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I. Introduction

As one of the nation’s most highly regarded colleges, Dartmouth has long been celebrated for its unique combination of research excellence and commitment to teaching, for the loyalty it engenders, and for the natural beauty of its setting. Yet Dartmouth is not immune from the problems of student life that plague most college campuses today. High-risk drinking and sexual assault have become all too common features of the college experience. A lack of inclusivity among student groups has contributed to a campus environment where students do not feel accountable to one another. Larger societal norms that glorify extreme or risky behavior have made the campus a far different place from what it was even a few years ago. Not only do these behavioral norms threaten the physical safety and psychological wellbeing of many students, but they also detract from the College's mission: to provide a positive, enriching, fully diverse academic and residential experience for all.

In May of 2014, President Phil Hanlon convened the Moving Dartmouth Forward committee to make recommendations that would address “the root causes of extreme student behavior in three critical areas: sexual assault, high-risk drinking and lack of inclusivity on campus.” The recommendations on the following pages represent our response to this charge. They are informed by research, consultations and conversations.

Our process has been wide-ranging and extensive. We have received over two thousand emails from students, alumni, parents, faculty and staff, who have generously provided their thoughts, ideas, and opinions on how to make Dartmouth a safer and more inclusive place. We have had hundreds of hours of discussions with students, alumni and other members of the Dartmouth community; heard from dozens of student groups; met with all the relevant staff on campus; spoken with experts in the fields of student life, student health and wellness, sexual assault, alcohol, diversity and inclusivity, and campus safety; and visited peer institutions, most of which are struggling with comparable issues endemic to college life today. We have spent many months searching for a clear way to counter the problem of extreme behavior among our undergraduates, and, like those we have talked to, have come away from the process impressed by the complexity of this problem.

In the end, these recommendations represent the best efforts of our committee to understand and address the problem of extreme behavior. What the committee has found is that such behavior emerges from no single cause and that there is no simple solution to its remediation. High-risk drinking, sexual assault, and lack of inclusivity are inter-related problems, and addressing them requires thoughtful, systemic understanding as well as a real commitment to institutional change over time.

The members of this committee are well aware of the many committees that have
preceded it in examining student life at Dartmouth.\(^1\) Nevertheless, behavioral problems continue to persist and to tear at the fabric of our community. We believe that the same behaviors will continue to bedevil us unless substantial changes to the residential and social life systems of our College, as well as to the expectations placed on our students, are carried out.

In facing up to -- and overcoming -- the challenge of extreme behavior on our campus, guided by the leadership of President Hanlon, Dartmouth has much to look forward to. In the meantime, our research has made clear one significant area of weakness. Although dedicated staff on the front lines have worked hard to combat extreme behavior, as an institution, Dartmouth has not done enough to foster a campus environment where all students feel safe, supported, and responsible for one another. Failure to invest in the residential experience over many years has created a void precisely at the place where students should be experiencing their most intense form of community, diversity, sociability, and intellectual exchange. A social system dominated by Greek organizations has stepped into this void, serving an important role for many students, but also reinforcing certain social norms that can lead to extreme behavior.

The committee feels it is incumbent upon the College, a residential institution, to foster an environment that encourages students to make the best decisions. The initiative to create a programmatically-rich and diverse House system, the recommendation to ensure that all residential spaces, including fraternities and sororities, provide safe environments that significantly enhance students’ academic experience, and the recommendation to invest in social programming and spaces to which all students have equal access will help create such an environment. We see these initiatives as integral to our charge.

As a liberal arts institution, the College must invest in educating students and in forming responsible citizens. It is not sufficient to assume that such formation can occur in the classroom alone. Recommendations for a new “Dartmouth Thrive” program, new citizenship initiatives, a substantial investment in diversity and inclusivity, as well as the recommendation to raise academic expectations, are all aimed at fostering integrity, responsibility, self-reflection and moderation in our student body.

Finally, the College must guide the way for students by enacting clear standards applicable to all students and by holding them accountable for their actions. The recently revised sexual assault policy mandating expulsion for those found responsible for the most egregious forms of sexual assault is an important step in the right direction. So are the recommendations to create a living code of conduct, to revise the SEMP policy and to adopt a hard alcohol policy.

\(^1\) Ad-hoc committees that have recently examined these issues include the Student Life Initiative (2000), the Student and Presidential Alcohol Harm Reduction Committee (2010), and the Committee on Student Safety and Accountability (2014).
None of our recommendations alone will magically transform the choices students make in their actions and behaviors. In fact, it is not clear how much power institutions of higher education have to impact these behaviors, given their prevalence in the greater society. But it is certainly incumbent on Dartmouth to do all it can to counter them and to make our campus as safe and inclusive as possible. Doing so will take a conscious effort on the part of all stakeholders over the course of several years. Many of our recommendations require continued programmatic development by working groups of students, staff and faculty. In addition, we request that the College convene an annual review committee to review the scope of the problems addressed by this committee and to assess the impact of our recommendations.

In the meantime, we believe the collective set of recommendations offered here will start us in the right direction toward reaffirming the norms of responsible behavior, and move toward creating a student experience that best embodies the College’s commitment to excellence in undergraduate education.
II. The Charge

In May of 2014, President Hanlon convened this committee to make recommendations to address high-risk drinking, sexual assault, and a lack of inclusivity on campus. The committee has collected data about Dartmouth students, consulted with researchers and experts on these issues, and examined the ways in which other institutions are dealing with similar problems. The discussion below outlines our understanding of the shape of these problems on our campus.

A. High-Risk Drinking

Dartmouth students drink more than the national average for college students. Dartmouth does not admit students who drink at higher rates – in fact, students entering Dartmouth drink less than college students nationally – but once on campus, the majority begin to drink and to drink more heavily than peers. (See charts, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dartmouth</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Risk Drinkers</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light/Moderate Drinkers</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Drinkers</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes 2% problematic
Includes 5% problematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dartmouth</th>
<th>National Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Risk Drinkers</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light/Moderate Drinkers</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Drinkers</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes 6% problematic
Includes 8% problematic

SOURCE: EVERFI AlcoholEdu for Dartmouth College 2013-14

Non Drinker = 0 drinks in the past 2 weeks. Light/Moderate Drinkers = 1-3 drinks for women; 1-4 drinks for men on at least one occasion in the past two weeks. High-Risk Drinkers = 4 or more drinks for women; 5 or more drinks for men on at least one occasion in the past two weeks (includes problematic drinkers – 8 or more drinks for women; 10 or more drinks for men).
The 2014 Dartmouth Health Survey results of all students also show Dartmouth students drinking more than their peers. Seventy-three percent of Dartmouth students used alcohol in the last 30 days in comparison to 63% of the national sample of college students.² (The same survey shows that tobacco and drug use by Dartmouth students is less than among peers.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Dartmouth Alcohol and Drug Use Compared to National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Graph]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When they drink, Dartmouth students tend to drink more than their peers. Forty-nine percent of Dartmouth students reported binge/high-risk drinking (five or more drinks at a sitting)³ in the past two weeks, which outpaces the 2014 NCHA percentage by 13%. Binge drinking is more prevalent – both at Dartmouth and nationally – among men than among women.


³ This use of the term binge/high-risk drinking is drawn from the NIAAA National Advisory Council definition, which is based on a level of drinking that brings blood alcohol concentration (BAC) to 0.08 gram-percent or above. For a typical adult, this corresponds to consuming five or more drinks (male), or four or more drinks (female), in about two hours.
Beginning with the launch of the Dartmouth College Health Improvement Project (DCHIP) in 2011, the College made it a goal to eliminate dangerously high blood alcohol concentrations (BACs)\(^4\) among students, leading to some measurable improvements. The number of students treated for dangerously high BACs has dropped from 80 in 2010-11, to 63 in 2011-12, and then to 31 in 2012-13. In 2013-14, however, the number remained at 31.

Those who engage in high-risk drinking are much more likely to experience negative consequences – having sex without consent, blacking out, injuring themselves, having unprotected sex and other actions.

\(^4\) “Dangerously high blood alcohol concentrations” (BACs) targeted by DCHIP are those greater than 0.25. At BACs above 0.25, many people lose consciousness, either falling asleep or passing out; those who do not are at increased risk of falls or accidents. At higher levels, the part of the brain that controls involuntary responses such as heart beat and breathing is impacted, which can lead to black outs, trouble breathing, cardiac arrest, and ultimately risk of death.
Adverse Events Experienced When Drinking Alcohol: Dartmouth Students Who Binge/High-Risk Drink Compared to Those Who Do Not

Source: 2014 Dartmouth Health Survey

Wednesday nights -- the nights on which Greek houses hold their membership “meetings” -- have become a major drinking night on campus, along with Fridays, Saturdays and Mondays (when senior societies meet). Similar quantities of alcohol are consumed on Wednesday nights as on Saturday nights. The fact that students are engaging in high-risk drinking potentially four nights a week has a bearing on their health and well-being; it also clearly affects their level of academic engagement. Given the brevity and intensity of Dartmouth’s quarters, the committee has repeatedly asked itself how students are able to complete their classwork, often maintaining high GPAs, while engaging in such behavior.

