studio and performing arts. More concert and dance spaces were recommended, as well as more concerts, plays and other performances. Additional display spaces for art works (especially 3-D artwork) were requested. These arts venues might also hold a coffee bar or a jazz bar where alcohol could be served. One proposal focused completely on the concept of a multi-purpose student-run community arts center, appointed with various size practice rooms, dance floors, art exhibit space, proper lighting, and adequate storage space (22).

One student, while recognizing the discount given for student tickets at the Hopkins Center, suggested that this practice might be more effective if done in the form of “Hop Bucks”. This process would involve giving students 20 virtual dollars that could be used only for Hopkins Center tickets. She felt that such an arrangement would get more students interested in the campus arts.

##### Recreational spaces

Many students noted, through every forum used for the collection of feedback, the importance of an improved recreational center. The extensive work done by the Centerbrook group was mentioned positively by the Student Assembly (38). One student who also cited Centerbrook’s work asked that Dartmouth Outing Club not be moved to the proposed recreational center. This sentiment was echoed by the Dartmouth Outing Club, which also requested that the ski team be kept in close proximity to their office and that new space be created for DOC groups (32). Other recreational suggestions were that intramurals be revitalized, lights be installed at the Dartmouth Skiway, transportation be provided to Moosilauke and the College Grant, more fitness outlets be created around campus, and the waterfront be developed (individual feedback and proposals 12 and 30)

There was broad support for renovating Collis, Robinson and Thayer, although one student suggested they not be connected.

### Student Center/General Social Spaces

Students were supportive of a new, larger student center and more student meeting spaces (1, 8, 12, 16, 17, 19, 25, 30, 33, 38, 46). While several of these proposals describe in great detail what such a center might include, some suggested components were a comfortable television area, up-to-date computer clusters, study spaces, ethnic food kiosks, bowling alley, movie theater, bookstore, newspaper vendor and small shops (12, 33). It was also suggested that an improved student center would facilitate interaction between graduate and undergraduate students and that undergraduate and graduate student organization offices might be included (19).

Additional licensed alcohol venues were seen as important (12, 27, 28, 33, 38). The concept of having a “student party room” available from Thursday through Saturday in Collis was also presented through individual feedback. Every method used to garner feedback indicated that building a large, flat floor hall has student support. This was supported by proposals 1, 10, 12, 28, and 38.

The recommendation concerning a space clearinghouse on campus was supported by students, on blitz, at one of the Fireside Chats and in proposals 12, 28, 38, and 46. Along these lines, proposal 46 suggested a centralized calendar, as well as making rooms in Rockefeller available for student meetings. One student proposal said that all groups need equal access to student spaces on campus (18). Feedback from the members of a COSO organization stated that because the number of student organizations are rapidly expanding, it is presently impossible to keep up with space concerns and requests.

### Dining

Centralized dining was strongly supported (9, 10). Students also saw the value to have secondary eating areas, such as snack bars and other venues on campus (9, 10, 28, 38), although one student questioned whether this would create a situation where people would eat in class, thus distracting other students. Proposal 26 presented the need for a 24-hour eating area, and the ability to use DBA at vending machines. Enhanced college catering would be viewed as an improvement, according to proposals 10, 28, and 46.

Kosher dining should be included in the dining facility (20, 33, 38). A multicultural dining area with authentic ethnic foods was suggested (1, 33). The Dartmouth Outing Club proposed that recycling and composting systems be incorporated into any new dining facilities (32).

Other ideas were:

- The Sustainable Living Center at the Organic Farm, a proposal which was submitted last spring, was re-submitted to the Task Force (31) and was supported by several individual submissions and proposal 21. This proposal puts forth a rationale for how the Center would exist as an academic, social, residential, and community resource. Two students who are active at the Organic Farm took advantage of the Task Force’s open hours and gave an excellent description of the merits of an expansion of the Farm’s unique niche at Dartmouth College.
- Dartmouth TV requested appropriate office space and the possibility of a house to fit their growing needs. (14)

- The Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, Questioning and Ally group and the Gay-Straight Alliance suggested a resource center or a multicultural center (16).
- More current movies should be shown at Spaulding Auditorium.
- A flower garden should be added to the campus.
- Smoking lounges should be created (two students mentioned this).
- A professional ice sculptor should be hired for Winter Carnival.
- Hanover should develop more options for students and the community (two students mentioned this.)
- Social spaces should be created in academic departments so that faculty and students could interact (this was suggested on blitzmail and at a Fireside Chat).
- More cross-organizational programming should occur in student controlled social spaces.

### The World Cultures Initiative

The World Cultures Initiative (WCI) was mentioned over 20 times in various proposals and individual responses (1, 9, 10, 12, 16, 21, 24, 28, 33, 38, 41, 44). The vast majority of the comments were supportive of the WCI concept. Although the WCI was not viewed as a solution to all concerns, it was seen as a good beginning. It would move toward relieving the burden placed on students of color to educate their peers.

Students had hoped for more specific details regarding the WCI. Some groups felt that a designated space (whether freestanding or not) would be an important component of the program. All references to the WCI indicated that having a dedicated staff to work with various populations of students and to program for the entire campus would enhance race relations at the College, provided that full-time staffing and adequate budgets would be allocated. Students mentioned that increasing the administrative positions from part-time to full-time for administrators who serve specific populations of students (i.e. Latino; Asian Pacific American; Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning & Allies; African American) was a way to enhance support, provide continuity, coordinate financial resources and increase programming on campus. Several recommendations called for the creation of a mandatory program that would be required of all incoming students that focused on issues of sensitivity, and understanding surrounding race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and socio-economic status (16, 19, 21, 24, 27, 28, 33, 40, 44).