Dartmouth’s social scene is in large part centered around the performative drinking game “pong.” Fraternity and sorority houses’ basements are lined wall-to-wall with pong tables, leaving little room for casual social interactions. For many students, gaining and proving proficiency in the game becomes almost as important as other academic and extracurricular endeavors. Pong, particularly as the game has developed, encourages rapid and increased alcohol consumption; current versions of the game may involve up to 30 cups of beer on the table. The committee also heard enough stories from students and recent alumni about inducing vomiting to facilitate further consumption (“boot and rally”) and competitions to see who vomits first (“doming”) to suggest that these are common occurrences. Students also routinely relate stories of having “blacked out.”

Almost all alcohol-related medical encounters involve hard alcohol. Students have told
us that first year students, virtually all of whom are underage, often consume hard alcohol in their residence halls. Fraternities and sororities also provide hard alcohol at open parties, “tails” events, and in private rooms. First-year students typically represent 43% of all alcohol-related medical encounters on campus. It is not clear if this higher rate among first-year students is due to higher rates of consumption or because they are more likely to come to the attention of undergraduate advisors or campus authorities.

As noted above, students are drinking in both residence halls and fraternities and sororities. According to 2014 Living at Dartmouth Survey results, 44% of students agree or strongly agree that high-risk drinking is most common in residence halls, while 52% believe it is most common in fraternities and sororities. National studies have shown that students who belong to fraternities and sororities drink more than non-members; this is attributed to socialization. Nationally, students living in fraternities and sororities also drink more than those living in residence halls or apartments.  

DCHIP has taken many effective steps on the individual intervention level, such as BASICS (Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students, an individualized counseling intervention). But to address high-risk drinking effectively there must be an institutional commitment to policy and environmental changes that encourage healthy habits.

B. Sexual Assault

Nationally, women between the ages of 18 and 24 are more likely to be victims of sexual assault than females in any other age group or men. Sexual assault statistics, however, are notoriously unreliable. Sexual assault is underreported and the number of reports

---


6“Sexual Assault” means unwanted or unwelcome touching of a sexual nature, including: fondling; penetration of the mouth, anus, or vagina, however slight, with a body part or object; or other sexual activity that occurs without valid Consent (Dartmouth’s *Unified Disciplinary Procedures for Sexual Assault by Students and Student Organizations*).


8 See *Rape and Sexual Assault Victimization Among College-Age Females, 1995–2013* (December 2014) for discussion of the complexity of estimating the prevalence of sexual assault.

9 Studies have estimated sexual assault reporting rates among college students (to campus authorities or police) of 5-20%. *Rape and Sexual Assault Victimization Among College-Age Females, 1995–2013* (December 2014) and National Institute of Justice, *Sexual Assault on Campus: What Colleges and Universities are Doing About It* (2005).
may fluctuate based more on the environment around reporting than on the number of assaults. Therefore, an increase in reported incidents may, in fact, represent a positive change to the environment in which victims feel more comfortable reporting the offenses.

Available data suggest that sexual assault rates at Dartmouth are similar to national rates on college campuses. In a 2014 Dartmouth health survey, 2% of students reported actual sexual penetration; the same rate was found in a national health survey of college students. In the same surveys, 2% of Dartmouth students reported attempted sexual penetration without consent compared to 3.2% nationally. Sexual touching without consent was 8% at Dartmouth; nationally, the rate was 7.6%.  

Dartmouth’s 2014 Clery Report indicates that there were 35 forcible sex offenses in 2013 and no non-forcible sex offenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Offenses, 2011-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses, Forcible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses, Non-Forcible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Students have posted sexually harassing material, including a notorious “rape guide” last year, on the website Bored@Baker. Although only a small number of students are involved in offensive postings (including not only sexist but also racist remarks), students have taken advantage of the anonymity offered by the site to broadcast hateful speech that threatens the safety and undermines the dignity of students.

Research has shown a connection between alcohol use and sexual assault. In half of sexual assault cases, one or more of the involved parties has consumed alcohol and one study found that serial perpetrators of sexual assault use alcohol to incapacitate their victims.

---


12 Lisak, D., & Miller, P. M. Repeat Rape and Multiple Offending among Undetected Rapists. Violence and Victims, 17(1) (2002), 73-84.
Many women at Dartmouth have told us that they feel unsafe in fraternities -- male-controlled social spaces awash in alcohol -- and that they have developed procedures and buddy-systems in an attempt to ensure their own safety when frequenting them. Affiliated women value their sororities in part, they tell us, because they provide a "safe" space. Some studies suggest that sorority membership correlates with being a victim of sexual coercion and that fraternity membership may be correlated to a greater likelihood of being a perpetrator of coercive sexual strategies.

Although sexual assault at Dartmouth does not seem to be geographically localized -- it occurs in residence halls and in Greek houses, as well as other locations -- the committee finds that the links between sexual assault and drinking, in conjunction with the concentration of campus social life at Dartmouth in fraternities with little older-adult supervision, raise special concerns. The committee firmly believes that every space on campus should be a genuinely safe space and calls on the College to take reasonable steps to make this a reality.

Dartmouth has taken many positive steps in the last year to strengthen its sexual assault education and prevention program: the hiring of a new Title IX Coordinator and Clery Act Compliance Officer and the adoption of a forceful new sexual assault policy. All incoming students receive sexual assault education and more than 800 students have also received bystander training. An active Student and Presidential Committee on Sexual Assault has done valuable work in galvanizing the community and the College has implemented a number of their recommendations. Dartmouth also hosted a Summit on Sexual Assault in 2014 that brought together leading national experts, government representatives and participants from colleges across the country. Research suggests that all of these steps are beneficial ways to combat sexual assault, provide greater support for victims, and ensure fair procedures are followed that protect the rights of respondents as well as complainants. Solving the issues, however, is complex. It will require additional research, including data provided by a campus climate survey, continuing education, and careful attention to environmental factors that play a role in exacerbating or minimizing sexual misconduct.


[16] [https://dartmouthspcsa.wordpress.com/](https://dartmouthspcsa.wordpress.com/)

[17] [http://www.dartmouth.edu/sosa/](http://www.dartmouth.edu/sosa/)
C. Lack of Inclusivity

Creating an atmosphere of inclusivity, in which differences between individuals are not only tolerated but celebrated, and in which students from diverse backgrounds feel a true sense of belonging and connection, is a central goal of any residential college. Our research suggests a pressing need for more to be done in this area at Dartmouth.

Forty-five percent of Dartmouth students are very or extremely concerned about the social climate at Dartmouth and 45% are very or extremely concerned about inclusivity at Dartmouth (2014 Living at Dartmouth Survey). Concerns about these issues were the impetus behind a small group of students staging a protest at the “Dimensions” show for prospective students in 2013\(^\text{18}\); for the “Freedom Budget” drafted by students in February 2014\(^\text{19}\), and for the Freedom Budget authors’ sit-in of the President’s Office in April of last year.\(^\text{20}\)

According to the 2014 Living at Dartmouth Survey, Dartmouth students believe the Dartmouth community is most inclusive of female students, but even so, only 36% believe it is “very inclusive” for women. Forty-three percent of students believe that Dartmouth is not at all or only somewhat inclusive of students of economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Thirty-seven percent feel it is not at all or somewhat inclusive of students with disabilities and/or chronic illnesses; 33% feel that is not at all or somewhat inclusive of LGBT students; and 31% say Dartmouth is not at all or somewhat inclusive of students of color.

---


How Inclusive Do You Think the Dartmouth Community is for the Following People?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Overall Average</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Students</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation College Students</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from Outside the U.S.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Students</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities and/or Chronic Illnesses</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Not at all Inclusive 2=Somewhat Inclusive 3=Neutral 4-Moderately Inclusive 5=Very Inclusive

Source: 2014 Living at Dartmouth Survey

Importantly, the survey also demonstrates that Dartmouth is experienced and perceived differently across socioeconomic and ethnic lines:

- 51% of minority students are very or extremely concerned about inclusivity (versus 39% of white students);

- 67% of International students are very or extremely concerned about social climate;

- 39% of minority students feel the campus is moderately or very inclusive for students of color, compared with 56% of white students who feel this way;

- 27% of minority students think the campus is moderately or very inclusive of students of economically disadvantaged backgrounds (versus 46% of white students).

The socio-economic dispersion of students at Dartmouth is in stark contrast to national demographic norms. Fifty-nine percent of the current Dartmouth student body is drawn from households in the top 6% of the income distribution, while only 11% of our student body comes from households in the bottom 40%. Based on our discussions with students, many of these latter experience anxiety and doubts centered around whether they belong or deserve to be at our institution. Inevitably, Dartmouth’s distorted socio-economic landscape exacerbates these feelings of isolation for many low-income students. The committee believes this is an unfair burden to place on students as it detracts from their primary goal of discovering and excelling at their intellectual passions.

While the committee understands the complex demands of the recruitment and admissions process, we are also mindful that the issue of “inclusivity” must be pursued within the framework of a strong institutional commitment to a truly diverse student body.
Dartmouth embraces the values of diversity and inclusivity in its Principle of Community that states, in part, that every student “should be appreciative of the diversity of the community as providing an opportunity for learning and moral growth.” Research demonstrates that diversity and inclusivity lead to enhanced cross-cultural understanding, improved cognitive skills and learning outcomes, better preparation of students for an increasingly diverse workforce and society and a greater sense of community. Meaningful interactions among students of different backgrounds in
college are correlated to increased civic engagement.\textsuperscript{21} The development of leadership skills is also correlated to the structural diversity of colleges, their racial climate, and to the level of cross-racial interaction during college.\textsuperscript{22} In addition, recent studies show that diversity can lead to improvements in problem-solving and greater innovation.\textsuperscript{23}

For all of these reasons, as outlined in the following recommendations, we call on the College to further strengthen its commitment to making the campus as diverse and inclusive as possible.


III. Recommendations

The recommendations that follow represent our sense of the most effective ways to combat extreme behavior on campus. Each stands on its own, as a specific intervention into one or more of the three behaviors studied. Yet they are meant to be understood as interrelated, reflecting both the complex causes that give rise to extreme behavior and the interconnected nature of the initiatives that may combat it. The recommendations are informed by the substantial input we received from members of the Dartmouth community and by our own considerable research. They represent broad sketches and many would need to be fleshed out by future working groups before being fully implemented.
1. Create a Vibrant Residential House System

Recommendation: That the College implement a complete residential House system with continuity, diversity, community identity, strong faculty leadership, and substantial resources for academic, cultural, recreational, and social programming. (See Appendix B for a detailed description of the recommended elements).

The College should implement a four-year residential House system that will provide:

1. A home for an academic, social, and residential community with strong faculty leadership;
2. A shared and fully inclusive identity with complete diversity;
3. Academic, social, recreational, and cultural activities based around the House community.

The system must be implemented with full commitment from the College and be allocated extensive resources for both physical facilities and programming. The success of the Houses will require engagement of the full Dartmouth community, and House membership should be open to all faculty, graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, staff, and alumni in addition to undergraduates.

It is clear that Dartmouth has a pressing need for greater community, diversity, and inclusivity in on-campus residences, and for stronger integration of the academic mission of the College into its residential life. In the committee’s view, the lack of a strong residential experience is one of the fundamental root causes for the extreme behavior that the committee has been tasked to address.24

Although almost 90% of undergraduate students live on campus, feedback from students and staff indicates a widely recognized lack of continuity and community in on-campus housing at Dartmouth. The first-year residential experience program (FYRE) is well regarded by students and strong communities are understood to develop on freshman floors.25 However, from sophomore year onward most students change rooms or residence clusters at least once and often multiple times per year. Combined with the comings and goings from Hanover due to off-campus programs and the D-Plan, this flux

24 Living in a residential learning community is associated with lower rates of drinking. This may be due to selection, socialization and reciprocal influences. Cranford, J.A., McCabe, S.E., Boyd, C.J., Lange, J.E., Reed, M.B., Scott, M.S. Effects of Residential Learning Communities on Drinking Trajectories During the First Two Years of College. Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs Suppl. 16 (2009 Jul), 86-95.

25 Spring of 2012 residential survey data showed that FYRE students felt a strong sense of belonging to their residential communities, and reported the highest level of satisfaction with residential opportunities to meet new people. While individual experiences may certainly vary, first year students report that they value the stability and relationships forged in first year living communities.
provides a residential experience with little sense of community. Many students describe their campus accommodations after their first year as being less like college residence halls and more like hotels, where they go only to sleep and do laundry. This lack of community is most acutely felt during sophomore fall, when students are separated from their first-year floor-mates and experience the separation from classmates for the first time due to the D-Plan. The desire to find a “home” on campus is a widespread motivation for entering the Greek system. As a result, tight-knit and genuinely diverse communities are largely missing from the college-run residential system after students' first year.

Faculty, graduate students, and postdoctoral scholars are often conspicuously absent from residential life, such that the academic mission of the College and meaningful intellectual exchange are seen as separate from the residential and social experience. This leads to a commonly-held distinction between “day” Dartmouth, in which students are engaged in positive intellectual, recreational, and cultural pursuits with guidance from faculty, staff, coaches, instructors, and senior peers, and “night” Dartmouth, in which student life is dominated by alcohol-fueled social activities with little guidance from older members of the community.

Successful residential House or College systems can help mitigate these issues, and are effective at promoting an academic and cultural experience in which undergraduates, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, faculty, staff, and alumni are brought together in a community of scholars. We have examined residential College and House systems at a number of peer institutions, from large urban research universities to small colleges in settings similar to Hanover, and have evaluated their success in building tight-knit, diverse, intellectual communities. Our research suggests the importance of strong faculty leadership in the form of residential Faculty Heads; of branding and identity through programming and shared activities like intramural sports and the arts; and of a range of housing configurations optimized for students at different stages in their Dartmouth career. Examples of less successful residential House systems point to the problems of weak institutional commitment or insufficient resources for facilities and programming. Without this commitment, and absent a clear articulation of the benefits of a continuous and diverse residential community, the impact of a House system can be severely limited. Going forward, we strongly encourage the College to continue to commit significant resources to the House system in the form of programming funds and the development of physical facilities that are adequate to the rich residential experience envisioned.

Our research on College and House systems highlights the particular importance of the Faculty Heads. In the most successful systems, the Faculty Heads are prestigious positions occupied by tenured faculty who are both distinguished scholars and

---

26 For an in-depth overview of College and House systems around the world, see http://collegiateway.org/.
superlative teachers, and who are instrumental in providing intellectual and cultural leadership to their Houses. It is critical that the College envisions the role of the Faculty Heads as more than simply residential administrators but as leaders of true communities of scholars, and takes concrete steps to attract prominent and talented faculty to these positions.

To this end, the College should provide extensive support for the scholarly endeavors of Faculty Heads while ensuring that they have the necessary time to focus on House leadership. Possibilities include additional research funding, enhanced administrative support, and/or partial reduction of teaching responsibilities. One interesting idea is to link the Houses to the new Dartmouth Society of Fellows, which will bring talented postdoctoral scholars and teachers to campus. Each of the Houses could be allocated one House Fellow who would be selected to work in the department or field of the Faculty Head, while also becoming members of the House community. \(^{27}\) The House Fellow would contribute to the scholarly and teaching efforts of the Faculty Head and his or her department and thus provide a strong incentive for prominent faculty to serve as House leaders, while embodying the integral connection of residential House life to the College’s academic mission.

At Dartmouth, the East Wheelock Program is the closest thing in the Dartmouth residential offerings to a “House” or “College.” East Wheelock is consistently identified in student surveys as the strongest residential community, with faculty involvement and a relatively continuous and diverse membership. However, East Wheelock’s impact could still be made much stronger, in line with the type of system we recommend. A successful House system at Dartmouth would include continuity of affiliation across all four years, creating a true community of scholars with the student membership drawn randomly from across the Dartmouth population. Houses would have strong branding, identity and traditions (all of which should be student-initiated), and clear faculty leadership of all aspects of the academic and cultural life of the community.

\(^{27}\) While the House Fellows would be automatically affiliated with a particular House community, House membership should be open to all postdoctoral scholars, graduate students, faculty, staff, and alumni as well as undergraduates.
2. Invest in Social Spaces and Programming

Recommendation: That the College invest in social spaces and provide greater funding for social programming that is non-selective, fully coeducational, and attractive to students.

To foster inclusivity and community, and to counter extreme behavior on campus, we recommend that the College make a significant investment in both social programming and new (or repurposed) social space on campus. Moreover, we believe that increased funding for compelling, positive social programming and new and expanded student facilities go hand-in-hand; the full realization of one is not possible without the other.

Currently, general student programming funds come exclusively from the student activity fee ($83/term; $249/year for each enrolled student). These funds are divided among student organizations by the Undergraduate Finance committee. In recent years, other offices have, on an ad-hoc basis, supplemented the funds available for social programming through the student activity fee with funds from their own budgets. Much of the social budget, however, is effectively paid by members of Greek organizations who host most of the College’s social life. The committee believes that regular sources of funding, beyond those funds available through the student activity fee, are needed to develop more robust College-sponsored social events and spaces. We recommend that the College dedicate a substantial and transformative budget for innovative student life programming.

In addition to allocating more programming funds, the spaces available for student social interactions should be improved. The College’s non-Greek student life is centered in the Collis Center, a multi-use space that supports student organizations and their programs; there is also student programming in nearby Robinson Hall. Collis (1901) and Robinson (1913) have not received physical plant renovations that fully address student life needs. The Robinson and Collis buildings have always been subject to focused improvements, not complete renovations. This has led to disjointed spaces and valuable square footage that could be utilized more fully.

Many students and administrators have also cited the lack of a large flat-floored programming space. This lack has been keenly felt on campus since Webster Hall was converted into the Rauner Library. A multi-use, large, flexible space dedicated to student programming would be a real asset in planning large-scale student events. Plans for such a structure have been drawn up in the past, but have never been realized.

In the past year, an imaginative programming venture at the Hopkins Center (“BarHop”) has proven to be hugely popular on Thursday and Friday nights among a broad array of Dartmouth students. This arts-themed club-like student-run social space is perceived as

---

The high cost of dues which this necessitates can be a barrier to entry for low-income students.
cool and inviting, providing an alternate to students eager for another late-night way to socialize than fraternity basements. Its outsized success\textsuperscript{29} suggests that Dartmouth has only begun to tap into student desire to socialize beyond exclusive, male-dominated and pong- and alcohol-centered spaces.