Other recommendations to enhance race relations at Dartmouth included:

- Providing diversity training for all College employees to help prevent miscommunication and to remedy misunderstanding;
- Providing social spaces and meeting places for people of color (1);
- Creating a protocol for responding to hate crimes and bias-related incidences;
- Hiring more tenure-track faculty of color in all disciplines and departments, not just to teach “world cultures;”
- Creating an Asian American studies program and a Korean language program;
- Explicitly stating the College’s commitment to “LGBTQA issues on campus;” and
- Creating places for African-American community members to buy hair care products (33).



### **RECOMMENDATION 3**

#### **Improve Residential and Social Life for Graduate Students**

##### **General Response**

The CSLI recommended improving residential and social life for graduate students by addressing needs for more graduate housing, social space, and increased campus access. The CSLI also proposed a north campus dining facility, enhanced college catering, a large flat floor hall and increased recreational space. The overwhelming majority of Graduate students support the CSLI recommendations. The Graduate Student Council (GSC) (17), Graduate Associates (GA) (48), and Green Lambda (19), as well as undergraduate student organizations including Palaeopitus (33), The Dartmouth Undergraduate Psychology Association, Swing Kids (39), and Voces Clamantium, all endorsed the proposals concerning graduate students.

##### **Specific Recommendations**

###### Housing

Graduate students who responded to the Graduate Student Council's query, and who individually submitted information, unanimously support the proposal to increase the amount of graduate housing (17). Students feel that the current units at North Park Street (30 students) and Sachem village (130 students) are not adequate in quality or number. Students cite multiple reasons for wanting to live on or near campus. First, international students and students from the West Coast describe the difficulties they faced finding housing before their first year in Hanover. Second, students feel that living together on campus will create a stronger graduate community, relieving the sense of isolation that many experience. Third, the distance that most students need to travel necessitates that they own a car and commute to campus; therefore living on campus will reduce costs and enable students without cars to attend Dartmouth. Finally, many students want to live on or near campus to be close to their offices, laboratories, and the recreation resources that the College and Hanover offer.

There were numerous suggestions for graduate housing styles. Most students preferred apartment style housing and the option of single or multiple resident units with kitchens. Many requested building married/family housing units as well. Some recommended that housing include common areas for hosting larger social events to encourage interdepartmental interactions that many students feel are lacking. Students requested that housing include Ethernet ports, which are not currently available at Sachem Village or North Park Street apartments.

Affordability is also an issue: the average graduate student lives on approximately \$1,100 per month. Students who mentioned cost said that they would be willing to spend \$300-350 per month for rent. Suggestions for combined graduate student/ junior faculty housing were made as well.

The Graduate Associate Program, currently consisting of six graduate students living in undergraduate dorms, exposes undergraduates to graduate life and provides guidance to students interested in pursuing an advanced degree. Graduate Associates organize group events and meet with students individually to discuss postgraduate education. The current Graduate Associates feel that this program has been successful, and they, along

with the Student Assembly, support the expansion of this program to include funding and housing for more students (38, 48).

#### North Campus Dining Area

The recommendation to create a North Campus dining area to replace Café North drew enthusiastic support from graduate students. Café North is small, offers limited variety, and closes at 2:00 p.m.; therefore students are unable to eat dinner anywhere on the north end of campus. Undergraduates, graduate students, medical students, post-docs, faculty, and staff in the science departments will utilize a North Campus dining facility with extended hours. Students feel that a larger eating facility will promote interdepartmental interaction between the groups mentioned above.

#### Social Space

Many graduate students feel alienated and isolated in their individual departments. Student groups, such as GSC and Green Lambda, bridge the different graduate communities by holding all-graduate gatherings. These groups are hindered in their ability to host all-grad events because of a dearth of social space. Currently, the only available venue for large campus gatherings is Collis Common Ground. The waiting list for using Common Ground on a weekend night is approximately 3 months. Both the GSC and Green Lambda support the building of a large hall(s) for parties and gatherings (17, 19). Many individual student submissions also support this recommendation. Additionally, multiple responders requested another lounge/bar or a coffeehouse on campus that could serve as a venue for musical performances.

#### Graduate Center

Most students support the proposal to build a graduate center and presented a variety of ideas for the graduate center's composition. Some suggest that a graduate center be part of new dorm space incorporating common areas and meeting rooms for student groups. Students who favor combining graduate apartments and a student center feel that having both areas in close proximity will effectively promote interdepartmental interaction and utilization of the building. Others picture a free standing building centrally located on campus. Many propose that the center contain rooms for events, a bar, and meeting space. A few oppose the center because they feel that students are happy socializing within their own departments. These students feel that a center will not be utilized.

#### Transportation and Access

Many students support the proposal to create a regular shuttle service from Sachem Village. They feel that a shuttle service will be convenient, reduce costs, and enable students without cars to live in Sachem Village housing.

#### Other Suggestions

Graduate students submitted proposals concerning areas of student life not addressed by the CSLI report. One submission called for an on-campus daycare facility for students with young children. A graduate student who is an alum of the undergraduate college proposed that graduate students go on "first year trips" similar to the Dartmouth Outing Club Trips program to develop a stronger sense of graduate community. Many students felt that the college should grant spouses of graduate students free access to the gym, the woodshop, and other campus facilities so that couples can enjoy these resources together.



## **RECOMMENDATION 4**

### **Make Major Changes in the Coed, Fraternity, and Sorority (CFS) Organizations**

#### **General Response**

Students presented general arguments both for and against the CFS organizations. The arguments in support of the CFS organizations noted that houses provide campus continuity, a safety net of friends, a chance to develop leadership skills, and interracial and inter-gender communication. They responded to the argument that houses are selective and exclusive with the argument that Dartmouth is both selective and exclusive, and that the houses provide an egalitarian means of socializing, since all the parties that take place are free. It was noted that fraternities are part of American culture and a strong Dartmouth tradition that creates bonds with alumni. Some students who wanted to keep the CFS system as it stands talked about not wanting change at the Dartmouth College that they know and love. Several women took strong issues with the comment in the recommendations that joining a sorority could be viewed as taking the less challenging path. It was noted that sororities are important for women for many reasons including empowerment, solace, comfort, friendship, personal growth, and support.

Some students felt that the CFS system should be eliminated based on their concern that it is extremely dominant on campus and pervades every aspect of campus life. Students asserted that the entire social system needs to be equitable; no one student organization should have ownership or control over another. Gender relationships were described as “horrible”, “threatening” and “limited.” Women commented on being subjected to obscene gestures and having beer thrown on them, and other students mentioned sexual assaults. Intolerance of students of color and gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered students was deemed a significant and troubling issue. A proactive approach of required diversity training and education (regarding both race and sexual orientation) was a recurrent theme. An unhealthy relationship between members and non-members was cited as a problem. One student noted that Dartmouth’s image as a “beer guzzling frat place” needed to be changed. Some saw the CSLI recommendations as changes “at the margin” and felt they would be ineffective if the goal was to truly change the culture of Dartmouth.

The theme most often expressed on the website, through blitz feedback and during discussion groups and fireside chats was that the College should not remove the CFS system until another social system was well established on the campus. They felt that this would create a significant social void on campus. Others felt that removing the CFS system would be removing basic freedom of association. CFS organizations were viewed by some as successful student run groups which make Dartmouth unique and provide a foundation for community.

Regardless of whether students were generally for or against the CFS system’s continuation, many students seemed to feel that the CSLI was seeking to suffocate the system out of existence instead of simply abolishing it. Some students commented that Dartmouth should take a free market approach, keeping the CFS system, but creating other options, which in time would equalize the power on campus. Change, not elimination, was another related theme. The students who embraced this line of thinking

felt that the recommendations were necessary and that if the houses were willing to comply with these changes, their continued existence should be guaranteed.

One final concern related to the misperception that the Dean of the College could unilaterally and arbitrarily derecognize a house which did not live up to the new standard proposed by the CSLI.

### **Specific Recommendations**

#### Limitations on number of organizations

The CSLI recommendation to limit the number of organizations was brought up in a number of reports. Most of the proposals opposed the recommendation that no new selective residential social organization be recognized. The predominant issue discussed was the need for a new sorority (12, 25, 26, 27, 35, 38, 43). A common theme was that given the large size of many of the sororities, it has become difficult to accommodate all women with the desire to join a house. Proposal 25 provided the example of this year's rush, when the inability to form a new sorority led to the failure of the houses to guarantee bids to all women who wanted to join.

Some believed that the limit on the number of residential sororities keeps the organizations too large to promote the deepest sense of community, and also makes them exclusive. When this topic was addressed at a fireside chat, the question came up about whether the community would support adding a sorority at the expense of losing a fraternity. The audience members did not respond to this query. Single sex options were deemed necessary since it was thought that no single sex residence floors existed, though in fact several do.

Two proposals supported the recommendation that derecognized single sex organizations might be replaced with new coed organizations (11, 26). Proposal 12 suggested the creation of a new coed house in addition to the creation of a new sorority.

#### Standards for Recognition

##### *Standards relating to organizational practices*

Of the proposals that mentioned the adoption and maintenance of a statement of purpose, and the development of a membership contract, there was overwhelming support for the CSLI recommendation pertaining to this area (8, 12, 43). However, one proposal (40) was against the notion that some students might be on a different footing than the student body as a whole regarding conduct and behavior.

Several proposals discussed the recommendation that each single sex organization would create formal affiliations with another single sex organization of the opposite gender or with another coed organization (12, 35, 43, 45). A common suggestion was to expand the number and type of organizations with which formal ties would be created to include a more diverse network of organizations (12, 45). These proposals indicated that such affiliations would aid in creating joint programming events and would lead to the development of a forum for interaction.

The Task Force received a broad range of ideas on having a SAPA, a DAPA, a Tucker Liaison, an Inter-Cluster Council Liaison and a member with diversity and leadership

training among an organization's residency (1, 5, 8, 12, 16, 23, 35, 43, 45). Most proposals were receptive to this general idea, but the specifics of implementing the proposed requirement varied. A number of proposals expressed interest in including these resources within their membership rather than strictly within their residency. Proposal 23 suggested that organizations be encouraged, rather than required, to have these resources as a part of their membership/residency. One proposal (35) suggested adding an eating disorder peer advisor (EDPA) to the list of resources required in an organization's membership. Proposal 16 suggested also requiring that a member of each organization be trained in diversity issues and combating intolerance and prejudice. Proposal 13 advocated adding a requirement that each house also contain a mediator from the Dartmouth Community Mediation Center. Given the number of positions recommended by the CSLI exceed some of the individual organizations' total membership (for example in the historically black and Latino organizations) proposal 5 requested that the requirement be considered fulfilled if their organizations' membership in aggregate could fulfill those positions.

The overwhelming majority of the proposals and individual feedback that addressed the issue of a non-member UGA opposed this recommendation (8, 25, 35, 43, 45). A concern expressed by many of the proposals was that the presence of a non-member, resident UGA would be uncomfortable for all, and thus might compromise the UGA's effectiveness. Most suggested that the UGA be a part of the organization's membership/residency and that some house residents currently fill this role by default.

The misperception that UGAs are only for first-year students prompted some of the concerns people had about this recommendation. Students said that the UGA would feel like an outsider, be viewed with suspicion, and would take away the members' sense of privacy. It was stated that some national organizations would not allow a non-member UGA, although Sigma Phi Epsilon cited a similar program that currently exists through their organization at a national level (45).