Dedicating funds for student life programming, particularly in the newly-created residential Houses, is critical. Renovating existing spaces such as Collis and Robinson, re-purposing existing spaces as was done with BarHop, and creating new social spaces -- such as a perpetually-planned but never-realized large flat-floor programming space to replace Webster Hall -- are all worthwhile investments.

\textsuperscript{29} BarHop began operating in the Spring of 2014 on Thursday nights only but quickly gained a following. In Fall 2014, BarHop opened on Thursday and Friday nights and regularly attracted 200-350 students/night. Overall, 4,159 students (3,306 undergraduates) attended in Fall 2014 representing 1,807 unique students (1,443 unique undergraduates).
3. Increase and Sustain Diversity and Inclusivity

Recommendation: That the College implement a comprehensive strategy to achieve and sustain diversity and inclusivity at all levels of the institution. (See Appendix C for a detailed description of the components of this recommendation).

To increase and sustain diversity and inclusivity the College should undertake a comprehensive plan to:

- Be more strategic with existing financial aid resources to better meet the need of enrolled students;
- Continue to diversify the admissions pipeline to reach more low- and middle-income students;
- Adopt a Need Affirmative admissions policy;
- Initiate a Financial Aid Capital Campaign;
- Increase the ethnic diversity of the faculty and staff through robust recruitment and retention policies;
- Increase efforts towards the full and seamless inclusion of people with disabilities in all aspects of Dartmouth’s environment;
- Build a sense of community and belonging throughout the College.

Progress must be made in each of these areas to have an impact. Diversity and inclusivity can only be achieved and sustained when they become core elements of Dartmouth’s educational mission, fostered by our admissions philosophy, nurtured by students, faculty, and staff, and articulated with clarity and conviction by our leadership.

The committee upholds the core premise that a liberal arts institution is most successful and transformative when it nurtures and values a plurality of viewpoints, a diversity of backgrounds and perspectives, and a sharing of power at all levels. Indeed, research demonstrates that diversity and inclusivity cause better learning outcomes, increase creativity and innovation, and foster a greater sense of community. Building on President Hanlon’s initiative to enhance diversity within the faculty, student body, and staff, we propose that the College continue to adopt broad and innovative measures to make Dartmouth a leader in recruiting, attracting, and retaining individuals from a wide range of backgrounds and perspectives. As Dartmouth becomes a more diverse campus, the College must remain vigilant in its recognition that diversity is often invisible to the eye, and that inclusivity must never be assumed but rather achieved through conscious, attentive policies and programs.
4. Develop Comprehensive Sexual Assault Education and Prevention Programs and Platforms

Recommendation: That the College create a comprehensive sexual violence prevention and education curriculum for students, faculty, and staff, and promote community awareness of sexual violence and gender-based harassment. Elements of the program should include:

- A four-year education and awareness program for students;
- Mandatory training of faculty and staff;
- An annual external campus climate survey, the results of which should be made public;
- Development of a “consent manual” with realistic scenarios;
- A revamped Safety & Security website that alerts the community to assaults and their locations as well as prevention and assistance resources;
- Development of a Dartmouth-specific safety smartphone app.

As noted above, the College has instituted a number of training and education programs for students. While these programs are valuable, not all of these programs reach all students – pre-matriculation and orientation programs are mandatory for all students but only some students receive bystander training and other education. We believe the various existing programs would be more effective if incorporated into an intentional four-year program that targets all students at specific times in a developmentally appropriate manner, building on prior learning to create a comprehensive prevention strategy. This would be a new type of program that could be a model for other Colleges – to our knowledge only the military academies have developed anything similar.

In our research of peer institutions, we noted that many schools have adopted consent manuals that provide sample scenarios of interactions between individuals and guidance as to whether the conduct would be prohibited under College disciplinary rules. Such manuals provide relatable, realistic situations and can be useful, interactive teaching tools for all students as to what constitutes consent.

Faculty and staff training, upon hire and periodically after, is essential. Faculty and staff may often be the first point of contact for student victims of sexual violence but they are often not aware of the best ways to manage trauma, of available resources, or of legal requirements relating to reporting. All faculty and staff should receive some primary education about sexual violence, all faculty should also receive first responder training, and certain staff and faculty, e.g., faculty leading FSPs and LSAs, should receive additional training.
Although the College provides data and information about resources related to sexual violence and harassment in many different venues, streamlining the information and making it readily accessible via the web and consistent across platforms would be beneficial. Development of a Safety & Security smartphone app as well as a personal security smartphone app specific to Dartmouth, such as those developed in response to a White House competition, are also recommended.

The committee endorses the College’s commitment to conducting an annual campus climate survey and believes that the survey should be performed by an external entity. The results of this survey should be made public. Campus climate surveys were identified by the White House as an optimal way to combat sexual violence on campuses.
5. Adopt a Hard Alcohol Policy

Recommendation: That the College enact a campus-wide ban on hard alcohol.

As part of an overall effort to address environmental factors that lead to high-risk drinking (see also Recommendation 6), a significant majority of the committee recommends that hard alcohol not be permitted on the undergraduate campus and that this policy apply to all, regardless of age. Hard alcohol should also not be permitted at any college-sponsored events.

To make clear the College’s particular concern about the risks posed by hard alcohol:

- A stricter sanction should be imposed on underage students in possession of hard alcohol than that for beer/wine (currently the consequence of underage possession is referral to the BASICS educational intervention).
- Students 21 or older in possession of hard alcohol will face a sanction. Students over 21 found procuring hard alcohol for minors should face a more severe sanction than if procuring beer/wine.
- If hard alcohol is found on the premises of an organization, the organization should face a sanction. This should foster self-policing and organizational accountability.
- Parents of students should be notified of the policy annually since parental guidance can be influential. Moreover, we have heard that parents sometimes provide hard liquor to students.
- Alumni should be notified annually of the policy and reminded of the policy during alumni events.

In 2013, there were 195 alcohol-related transports to Dick’s House or the hospital. Although this represents a continuing decline in annual transport numbers, the number is still high and excessive alcohol consumption remains a concern. Anecdotal evidence collected through BASICS, Dick’s House staff, and students themselves indicates that hard alcohol is involved in almost all alcohol-related transports.

Hard alcohol is being consumed by students in locations throughout campus. We have heard from students that hard alcohol is often consumed rapidly in residence halls (“pre-gaming”), sometimes before attending another social event, but sometimes as an end in itself. Hard alcohol is also regularly consumed in fraternities and sororities. Some of this is registered for social events (“Tails”) but we have heard from students that significant quantities of unregistered hard alcohol is also consumed on the margins of registered events and at unregistered events.

Hard alcohol presents a greater risk of over-consumption than do other forms of alcohol, particularly when it is not being served by a professional bartender. Students tend to “overpour” – so one “serving” is actually more than one standard shot of 1.5
ounces. Alcohol content is also difficult to judge when hard alcohol is mixed with other beverages, which can lead to excessive and often dangerous levels of consumption.

Research shows that limiting students’ access to alcohol reduces binge drinking\textsuperscript{30} and that an overall reduction in consumption is likely to lead to the greatest overall reduction in alcohol-related harm. Because of the higher risks associated with hard alcohol, a number of institutions restrict hard alcohol during certain times of the year, or at certain locations. Bates, Colby and Bowdoin Colleges have all enacted campus-wide bans on hard alcohol.\textsuperscript{31} Institutions that have adopted policies to limit the presence of hard alcohol on campus have seen reductions in alcohol-related medical transports and other measures of high-risk drinking.

The committee recognizes that for members of the Dartmouth community who are over twenty-one, this policy restricts their access to hard alcohol while on campus, although it would be allowed in most other residential or social settings. Such a restriction on otherwise legal behavior is not unprecedented; for instance, the College already prohibits smoking in any College-owned residential facilities. On careful consideration, the committee feels that this restriction is justified given the significant potential benefits in reducing high-risk drinking and associated extreme behaviors.


6. Reform Event Policy Procedures

Recommendation: That the College revise rules related to parties (Social Event Management Procedures [SEMP]) to increase accountability. An advisory committee composed of students, administrators and faculty should inform the drafting of the rules. Revised, simplified rules should be consistently enforced.

The committee recommends that the current Social Event Management Procedures be revised. Among the recommended changes:

- Parity/clarity in rules for Greek and non-Greek organizations’ event registration (e.g., revising current “members” event category which doesn’t apply to non-Greek events);
- Reasonable enforceable limits on alcohol quantity and type;
- Requirement for third-party vendor and third-party security at large events, paid for by the sponsoring organization;
- Requirement and enforcement of wrist-banding of underage guests at large events;
- Permission for large events only on days preceding those with no classes (typically Fridays and Saturdays);
- Enforcement of requirement that bartenders are 21 or over and TEAMS-trained;
- Enforcement of current regulation permitting Safety & Security timely access to all common spaces, including on upper floors;
- Conducting random walk-throughs;
- Recognition that social events are not defined by the presence of alcohol.

The current policy does not seem to serve as well as it could the purposes of the administration or of students.

We have heard from many that the way Safety and Security walk-throughs are scheduled makes it easy for students, particularly those in Greek organizations that have their own facilities, to violate policy, creating a sense of impunity. For example:

- There are generally no walk-throughs of upper floors of Greek houses even though this is typically where prohibited punches and hard alcohol are served;
- There are generally no walk-throughs during “members only” events such as many Wednesday “meeting nights” – even though the quantity of alcohol registered during these nights is comparable to that registered on Saturday nights;
• Walk-throughs of large events occur a set number of times, providing a sense of impunity once the scheduled walk-throughs have occurred;

• There is often no verification that bartenders are sober, of age and trained. Policy requires this but anecdotal reporting indicates this requirement is routinely violated.

The committee has also heard concerns from students:

• That the quantity of alcohol permitted is so low that it encourages off-the-books alcohol purchases;

• That the rules regarding types and form of alcohol allowed (e.g., they must choose between beer or wine, bottles or cans) are overly restrictive;

• That non-Greek student organizations must navigate a policy clearly designed with Greek organizations in mind – e.g., an event category for “members only” events.

We propose the formation of a committee composed of students, staff and faculty to draft revised rules that would encourage responsible drinking and increase student safety and accountability. We believe such rules should include a requirement for third-party vendors and security at large events; this would help reduce underage and excessive drinking without imposing an undue financial burden on students hosting small events. Events with alcohol should also be restricted to evenings preceding days with no classes (typically, Fridays and Saturdays); this would help return the emphasis to the College’s academic mission. The committee believes that rules considered reasonable by students interested in safe and responsible drinking will have greater buy-in.

Research indicates that policy and enforcement have the greatest impact of any alcohol prevention strategy. Policy and enforcement are highly correlated with a substantial reduction in consumption and many fewer negative consequences (e.g., sexual assaults, missed classes, regretted actions, hangovers). Alcohol researchers with whom we spoke indicated that, to see a substantial impact, the policy must be clear and enforcement must be consistent.

---

Introduction to Recommendations 7 and 8

The two recommendations that follow represent proposals for new community service-learning, leadership and wellness programs at Dartmouth. We recognize that the College is currently supporting a wide variety of such programs through the Rockefeller Center, the Dickey Center, the Tucker Foundation, the Outing Club, the Athletic Department’s Peak Performance program, and other venues. These programs are scattered throughout the campus and the benefits and competencies to be gained in each may not be clearly identified for students.

The committee recommends creating a centralized, managed clearinghouse for these offerings, perhaps under the umbrella of a new program called “Dartmouth Thrive,” detailed in Recommendation 7. Offerings should be organized by competencies and should include physical and mental wellness components, cultural awareness, leadership and service. Incentives for involvement could range from a certification on a transcript, an extra-curricular portfolio, requirements to complete certain competencies before taking on student leadership positions, and normative patterns of involvement.

The committee also recommends incorporating experiential community service-learning programs more centrally into the College’s portfolio of offerings. The two possible service initiatives we offer here in Recommendation 8 are designed to reach as many current students as possible, and to make Dartmouth attractive to potential students who see service as an essential part of their education. Again, we envision the need for any service program at Dartmouth to be consolidated under a single existing resource, such as the Tucker Foundation or the Center for Professional Development.
7. Create a Personal Development, Wellness & Leadership Program
(“Dartmouth Thrive”)33

Recommendation: That the College create a holistic personal development, wellness and leadership program (“Dartmouth Thrive”) for all students. (See Appendix D for a visual schema of this recommendation).

Dartmouth should create a transformational College-wide program that encourages every student to focus on his/her development as a total person -- in and out of the classroom, at Dartmouth and beyond, in mind, body and spirit. The program should combine existing and new resources to push students to be accountable for their actions, foster a depth of engagement in their development, and learn to be reflective about those experiences. A prominent, centralized wellness initiative that engages most of the student body would help set new norms for Dartmouth students that would counter the pull towards extreme behavior.

The program should focus on providing students with a strong foundation in wellness and leadership in a number of areas: intellectual, physical, emotional, social, cultural and environmental.

The benefits of such a program would include:

- A positive approach to well-being and reflection that encourages mindful behavior and discourage extreme behavior;
- Incorporating new and existing education and training related to drinking, bystander intervention and sexual assault prevention into an intentional program that reaches more students;
- Purposeful training and reflection for every student on the principle of responsible leadership and service;
- An intentional approach to each student’s health and well-being that promotes the importance of a lifelong mindful wellness strategy;
- Students, faculty and staff engaging purposefully in student development;
- Encouraging students to stretch themselves academically and to recognize the vast possibilities of the liberal arts model.

There are a number of students who take advantage of some of the related resources on campus. The Athletic Department’s Peak Performance program (DP2) centralizes many similar resources under its umbrella. The transformational idea of Dartmouth Thrive would be to organize and provide the resources to all students, and to incentivize

---

33 The Student Health Promotion and Wellness Office offers a small wellness program, “Thriving at Dartmouth.” The concept recommended here would build on this model, but incorporate a greater range of programs and resources.
students to pursue wellness and leadership while still providing the space for growth, development, failure and reflection.

The program should be continually assessed to determine its effectiveness and adjusted as necessary.
8. Develop Global Citizenship and Service Initiatives

Recommendation: That the College adopt two new programs that encourage experiential learning through service-learning and global citizenship.

1. **The Community Collaboratory**: The committee proposes the development and funding of a selective experiential-learning program focused on community service. This, most naturally, would be led by the Tucker Foundation (possibly in conjunction with an academic department, with the Dickey or Rockefeller Centers, the DEN’s social entrepreneurs or with service initiatives at Tuck). Such a program might be similar to the Rockefeller Center’s successful “Policy Research Shop,” but with a focus on service. It could be extra-curricular, but we believe it would be most transformative if offered for credit in conjunction with an academic department. It might be offered during sophomore summer or during the December break.

   We envision a program, the “Community Collaboratory,” that selects a group of students to work in teams with NGOs to solve complex, real-world problems. NGOs locally, domestically, and internationally could submit their most vexing challenge for members of this class to work on. Over the course of the project, students would work in teams to identify plausible solutions to the selected question. Mentor teams, which could include an alumnus/a who has expertise in this area, a faculty member, and a subject-matter expert from the field from which the challenge is pulled, would work with the students. Such engagement would allow students to pursue short-term national or global service as part of a focused undergraduate curriculum.

2. **Formalize Deferral Process for students to pursue a Service-oriented Gap Year**: We propose an initiative that formalizes the deferral of a Dartmouth student's matriculation in order to pursue a gap year with an already existing service program, either in America or abroad. Programs like AmeriCorps, Earth Conservation Corps, Habitat for Humanity, and Global Health Corps provide service experiences with a small stipend. All of these programs and many more are currently brokered by The Aspen Institute's Franklin Project, a non-profit organization that offers recruiting pathways for individuals looking to serve. We propose partnering with the Franklin Project to meet our mission of providing outlets for students to serve and strengthening the campus environment. This partnership would be resource-free. It could be tied to an incentive program where students who successfully complete service-oriented gap years before coming to Dartmouth could receive a "Service-Year Transcript," a deliberate mechanism that ensures a student’s service year is made visible to graduate schools and employers.

   Studies have shown that participating in service activities during college years enhances
students’ academic and life skill development, as well as the student’s sense of civic responsibility. Service-learning (service as part of an academic course) has also been shown to lead to an increased sense of personal efficacy and values, increased awareness of the world and greater levels of classroom engagement. We believe that shifting Dartmouth’s narrative away from "work hard/party hard" toward "learning, thriving, serving" is a crucial way to counter extreme behavior and to give rise to a healthier campus environment with a more responsible, engaged student body.

---


9. Adopt a New D-Plan

Recommendation: That the College optimize the D-Plan to allow students the option of a continuous academic experience.

The College should consider ways to adjust the D-Plan to allow all students the option of maintaining a traditional academic year. The construction of swing space planned to allow for transition to the new residential House system should provide the College the ability to house a greater number of students on campus. A continuous thriving residential House experience combined with an end to the disruptions caused by the current D-plan will create a stronger, more inclusive Dartmouth community.

Changing the current D-plan would not necessitate abandoning the quarter system, changing FSPs, LSAs or winter-term internships, nor would it necessarily affect the freedom of students to design their own academic schedules or faculty to teach only six months of the year. Robust study-abroad and work experience programs exist at institutions that operate under a more traditional enrollment pattern. While these programs take students off-campus during terms in which they would be traditionally enrolled in classes, they have clear benefits in line with the overall academic mission. In contrast, there is no clear pedagogical benefit to the current D-plan which was designed to allow increased student enrollment without an increase in residential capacity.

Because of the current D-Plan, students come and go from campus on widely varied schedules and are scattered repeatedly to residences across campus, often changing rooms twice or more per academic year, with significant negative effects on academic and residential community. In conversations with students, many identified their sophomore year as the loneliest period of their Dartmouth experience. After forming tight bonds during their first year, Dartmouth students felt adrift in their sophomore year as their social networks were weakened or pulled apart by the D-plan and the majority of students self-segregating into different Greek houses. The lack of continuity that begins in their sophomore year persists throughout their junior year.