Of the proposals that mentioned a standard for community service designed in consultation with the Tucker Foundation, one proposal suggested that organizations should not be limited to only those projects organized through the Tucker Foundation. Some feedback also questioned having Greek organizations held to a higher expectation for service than the rest of the Dartmouth population.

Regarding the requirement of having Greek facilities open to other organizations, it was noted that some organizations already engage in this practice (2, 12, 45.) To increase the visibility of this option, some proposals suggested the creation of a centralized office or clearinghouse where campus organizations could find information and reserve a space at a Greek organization.

There was a general consensus that organizations should be required to submit their budgets to their membership. However, proposal 43 presented the idea that the scrutinizing of budgets by non-members would limit planning flexibility and create excess bureaucracy.

Students shared that the CFSC Constitution states that Safety and Security currently has the free and continuous access to organizations' common spaces as Safety and Security deems necessary. Many proposals felt that S&S should maintain its current role and continue to use its own judgement. The same proposals noted that the reason the current monitoring procedures worked so well was because Officer Bobby Young had been able to build strong relationships with individual houses and create an atmosphere of trust. The recommendation raised concerns for some students who felt that this was an invasion of their home and their right to privacy.

#### *Selection & Initiation Process*

In response to this section of the CSLI recommendations, there were a few students who supported moving rush and overhauling the entire rush and pledging process as suggested in the report. The majority of the proposals advocated continuing fall term rush. The rationale cited included the additional revenue that new members generate during the fall term, a decrease in the amount of time available to learn leadership skills before sophomore summer, and the burden of winter rush falling to a very few seniors and juniors. A student who identified herself as a dual season athlete said that winter is her only possible off term and so moving rush to winter would have resulted in her inability to rush. One other student said that since winter weather is "horrible", there could be increased liability issues, as well as unpleasant travel, associated with winter rush. Proposals 11 and 38 suggested that rush be held every term

The proposition that rush be held simultaneously by the various single sex organizations and coed organizations was met with mixed opinions. Proposal 35 supported simultaneous rush, citing the greater chance of rushees being accepted into a house and suggesting that simultaneous rush would eliminate many of the negative aspects associated with fraternity rush. Simultaneous rush was opposed by those who said that national organizations rush schedules were inconsistent with the practice of simultaneous rush (5); difference in methods of rush practiced by organizations in the CFS system were irreconcilable (12); and students who want to join a coed may not wish to go through the extraneous process of sorority or fraternity rush (11). Proposal 40 as well as individuals in these coed houses felt that the elimination of their rolling rush process might lower their membership and thus hurt their organizations. Proposal 42 outlined ideas for changes to the current fraternity rush system in order to diversify and open the system to a wider range of the Dartmouth Community.

The four proposals that mentioned the recommendation of providing financial aid to eligible new members, as well as individual responses, were receptive to the idea (8, 12, 38, 43, 45). Some proposals noted that financial aid is currently provided to eligible members, while some individual students thought that the "work detail" that occasionally goes along with this aid is demeaning. Some proposals called for a greater financial contribution by the College. Proposal 12 suggested that the College determine the standards for eligibility.

Responses to the recommendation that pledge periods be eliminated (7, 8, 11, 12, 23, 35, 43, 45) stressed the difference between a pledge period and hazing. The majority of the proposals advocated the continuation of provisional membership of new members, citing it as being a period when both the new members and the organization can decide whether

they want to make a formal commitment to each other. Proposal 11 highlighted a system where pledge periods are optional, and where members can select the activities in which they wish to participate. Proposal 45 cited their organization's alternative new member program – in which new members are granted full membership at the outset – as an example of where a traditional pledge period does not exist.

All of the responses that mentioned hazing (2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 23, 34, 35, 38, 43, 45) agreed to a commitment to end hazing. Some suggested that the College propose its own hazing policy in addition to the existing New Hampshire State policy on hazing.

#### *Residence and membership requirements*

The majority of proposals called for a reduction in the membership requirement that the CSLI recommended. Those that opposed the minimum membership requirement cited the observed year-to-year fluctuations in their organization's new member class. The coed house members voiced extreme concern through individual responses about the suggested membership numbers. They argued that their houses are more diverse than most, have a very open membership process, and have less behavioral problems, yet the membership number requirements would be their downfall. The caveat that the Dean of the College could “allow reasonable exceptions to this timetable”(p. 31) was not of great comfort to them. Proposal 12 recommended that these requirements be waived for the historically Black organizations, Latino organization, and coed houses.

There was opposition on the part of the coed houses regarding the recommendations on membership requirements, contending that the recommendations will result in the opposite of what is intended, weakening those smaller, more diverse, less wealthy houses that embody the objectives of the Student Life Initiative instead of allowing them room to thrive.

While there was general opposition to the CSLI recommendation that only seniors and four junior officers reside in CFS houses, the proposals mentioning the topic contained no consensus on the optimum residency requirement. The suggestions for residency qualifications ranged from any member of the organization to any junior or senior member. Individual students took issue with only junior officers and seniors living in the houses on the grounds that these are the students least hurt by the current housing crunch, so their living in the house would take away spaces from sophomores (40). It was also stated that having sophomores live in gives some a unique opportunity to learn about their house and develop as leaders early in their CFS career.

Most proposals supported the idea of having minimum standards for the students' academic records. The SA suggested that non-resident members be exempt from these requirements (38). Some individual responses cited saw the issue of having a certain GPA in order to live in CFS houses as not in concert with the degree of interest taken in the GPAs of students in the residence halls.

Of the proposals that discussed the issue of boarders (8, 11, 12, 34, 43, 45), many cited the current practice by their organizations of not allowing non-member residents. Proposal 12 suggested that coed houses and the historically Black Greek organizations

should be exempt from this requirement. Proposal 11 cited the practice of allowing boarders as a way of exposing students to the positive aspects of living in a coed house.