While we recognize the attraction of the D-Plan’s flexible schedule, the constant fluctuations of the student body and faculty necessitated by the D-Plan disrupts the College socially, academically and operationally, making it a significant impediment to the creation of an inclusive community:

- The D-Plan makes it difficult for students to maintain close relationships across their four years at Dartmouth;
- The D-Plan disrupts relationships between students, faculty, and staff;
- The D-Plan produces constant turnover in the membership and leadership of undergraduate organizations, which hampers organizational development;
- The lack of community in residence halls, due in part to the D-Plan, compels many students in search of community to join the Greek system in spite of reservations about joining or previous intentions;
• The D-Plan enables students to be less accountable to one another as the makeup of students on campus is reset every ten weeks.

The D-Plan further disrupts the curriculum, with significant effects on academic rigor:

• The D-Plan makes it difficult for departments to offer curricular sequences;
• The D-Plan can make it difficult for students to fulfill prerequisites for courses;
• The D-plan compels some departments to offer introductory or basic courses more frequently, which ties up teaching resources that could be devoted to more advanced courses;
• The D-Plan requires staff members to be actively involved with students 12 months of the year, which is particularly draining for staff who routinely deal with student trauma.

For all of these reasons, we propose that the College reconsider the current D-plan.
10. Increase Academic Engagement

Recommendation: That the College create expectations and incentives for students to engage more thoroughly with their academic experience.

For the majority of students, a primary reason for coming to Dartmouth is excellence in academics, and the committee has been continually impressed with the exceptional scholarship and intellectual energy of which Dartmouth students are capable. However, we have also been struck by the extent to which social activities – often revolving around alcohol – come to occupy a remarkably high priority in many students’ lives, in contrast to the academic and intellectual pursuits that brought them here. Many talented Dartmouth students engage in high-risk drinking and other extreme behavior numerous times per week, which clearly impacts their ability to commit themselves as fully as possible to the unique academic opportunities that Dartmouth offers.

The committee recommends that:

• By the end of 2014-15 academic year, each academic department submit a plan for increased academic rigor and intellectual expectation. Departments should consider:
  
  o Increasing the number of students writing theses, in order to expand opportunities for students to engage deeply with a topic of interest and produce rigorous, original academic work;
  o Increasing the number of undergraduates who attend department seminars and colloquia and participate in other aspects of the department’s intellectual life;
  o Examining course requirements in order increase expectations;
  o Holding popular upper-level classes early Thursday morning, to promote a focus on academics during the week;
  o Examining policies on X-hours and class cancellations, particularly on “party” weekends (Homecoming, Winter Carnival and Green Key).

• The Administration should further form a task force on grade inflation, to ensure that students are held to high standards and rewarded for outstanding achievement. Each academic department should be required to arrive at standards for combatting grade inflation by AY 2015-16.

• Faculty should be reminded that they have an important role to play in setting students’ perceptions of normal behavior, and in particular in discouraging perpetuation of heavy-drinking social norms.36

36 For example, students told us that faculty make verbal assumptions in class about students drinking over the weekend, which helps to create a norm of what is expected of them.
• The faculty should encourage and support the intellectual vitality of the student body through greater engagement with the students outside of the classroom, for example through participation in the House system and more robust presence at student events.

Some of these recommendations address specific circumstances at Dartmouth that have allowed students to forgo full engagement in their academic and intellectual life. Our research has shown that during a regular week many students are partying three and sometimes four nights (Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday). In examining the root causes as to how such behavior can occur given the stresses of a compressed, 10-week quarter, we have found that:

• Students tend to avoid early morning classes and classes that meet on Thursday mornings, following Wednesday “house meetings”;

• On any given Wednesday, as many as 1700 and as few as 1100 servings of alcohol will be registered. The average quantity of alcohol registered for a single Wednesday comes to 1,225 servings of alcohol. This is close to that registered on an average Friday (1,489 servings) or Saturday (1,331). (Almost all is registered to Greek houses for “meeting nights” and we have heard estimates that actual alcohol present may be roughly three times the registered quantity). Many of the parties on Monday nights, almost all of which are held by secret societies, are unregistered;

• Students will often skip classes on the Thursday and Friday of big three weekends; faculty sometimes cancel classes for this reason. On Green Key weekend 2014, 2,280 servings of alcohol were registered on Wednesday, 1,200 servings on Thursday, 2,995 servings on Friday and 1,655 servings on Saturday;

• Grade inflation has made it possible for many students to maintain relatively high GPAs despite frequent high-risk drinking episodes.

Studies have shown correlations between binge-drinking among college students and fewer hours spent studying, as well as having fewer academic demands. One study


showed that students with early morning classes the morning after a “party night” drank half as much as those with no classes the next day.\(^{39}\)

While we are concerned by the lack of intellectual engagement in certain corners of our community, we are heartened and inspired by the many Dartmouth students who embrace the liberal arts experience, and help make Dartmouth a destination for intellectually-gifted young adults from around the world. To celebrate and invigorate the creative spirit that exists within the undergraduate population and to enable more students to take intellectual and professional risks, we propose establishing the Dartmouth Innovation and Imagination Grant (DIIG), a three-year post-graduate fellowship modeled on the famous MacArthur “Genius Award.” This award, granted to a graduating senior(s), would enable some of our most creative and self-directed students to pursue a project for three years with the only stipulation being that during the third year of their fellowship they return to Dartmouth for a term-long residency during which they will present a series of lectures, (co)-teach a course, or give a series of performances based on their work and experience.

As is the case for the MacArthur Fellows Program, there need be no application process for the DIIG. Instead, a committee consisting of a broad cross-section of faculty and staff would be charged with identifying exceptionally creative and passionate members of the student body for whom this award would be a “game changer,” allowing the recipient the time, freedom and resources to pursue a great intellectual, civic or artistic idea that might go unrealized without this support. While this award highlights individual achievement and vision, the requirement of returning to the campus underscores our belief that Dartmouth students are responsible for participating in the intellectual and personal growth of their classmates. The Dartmouth Innovation and Imagination Grant is also a statement of our faith in the ability of Dartmouth graduates to make a positive and sustained difference in the world. This award will help ensure that the very best traits of our student body (creativity, intelligence, civic awareness, and humanity) will always be in the forefront of our community’s consciousness.

---

11. Raise and Enforce Standards on Greek and Other Residential Student Organizations

Recommendation: That, on an annual basis, all residential student organizations should demonstrate their benefit to the educational experience of participating students. Further, that the College should convene a panel in four years to review the state of overall social and residential life on campus, including a consideration of the long-term role of exclusive residential student organizations.

As described in Recommendation 1, the committee believes that the College’s ability to fulfill its mission as a residential college will be significantly enhanced by the development of a House system offering a continuous residential community. Currently, beyond the first year, most students find that a sense of community and a “home” on campus are fulfilled by residential student organizations -- Greek organizations, living-learning communities, and affinity houses -- rather than regular on-campus residence halls. Notably, membership in Greek organizations has increased over the years. There are now thirty Greek organizations all with residential facilities, and 52% of students belong to a Greek house (69% of eligible students). Based on input from many students and alumni, we believe this growth in membership can be attributed primarily to the weakness of the College’s residential system.

Given the residence halls’ inadequate physical structures, the lack of residential continuity and community, and the lack of College-sponsored social programming, it is natural that most students choose to seek membership in Greek organizations. Greek organizations have a long history at Dartmouth, and membership conveys a number of clear benefits including a real sense of community, growth of genuine and long-lasting friendships, and connections with alumni and Dartmouth’s traditions. These are central to many students’ college experiences, and are reflected in the clear support for their organizations that have been shown by a large number of current students and alumni. However, the committee’s research shows that similar benefits can also be achieved in a residential House system without the concomitant negative aspects of the Greek system.

While Greek organizations make some positive contributions, they also cause fractures in the social and residential environment and may promote values that run counter to those of the College.

- Greek organizations are by definition exclusive, with unlimited power to accept or exclude new members. As such, they lessen the growth that comes from residing in a truly diverse community and create a remarkably prevalent sense of

---

40 Only about a quarter of Greek members actually live in the residential facilities (approximately 530 members) at any given time; however, the residence serves as the social hub for most members. The variance in statistics relate to the fact that first-year students are not eligible to join Greek houses.
social hierarchy among students. While we have heard from many members of the community that they believe Dartmouth’s Greek system, unlike that at many other colleges, is in fact inclusive because Dartmouth’s fraternities allow any Dartmouth student to attend their open social events, hosting open parties does not equate with being an inclusive organization. Control of the premises and the terms of interactions within it are determined by an exclusive membership; all others have access as mere guests.

• Most Greek organizations affirm gender segregation. Indeed, over forty years after coeducation, over half of all eligible Dartmouth students belong to a single sex Greek organization. On a coeducational campus, this is both anachronistic and creates a gender-power imbalance in the campus social life, given that fraternities host many of the social gatherings. This college-sanctioned gender segregation leads many students to view campus social spaces as either “male dominated” or “female dominated,” a dichotomy that is at odds with a truly co-educational experience. In many ways, the social life of Dartmouth – consisting primarily of parties in male-owned fraternities – has changed little since the College went co-ed in 1972.  

• Dartmouth’s Greek houses provide their members with potentially unfettered access to free alcohol with clear implications for the problem of high-risk drinking.