### *Physical standards*

The overwhelming majority of the proposals were enthusiastic about the proposed structural improvements to their houses, including compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. Proposal 34 expressed concern that certain older houses are incapable of having bedrooms and bathrooms on the first floor, and should therefore be excused from the requirement. An individual comment was made that CFS houses should not have to comply with the standards set by the ADA until the residence halls do so. Currently the residential system complies with the ADA by offering a range of accessible spaces which reflect the variety of student room types that are available on campus.

A common concern expressed by most organizations was the high cost associated with the proposed renovations. A number of organizations requested the College's assistance in financing the renovations, as many felt that they would benefit the entire Dartmouth community. A variety of options were proposed, ranging from low interest loans to grants and matching funds. Proposal 8 suggested a system where houses would pay back the loans as mortgages as long as the houses remained recognized by the College. Individual students echoed this financial concern. Some felt that they would not be able to afford such renovations. Others felt that if they were able to fund the renovations, they should have a guarantee that their organization would be secure. One student suggested expanding the schedule for expensive changes over a period of time.

Regarding the transformation of basements into general-purpose areas, the majority of the proposals indicated that basements should be upgraded but not fully converted. Proposal 8 cited three reasons for opposing the conversion of basements: a reduction of available social space; the inability to separate areas where alcohol is consumed from areas where it cannot be consumed; and significant wear and tear of the houses themselves. It was also noted that some houses have problems with flooding that would make it difficult, if not impossible, to convert the basements. Individuals commented that the lack of natural light would hinder the basements from being good study spaces, that renovations would ruin the first floors, and that pong would continue regardless of how the basements look. Additionally, some stated that the current configuration of houses provides much needed performance space for singing groups and others.

Proposal opinions regarding the removal of all tap systems and permanent bars varied. Proposal 23 called for the continuation of permanent bars; justifications included the high cost of removing them and the benefits of the current separation between the server of alcohol and the consumers that these bars provide. Proposal 12, reasoning that the removal of taps would curb alcohol abuse, supported the CSLI recommendation.

### Governance

In the proposals that discussed the creation of an advisory board for each organization (8, 12, 38, 43 ), there was wide-ranging support for the idea, though proposal 43 questioned the need for a change in the current system. Proposal 12 suggested that the board include one alumnus, a faculty member and an administrator. One individual felt that it would be

useless to expect faculty to be on the advisory boards since faculty, in general, do not support the system, while another supported the idea of an alumni member of the advisory board stating that the alumni truly need to be more involved.

Regarding the creation of a separate judiciary committee, the Task Force received proposals both supporting and opposing the CSLI recommendation. Proposal 12 opposed a separate Judicial Council (JC), arguing that there is no peer pressure involved in making decisions, and reasoning that the present system is not biased nor ineffective. However, proposal 9 felt that the current JC is too lenient. Proposal 11 felt that a separate JC was a logical idea but urged members of the Dartmouth community to understand the seriousness of a possible derecognition. Proposal 13 suggested giving the Dartmouth Community Mediation Center a larger role in the judicial process on campus. The individual responses expressed the opinion that the CFSJC should continue.

### Five Year Review

The limited commentary offered on the five-year review tended to focus on the relationship between compliance and assurances. Five proposals (11, 12, 23, 35, 45) and some website and SRTF fliers strongly suggested that in order for the CFSC reforms to work there needed to be a promise that if organizations met all standards, their existence would be assured. The rationale for this is that it would be hard to rally member and alumni support if there was a possibility that organizations would be eliminated at the end of five years. The CFSC proposal suggested that the Board enter into a renewable five-year contractual agreement with each CFS house, agreeing that each organization would be recognized as long as they maintained compliance with the standards of excellence. The SA supported the five-year review in 2005.

The Panhellenic Council (34) suggested that instead of a five-year review for the entire system, each house should be reviewed annually as an individual entity. This parallels a comment made on a SRTF flier which stated that the College should “continuously review the action being taken in the context of overall goals and progress rather than waiting until 2005.” One of the January 10 discussion groups noted that the five-year review, as currently defined might result in hesitancy and mistrust from smaller houses, and ultimately lead to their demise.

### CFS Alumni/ae Board Response

While not a student group, the CFS Alumni/ae Board (CFSAB) submitted a response to the Student Response Task Force (47). The Student Response Task Force believes that this group’s involvement in the current social system on campus makes it reasonable for us to include their response among the student response. The CFSAB agreed that CFS houses would benefit from change and improvements, but they expressed reservations about many of the recommendations of the Committee on the Student Life Initiative. Their specific concerns are noted in their report, and address issues of residency, non-member UGAs, winter rush, servers for groups numbering over 15, renovation of basements, moratorium, and membership size.

The alumni chapter of Tabard (Sigma Chi-Tabard Corporation) also submitted a proposal (40) in response to the CSLI recommendations. Since their proposal was written in conjunction with undergraduates, it is integrated into the text of this report.



**RECOMMENDATION 5**  
**Conduct a Review of Senior Societies and Undergraduate Societies**  
**and**  
**RECOMMENDATION 6**  
**Conduct a Review of Academic Affinity Houses and Programs**

NOTE: The Committee on the Student Life Initiative presented these as two separate recommendations. However, student responses tended to address both recommendations together.

**General Response**

Seven proposals (1, 9, 10, 26, 28, 33, 38 ) addressed the issues of reviewing other undergraduate social organizations and residential programs. Overall, such a review was seen as a necessary and good idea. Palaeopitus recommended that the review of the senior societies focus on accountability, secrecy, ownership of land, and membership (33).