---

41 Although there are three gender-neutral Greek houses, they have failed to attract a significant number of students. Only 4% of Greek members belong to a gender-neutral house.

42 Nationally-affiliated sororities are prohibited from hosting functions with alcohol. Many people suggested to the committee that it recommend mandating fraternities and sororities become “local” or break their national affiliations, which could allow organizations to become co-educational (see also Footnote 28) and could allow sororities to host social events, helping to address this gender imbalance. Many others, however, advocated for requiring fraternities and sororities to have national affiliations so that the organizations would have the benefit of the guidance and oversight of the nationals. The committee believes that there are merits to both arguments and that neither is a cure-all; it believes the standards articulated in this recommendation will do more to address the underlying problems.

43 Many members of the Dartmouth community suggested to the committee that Greek organizations should be required to become co-educational. While the committee believes that the College should strongly encourage organizations to voluntarily become gender inclusive, in studying the issue, the committee determined that requiring organizations to become co-ed or gender inclusive would not be advisable. Based on our research, mere compliance with a requirement to accept members of a different gender will not address underlying problems. Moreover, at other institutions that required fraternities to accept women, the results have been somewhat mixed, with female members often noting that they were treated poorly. Finally, given changing societal gender norms, the committee is aware that enforced co-education, ironically, may itself come to seem an anachronism in the Dartmouth of the future. We strongly encourage Greek organizations to think about their gender identity in ways that are truly inclusive, moving well beyond the goal of “co-education” toward a system that recognizes and affirms all gender identities. (See also Footnote 27.)
• Unlike affinity houses and living-learning communities, residential Greek organizations have no undergraduate advisors or Community Directors; hence supervision in these spaces by more mature community members is often inconsistent and only intermittent.

• Most importantly, despite the efforts and initiatives of staff charged with overseeing Greek life, the guided learning, appropriate supervision, and meaningful influence central to the College’s mission are largely absent from Greek life. The committee recognizes that many organizations do host some academic, cultural activities and participate in community service. However, Greek Letter Organizations and Societies (GLOS) organizations are by definition primarily social, and for the most part, they have operated less like educational communities and more like social clubs, with unlimited free alcohol for members and guests, where high-risk behaviors have flourished.

These problems are reflected in the chart below, which shows incidents of serious misconduct in the last academic year centered in Greek houses.44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013-14 Serious Misconduct Cases by Location of Incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart showing incidents of serious misconduct" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Judicial Affairs

Indeed, these issues were the motivation for the recent vote of the faculty to abolish the Greek system,45 an open letter from 239 members of the Arts & Sciences faculty to the committee, the corresponding views voiced by The Dartmouth editorial board, and

44 The behaviors reflected in these 22 conduct cases include physical assault, sexual misconduct, drug transfer/distribution/trafficking, driving under the influence, threat of harm (bomb threat, sexually threatening behavior), theft, urination on another person, and identity theft. Academic misrepresentation and honor principle violations are not included.

45 They were also the motivation for similar faculty votes held in 1978, 2000 and 2001.
the concerns about the system that have been expressed by a large number of students and alumni, both affiliated and unaffiliated.

The committee acknowledges recent reform proposals by Greek organizations; these proposals result from efforts by current students to envision a more positive social environment at Dartmouth while recognizing that the current system cannot continue to exist unchanged. A number of these proposals represent encouraging steps forward, with aims that align closely with many of the recommendations presented here, and we look forward to seeing positive reforms initiated by students. However, the committee also feels that many of the Greek organizations’ proposals do not go far enough to address the root causes of extreme behavior on campus. The committee is also quite aware that promises and plans for reform generated by Greek organizations have not, in the past\textsuperscript{46}, led to substantive and lasting changes. Administratively-imposed efforts to regulate Greek organizations in an attempt to raise standards over the past decades have also been largely ineffective.\textsuperscript{47} Despite the lack of meaningful change, the College has bolstered the Greek system — as evidenced, for example, by the construction and renovation of impressive new sorority houses on campus in recent years as an attempt to equalize gendered housing of Greek houses, ostensibly a laudable goal, but in effect deferring maintenance on many other residential and social spaces on campus.

The nature of our charge has compelled us to consider carefully whether Dartmouth’s Greek organizations — or other residential student groups with comparably exclusive membership or lack of faculty leadership — have a place in Dartmouth’s future. The Committee spent a great deal of time considering this issue; as in the community at large, committee members brought a range of perspectives to the discussions. Given practical constraints — private ownership of many Greek houses, the lack of sufficient beds in College-owned housing, and the fact that the College is only in the beginning stages of transitioning to a House system — a significant majority of the committee believes there is reason at the present time to explore whether the Greek system can be improved, rather than phased out. However, as noted above, the committee feels strongly that the College’s investment in a universal House system with greatly enhanced funding for social options is the right path for the future, offering the most promising way to foster deep friendships, a strong sense of community, a connection with College traditions as well as a fuller integration of faculty and students into a true community of scholars.

\textsuperscript{46} Including a commitment by the Interfraternity Council following the 1978 faculty vote to abolish fraternities, the 2001 Greek Life Steering Committee’s “Guiding Principles,” and those made by individual organizations following disciplinary actions. See also the Report of the Alumni Council Committee to Support Greek Letter Organizations (May 12, 2010).

\textsuperscript{47} These include the 1982 requirement that Greek organizations comply with a set of “minimum standards,” the 2000 Student Life Initiative’s requirement for “higher standards” and the more recent imposition of Achieving eXcellence in Standards (AXIS).
With these considerations in mind, we recommend an annual review process designed to ensure that all residential student organizations offer an experience that is consistent with the College’s educational mission.

**Annual Review Process:**

In keeping with this new intentional model of residential life, we recommend that all student organizations with a residential component\(^48\) -- including residential GLOS houses, affinity houses, and living-learning communities, and senior societies -- be subject to an annual renewal process in which they demonstrate how their residential experience offers a net benefit to the College's educational mission. In making this recommendation, the committee acknowledges that current residential student organizations are not all alike, with varying levels of extreme behavior and inclusivity, and emphasis on academics and community service.

Residential student organizations, including those overseen by the College but not currently part of the residential House system, should demonstrate on an annual basis that their structures (advisors, meetings, oversight, accountability, etc.) and programming enhance students’ academic and personal development and contribute to the health and well-being of the members of the organization and the community as a whole. Key factors in determining this should include:

- The organization’s ability to articulate a clear mission and values based upon scholarship, leadership, service, accountability, and community and to demonstrate its adherence to these;
- Membership development that emphasizes character and leadership in addition to GPA;
- An advisory system that provides meaningful oversight (the College should provide the parameters of the required advising structure);
- Organizational meetings that are substantive rather than alcohol-fueled, with an agenda, minutes, and advisor present;
- The creative use of residential social space in ways that need not revolve around drinking.

Renewal applications should be subject to genuine and enhanced scrutiny for conformance with these new standards, and accountability for those organizations that

---

\(^{48}\) We note that living-learning communities and affinity houses are administered by the Office of Residential Life. As such they are not technically student organizations in the same sense as GLOS organizations and senior societies, and are subject to funding, space, and other factors affecting residential housing allocations. However, we recommend that all these residential communities be held to equivalent standards, and so for the purpose of this recommendation they will be discussed together as “residential student organizations.”
do not meet such standards. Recognizing the complexity and variety of Dartmouth’s residential student organizations, these standards do not represent a set of objective requirements or “tick boxes” as is often the case in such organizational assessment. Rather, these new standards require an in-depth, qualitative determination of the organization’s broad contribution to the College’s educational mission.

A panel including students, faculty, staff, and at least one member not affiliated with Dartmouth should be convened annually to review and evaluate each application. Based on its evaluation of the application and its determination as to whether it is reasonable to expect the organization will adhere to the standards, the panel may approve the application. Any residential organizations overseen by the Office of Residential Life, e.g., living-learning communities and affinity houses, will also be subject to funding, space and other factors affecting residential housing allocations.

For GLOS organizations and senior societies, we expect that the renewal application will be prepared by student members, along with advisors and alumni. For organizations overseen by the Office of Residential Life (e.g., living-learning communities and affinity houses), we expect that the application process would be directed by student community leaders and/or relevant residential staff. Keeping in mind this variety in organizational structure, we strongly recommend that all residential organizations be held to the same new standards described above.

In performing annual reviews, as one of its criteria, the panel should take account of any disciplinary sanctions placed on the organization in the previous three years. However, meeting standards should require more than a non-finding of misconduct. It should require a judgment that the organization makes an affirmative contribution to the student members’ educational experience and the mission of the College. In the past, Greek organizations, although technically subject to high standards, have often not been held accountable for failing to meet those standards. Institutional commitment to accountability is critical if any changes are to be made. There must be clear lines of authority and these must be respected in practice.

If a student organization’s annual application is not approved, the panel should make a determination, based on all available evidence, as to whether it believes the organization can make changes to bring it into line with the required standards or whether it should be discontinued as a residential organization.

---

49ments to organizational renewal include an annual renewal process (Achieving eXcellence in Standards); however, there have been no consequences for those organizations that fail to meet expectations. In addition, our proposed process is meant to provide a more meaningful overall review of the organizations rather than the current more cursory one.