The Dartmouth China Society (9) felt that the Affinity programs needed more attention and that there was a clear lack of funding and programming. There were conflicting opinions about whether or not the senior societies were exclusive organizations (1, 28, 33).

**Specific Recommendations**

Proposal 26 contended that all social organizations, whether they be CFS, senior societies or undergraduate societies, should receive an individual review to assess ways in which they contribute to and/or detract from the Dartmouth community.

One proposal suggested that a way to combat the perceived exclusivity of the senior societies would be to make their selection processes open (28). Anyone could apply for membership, but the senior society would have final say over who was selected as a member. This proposal also suggested that if the current system of membership selection was to remain, then the advising role that these groups have with administrators be removed.

The '03 Council (10) suggested that programming done by academic affinity programs be open to the entire campus and advertised as such. While much of the programming done by affinity houses is open, the community is not always aware of this.

The proposal submitted by the Afro-American Society (1) presented three suggestions for academic affinity programs. First, that any future construction of such houses be done with the concept of creating a warm, welcoming environment in mind. Secondly, that the relationship between the academic program and the corresponding affinity house be taken into account, and that it be understood that an affinity program can not flourish if the associated academic program is not flourishing. Finally, it was suggested that the program liaison position be evaluated and strengthened. This final suggestion was echoed in proposal 33.

## **RECOMMENDATION 7**

### **Introduce New Guidelines for Alcohol and Other Drugs**

#### **General Response**

##### Culture

There was overwhelming agreement with the CSLI's conclusion that much of Dartmouth's alcohol problem lies in the campus culture. Palaeopitus wrote, "the most important thing that Dartmouth can do in combating alcohol abuse on campus is to address the problems in the drinking culture" (33). At a fireside chat, one professor remarked on Dartmouth's culture by saying, "what I worry about with the drinking culture at Dartmouth is the structure of compulsion that disguises itself as student choice—it's really conformity." In a comment posted on the Web, one student specifically wrote about the close connection between alcohol and social pressure in her experience here.

The goal set forth by students seemed to be promoting an environment where people who choose to drink can do so safely and responsibly. The method for achieving this is dependent on two approaches that must be pursued in concert: comprehensive and responsible party planning and management, and the modeling and reinforcement of appropriate and safe choices. There was a general sentiment that rules and regulations will be effective only by targeting the culture that sustains the alcohol problem on campus, and that these two approaches would move in that direction.

##### Acknowledgment of the Need to Change

One student put it well: "Do we have to have someone DIE for us to revise the way we think about alcohol? I hope not." Another wrote, "The drinking culture at Dartmouth is...ridiculous. Never would I have thought that I'd become so accustomed to this." Another referred to the recent Dartmouth drinking jokes on the Simpsons, saying, "this image of a beer-guzzling frat has got to go." Finally, one student touched on the common theme of paternalism in her response: "While I think the legalistic, number-defining alcohol regulations are absurd, it's pretty obvious that something has to be done about alcohol consumption here."

##### Inevitability

At another fireside chat, the distinction was made between alcohol *consumption* and alcohol *abuse*. The responses to the Student Response Task Force accepted the reality that drinking is an inevitable aspect of college life, and that any institutional mandates should be aimed at curbing the abuse of alcohol rather than seeking complete abstinence from drinking. A student at the Mass Row cluster discussion highlighted this reality: "people will drink no matter what." The question, it seems, is what can be done to promote greater moderation and responsibility among those who choose to drink.

##### Public Drinking and the Role of the Greek System

Reaction was mixed as to whether the Greek system is the cause of or is merely symptomatic of alcohol problems at Dartmouth. Independent of any blame, however, there was much concern over a potential shift of consumption from Greek houses. Students expressed concern about safety and exclusion.

- *Safety.* Several proposals shared their perception that there is some comparative safety in the beer-based, public drinking that occurs in Greek houses rather than the consumption of hard alcohol in smaller settings. The IFC wrote, “excessive consumption of alcohol is often prevented by the intervention of friends or fraternity members” (23). A student argued, “isn’t it better that this alcohol consumption is happening in a social/public place where signs of stage III (dangerous) drunkenness can be observed...by people who know how to deal...than if it happened in a dorm room or off-campus house somewhere?” Individual proposals also emphasized concern for higher incidents of drunk driving and a tougher burden of enforcement if consumption were to shift from Greek houses. Groups in two cluster discussions noted that they appreciated how alcohol consumption largely takes place outside of their residential settings.
- *Exclusion.* There was concern that the social scene would be more exclusionary if Dartmouth were to shift from relatively open consumption to smaller, closed, off-campus or room-based drinking. There was also concern that a move towards bars would highlight the currently transparent 21/under-21 divide.

## **Specific Recommendations**

### Education

In its alcohol section, the CFSC states that “education should be the single most important part of any new policy” (12). A student proposal states that “only education will change this behavior.” As these comments indicate, education was given a high priority for much of the alcohol-related feedback. The CFSC asked that this education be more peer-based, while DTV volunteered its publicity resources to aid in this quest (12, 14).

Margaret Smith, Coordinator of Alcohol and Other Drug Education, has also addressed the importance of alcohol education. She has shared that an effective alcohol and other drug program includes not only education, but prevention, treatment and aftercare which is relevant to the individual, groups, and the community as a whole. She said that national and regional researchers and theorists highlight the importance of addressing all these areas. To implement a program without addressing each of these facets weakens the goal to change the culture of the college environment, a goal that students have deemed important.

Sigma Phi Epsilon asked that alcohol education and training involve interaction with Safety and Security (45), while the LGBTQA community asked that some focus be given to queer students and community members, as well as other high-risk groups for substance abuse (28). The Dartmouth China Society also asked that programming be done to help students drink responsibly (9). While there is much to this topic, the education recommendations broke down into three main categories:

- *First Year.* The recommendation that received by far the most support was one for greater first-year education. Palaeopitus called for first-years to “undergo a comprehensive education program aimed at making students aware of the risks of alcohol abuse” (33). The CFSC asked for a mandatory first-year program that lasts beyond orientation, extending “at least through fall term, if not beyond” (12).

Proposals from Psi Upsilon, the Student Assembly, Sigma Phi Epsilon, and Zeta Psi (35, 38, 45, 43) also emphasized greater first-year education, as did comments from cluster discussions, fireside chats, and other campus discussions.

- *Counseling.* Many of the discussions have revealed the need for greater counseling resources for at-risk students. One student wrote, “Alcohol issues are so linked to self-esteem issues, that I don’t see how you can revamp a social system while ignoring improving the health service.” At the discussions on the night the CSLI report was released, another student spoke about his problems getting help once he realized he was at-risk. At a cluster discussion, another student spoke on the difficulties on getting friends to realize they had a problem, and how very little visible help was made available.
- *Greek-Specific.* Several proposals, including the CFSC and SA’s (12, 38), supported augmenting the DAPA (Drug and Alcohol Peer Advisors) program. The Tabard committed itself to more member education (40). The Inter-Fraternity Council and Zeta Psi proposals were more reflective of the general Greek response, noting that through the TIPS and Alcohol Mentors programs, affiliated students may be more educated on alcohol than most of the campus (23, 43).

### More Options

There was widespread agreement on the need for more social options, especially the creation of additional venues that serve alcohol. One respondent wrote, “given the choice, most students would rather drink in an inexpensive bar than in a grotty basement.” Both the CFSC and Psi Upsilon encouraged abolishing the three-drink limit at the Lone Pine Tavern, saying that such a measure is critical to a venue’s effectiveness (12, 35). Palaeopitus (33) in addition to suggesting a freestanding campus bar suggested more events like senior tails or professor-student cocktails since “they provide mature and responsible socializing and drinking for students.” One student recommended that these student-run alcoholic events have proceeds sent directly to the Programming Board to raise money for more options. Psi Upsilon (35) suggested that the College borrow from the model of the Greek system and occasionally even provide free alcohol at social events.

There was support for additional non-alcoholic programming as well. This is outlined to a greater extent in other sections of this document, but Zeta Psi (43) proposed a structural change of note. It suggested creating a non-alcoholic programming umbrella organization for CFS houses similar to the Council on Student Organizations. This would be the mechanism through which houses would apply for funding to hold “additional, more attractive non-alcoholic events.”

### The Tap Systems

The reaction on the CSLI recommendation to remove tap systems was mixed. The Tabard, Bones Gate, and the Coed Council (40, 7, 11) supported the recommendation. The Coed Council said removing tap systems would “help curb alcohol abuse,” while Bones Gate wrote, “our core values are not contingent upon a tap system or kegs.” An individual wrote, “Why have beer as part of your plumbing, available 24-7? I don’t endorse that at all.”

However, there were several contrary arguments presented. A few individuals said that the environmental cost from switching to cans would be too enormous to justify. A graduate student who was at Dartmouth during the keg ban a few years ago wrote that there was no decrease in the supply of beer. Rather, he believed that as a result of the switch to cans and bottles, “there was even more open access to alcohol and less of a wait to get another drink.” Chi Gamma Epsilon wrote that “while we are not intractably opposed to removing them, we feel the Board should be aware that the alternatives to the tap system (hand-tapped kegs, cans, or hard liquor) are equally conducive to hard drinking. Therefore the expense and inconvenience of removing these taps will serve no purpose”(8). Zeta Psi also questioned any reductions in alcohol use (43). One compromise that an individual proposed was keeping only one tap open. “Nothing limits access to alcohol like having to pump it all through one tap,” he said.

### Permanent Bars in Houses

Not much was written on this, though those who did supported keeping houses’ permanent bars in place. Chi Gamma Epsilon wrote that bars help deter alcohol violations: “By maintaining a clear separation between servers and patrons, permanent bars help ensure that no mistakes (such as serving minors) are made” (8). The Coed Council wrote that bars do not influence students’ decisions on “whether to drink

responsibly, irresponsibly, or at all,” and concluded that bars should remain in order to protect the physical plant’s integrity and spare the sentiments of nostalgic alumni/ae (11).

#### Enforcement / Safety and Security

We received considerable commentary on the need to enforce current regulations. The ‘03 Council wrote, “the best solution to the alcohol issue would be to actually enforce the current requirements” dealing with keg limits and underage drinking (10). A student wrote, “If the college cares so much about alcohol, they should enforce the policy they have now.” Another student recommended a “one strike, you’re out” policy on underage drinking. This student cited the need for consistency, saying, “All of the recommendations are based on rules, and to take as a premise that students will (should) break a state law seems to make all the other rules laughable. It’s built on a contradiction and can’t work.”

The relationship between houses and Safety and Security seems to be cordial at present. Psi Upsilon, Sigma Phi Epsilon, and Zeta Psi all praised the state of cooperation between Greek organizations and Safety and Security (35, 45, 43). Officer Robert Young, Jr. was particularly commended. One individual wrote, “Bobby Young is the best choice you could have made for an S&S officer. He only cares about making sure that people are okay, so we trust him.”

#### Student Bartenders

In contrast with the CSLI recommendations, most students and student groups supported the idea of student bartenders rather than professional ones. Palaeopitus wrote that non-student bartenders might “discourage the registration of parties and lead to more private and unmonitored drinking” (33). The CFSC commented that it is unlikely that the College could find enough non-students willing to do the job (12). The Student Assembly suggested that both students and non-students should be allowed to be bartenders.

Psi Upsilon and Zeta Psi argued that they could not accept liability for the actions of a non-member server as the CSLI recommended (35, 43). Zeta Psi suggested that the student servers from each house could also use their income to pay organizational dues (43). Alpha Delta, however, supported the idea of a non-student bartender, with the caveat that the financial burden of employment be shared between the fraternity and the College (2).

#### The Yellow/Green Light Requirement

The feedback received on this topic was generally critical of the proposed CSLI two-track system. The CFSC wrote “the numbers set forth by the Committee to require registration are unenforceable and counterproductive. As a simple example...three seniors sharing a bottle of wine in the same room as four non-drinking underclassmen would be required to pay for a bartender.” The CFSC and Zeta Psi claim that such a policy will result in students putting their energy into avoiding and sidestepping regulations (12, 43). The CFSC suggested registration be required only when attendance at an event will exceed 50, while Psi Upsilon suggested keeping the membership size of the sponsoring organization as the cut-off for registration. (12, 35). The Coed Council made a distinction between events where alcohol is served and those where alcohol is

merely present (11). The Student Assembly supported the recommendation but ask that the numbers used by the CSLI be re-examined (38).

### Curfew

The idea of a curfew was met with strong opposition. “You act as though we still need a babysitter,” wrote one student. The ‘03 council wrote, “The curfew regulations...insulted many members of the 03 class” (10). However, it is worth noting that some form of curfews currently exists—registered parties must end by 3:00 a.m. on weekends, and 1:00 a.m. on weeknights.

### Other feedback

- Bring Your Own Beverage parties could limit the amount of alcohol at parties (33).
- Allow CFS houses to have parties on only one weekend night per week (33)
- Require alternative refreshments at alcoholic events (12)
- If pong were to continue, require that water be available for use (Cluster Discussion)

### New Penalties

The CFSC asked for a new set of penalties for violations of the alcohol policy. It asked that the Dean of the College formulate these penalties in consultation with student leaders (12).

### Other Drugs

#### *Tobacco*

The Cancer Awareness Organization (part of the COSO feedback) warned of a dramatic increase in tobacco use on campus over the last five years. It stated that the jump “has occurred with an increase in social smoking at parties and an increase in the use of tobacco to relieve stress.” The organization stressed the consideration of the impact of tobacco on the culture here. “We need to work to promote tobacco-free life,” it wrote.

#### *Shift from Alcohol to Other Drugs*

One student’s comment was representative of many: “Restriction of basement drinking will lead to even more unsafe private use of hard alcohol or other drugs.” Another wrote about his/her perception that the most successful non-alcoholic party of last year involved many students doing hard drugs instead of drinking. While no proposals focused on the use of illegal drugs, that aspect of campus life does indeed exist and it warrants consideration.

## OMISSIONS

### **General Response**

While there were numerous reports supporting and commenting on various recommendations offered by the CSLI, there were also several areas that students felt were largely ignored by the report. For instance, individual students and student groups were concerned that references to gender relations and the impact of the Dartmouth Plan were either omitted or only partially addressed by the committee's work.

### **Specific Recommendations**

#### Gender Relations

Several responses mentioned the lack of reference to improving gender relations as a goal. A first year student said that Dartmouth still seems to be a place that is "more comfortable for and attuned to men than women" and proposed the creation of a new, expanded "Center for Women at Dartmouth". This Center would operate from a broader definition of feminism that focused on the advancement, empowerment and support of women at Dartmouth and beyond. Other proposals called for a significant expansion of the staffing, programming and/or resources of the current Women's Resource Center (4, 21, 38). Still other proposals call for an increase in coeducational houses (11, 12, 40, 46).

#### The Dartmouth Plan

The Dartmouth Plan was also mentioned several times as contributing to the discontinuity and lack of connection that students feel on campus. It was suggested that the D-Plan could be altered so that students would be free to travel and study abroad for one year rather than two or that students should be assigned to clusters based on their enrollment patterns. Several responses urged the creation of a committee or task force to evaluate the continued use of the Dartmouth Plan (9, 33, 38, 40).

#### Other topics

- Moving Dick's House to a central campus location, and increasing its size and staffing. (9, 21)
- More dial-up accounts for commuting students
- A review of the faculty advising system (38)
- Increasing opportunities for service learning in the Upper Valley to integrate the College with its' surrounding community
- Creating a larger role for the Dartmouth Community Mediation Center in the judicial process on campus and assigning mediators to each CFS House and residence hall (13)

## CONCLUSION

The feedback that was presented to the Student Response Task Force was impressive in a number of ways. Students dedicated a great deal of time to engaging in campus discussions, generating 48 formal proposals and an extensive amount of commentary. The manner in which they challenged each other was generally respectful and quite often exemplified the very best qualities of our students. The Task Force thanks the Dartmouth student body for their heartfelt commitment to improving the social and residential life of the College.

The Task Force heard clearly that a sense of belonging is essential for student success. In order for students to take the responsible risks that will allow them to mature and grow as well-rounded human beings, they must feel that there is a place where they are appreciated and valued. The Student Assembly report supports this concept, noting that “roots” and continuity are essential elements of a successful institution (p. 41). It seems that the College must seek better ways to foster that important sense of belonging for all students.

The Dartmouth community has an invaluable resource in its vibrant and diverse student body. It is the variety of backgrounds and experiences that students bring to our community which made the winter term discussions rich and meaningful. Understandably, this variety of viewpoints, while necessary for considering all aspects of an issue, does not translate into an easy or unanimously agreed upon path for the work that must be done. Fortunately, Dartmouth students have shown that they feel a sense of responsibility for the future of the College and are ready for the challenge of moving forward. The Student Response Task Force is confident that the shared commitment that our community has shown this term will serve the College well in the next phase of the Student Life Initiative.