50It is essential that equivalent standards apply to both student-run organizations and those administered by the College, such as living-learning communities and affinity houses. If the panel determines that a College-run organization should lose residential privileges, then it should be discontinued as a residential option.
determines that an organization will no longer be able to remain residential, it may, barring any substantial violations of college policy, continue to exist as a non-residential student organization. If the panel believes that the organization will be able to rectify any shortcomings and meet the standard in the coming year, it may be put on probationary status for one year. A second consecutive annual failure to gain unqualified approval should result in the organization losing residential privileges, as should two such failures in any three-year period. In these cases, the College should also consider whether the failures are such as to merit de-recognition of the organization, in which case it could not continue as a residential or non-residential student organization.

In reaffirming the primacy of the House system for the future, we would also recommend:

• That the College move organizational recruitment to sophomore winter, giving sophomore students the opportunity to fully embrace their House experience, during what will be, for most, their first term as residents of their Houses. Moving rush to winter term would also have the advantage of allowing first-year students to acculturate to life at Dartmouth at a time when student activity is not dominated by Greek recruitment;

• That the College not fund the construction or renovation of any residential structure that is not integral to the House system;

• That the College encourage all single-gender residential organizations to adopt non-exclusionary membership criteria and promote gender neutral membership;

• That upon the de-recognition of an organization, it should not be allowed to return to campus, as either a residential or non-residential entity;

• That the College adopt a policy that prohibits students from rushing, pledging, perpetrating or initiating activities with unrecognized fraternities or sororities.

As it commits to a residential house experience, the College should be prepared to house any students displaced by the above requirements. Further, with respect to any organizations in privately-owned residences that are derecognized, the College should be prepared to (1) report the derecognized House to the Town of Hanover, to ensure compliance with any applicable zoning or other laws and (2) acquire their facilities and repurpose them for the College’s residential, social and academic purposes.
Assessment in Four Years

In four years, the new residential and social structures will be in place and further reform of student organizations will be well underway. At this time, the College should convene a panel to re-assess the overall residential and social experience at Dartmouth. The panel should analyze the success of the new residential House system and college-sponsored social options, and determine whether the system has been allocated sufficient resources and adequate policies to allow it to achieve its goals. The panel should also determine the value of continuing residential student organizations, with a particular emphasis on those that are, by their nature, exclusive as to membership and in large part segregated by gender. We strongly recommend that the review panel be granted broad power to make further transformational changes to the College’s residential and social life.
12. Adopt a Comprehensive Pledge Ban

Recommendation: That the College prohibit all pledging by all organizations.

The College should adopt a comprehensive ban on pledging by any student organization, whether Greek or not, and mandate sanctions for individuals and organizations that violate the ban. Once accepted in an organization, new members should be accorded full member status and should not be asked to perform activities unique to new members, unless they are purely educational in nature. All organizations should comply with this ban even if their affiliated national organizations do not support it; those violating the ban should be sanctioned. Organizations may have an educational program for all members, if approved in advance by the administration.

Pledge period, a period in which new organizational members are accorded a lesser status, creates an environment conducive to hazing. Pledge period encourages social dominance and control of others: initiates are eager to prove themselves and, therefore, are particularly vulnerable to demands to perform demeaning and risky acts. Although hazing is a crime in the state of New Hampshire and the College has long had a ban on hazing, anecdotal reports indicate that hazing remains an issue. Banning pledging should contribute to the elimination of all hazing.

In addition to the hazing risk, pledging fosters a sense of loyalty to fellow class members at the expense of organizational loyalty and accountability. Members of organizations with physical plants have told us that they believe this exacerbates neglect of the physical plant as some members take little personal responsibility for the functioning of the organization overall. Faculty further note that during pledge term, pledges more often turn in assignments late, miss class, or come to class tired, hungover or intoxicated.

---

51 In the fall of 2014, following the initiative of President Hanlon, the Interfraternity Council and the Panhellenic Council banned pledging by their organizations. The College should continue to support this and adopt a comprehensive ban on pledging by any student organization, whether Greek or not, mandating sanctions for individuals and organizations that violate the ban. The Greek organizations affiliated with the National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations and the National Pan-Hellenic Council (the governing body for the historically black fraternities and sororities) do not support the ban, in accordance with their national organizations’ policies; however, we believe a pledge ban is beneficial and should be required of all organizations. The committee also believes it important for the institution as a whole to commit to the ban given anecdotal reports that some organizations did not comply with the self-imposed ban.
13. Develop a Living Code of Conduct

Recommendation: That the College adopt a new Code of Conduct that must be signed by students upon matriculation and that is folded into the fabric of daily campus life.

The College should adopt a Code that includes:

- A statement of the expectations for conduct that apply to all members of the Dartmouth community;
- Language that stresses civility, dignity, diversity, community, and safety;
- Parallel language to the Honor Code ("honesty and integrity").

The Code may also include the following:

- A Student Bill of Rights that articulates rights of citizenship;
- Language that acknowledges the importance of consent;
- Language that covers online behavior.

The College has a compelling, concise Academic Honor Code and Principle of Community. It also has a lengthy, nine-part "Standards of Conduct" policy statement. The committee recommends that the College adopt a short, cogent Code of Conduct, incorporating principles from all of these, which every student receives upon acceptance and must sign upon matriculation to the College. This is not meant to replace the “Standards of Conduct,” violations of which are judicable; rather, this document is meant to be a powerful reminder to students of the values that guide the institution and of our expectations of students.

In addition to requiring the Code to be signed on matriculation, students should participate in small-group discussions led by upperclassmen about the Code during a formal induction period at orientation, and senior leadership should emphasize the centrality of the Code. Informal discussion of the Code should also be incorporated into the first-year DOC Trip experience before matriculation.

The committee’s research on codes of conduct at other institutions has shown that the impact of a code of conduct depends upon the extent to which senior leadership publicly reinforces it, and the student body internalizes its content.
Appendix A

Meetings and Consultations

Between May and November 2014, the Moving Dartmouth Forward Committee received over 2000 emails, met with hundreds of members of the Dartmouth community, and consulted with numerous experts. The individuals and/or groups include the following:

Student Groups

Afro-American Society
Alpha Phi*
Alpha Theta*
Alpha Zi Delta*
Athletic Department Student-Athlete Forum
Beta Alpha Omega
Bones Gate
Cobra Senior Society
Collis Center Student Leadership
Dartmouth Apologia*
Dartmouth Co-FIRED*
Delta Delta Delta*
Epsilon Kappa Theta*
Foley House*
Friday Night Rock*
Gender Inclusive Council (formerly Co-Ed Council)
Graduate Student Council
Greek Leadership Council
Green Team
Inter-Community Council
Inter-fraternity Council
International Students
Kappa Delta Epsilon*
Kappa Kappa Kappa
Latin@ Students
Ledyard Canoe Club*
Men’s & Women’s Squash Teams*
Men’s Hockey Team*
Men’s Lightweight Crew Team*
Men’s Soccer Team*
Men’s Tennis Team*
Mentors Against Violence
Native Americans at Dartmouth
Paleopitus
Pan-Asian Council
Panarchy*
Panhellenic Council
Phi Tau*
Sigma Alpha Epsilon*
Sigma Delta*
Sigma Phi Epsilon*
Sphinx Senior Society
Student and Presidential Committee on Sexual Assault
Students from Engineering 12: Design Thinking
Swimming and Diving Teams*
Theta Delta Chi*
Undergraduate Advisors
Women’s Basketball Team*
Women’s Field Hockey Team*
Women’s Lacrosse Team*
Women’s Tennis Team*
Women’s Volleyball Team*
Zete Psi*

Other Members of Dartmouth Community

Academic Skills Center Staff
Alicia Betsinger, Director of the Office of Institutional Research
Alumni Council
Alumni in Boston, Chicago, New York City, the Bay Area, San Francisco and Salt Lake City
Arts and Sciences Faculty members
Athletic Department Staff
Centennial Circle members
Class Officers
Coed Council (since renamed Gender Inclusive Greek Council)
Collis Center Staff
Committee on Organization and Policy
Committee on Standards
Committee on Student Life
Dartmouth Center for the Advancement of Learning
Dartmouth Change
Dartmouth College Health Improvement Project Members
Dean of the College Office
Dean of the Faculty Mike Mastanduno
Department of Safety and Security Staff
Trustee Emeritus Susan Dentzer
Carolyn Dever, Provost
Dicks House Staff
Robert Donin, General Counsel
Employee Resource Networks: Black Caucus, Native American Council, Latino Council, and Pan Asian Caucus
Evelyn Ellis, Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity
Theresa Ellis, Acting Director of the Tucker Foundation
Peter Fahey
Greek Letter Organizations and Societies Staff
President Phil Hanlon
Hopkins Center Board of Overseers
Jeffrey James, Director of the Hopkins Center for the Performing Arts
Punam Keller, Professor, Tuck School of Business
Harry Kinne, Director of Safety and Security
Greek Letter Organizations and Societies Advisors
Maria Laskaris, Dean of Admissions
Heather Lindkvist, Title IX Coordinator and Clery Act Compliance Officer
Inge Lise-Ameer, Interim Dean of the College
Daniel Nelson, Director of Outdoor Programs
Office of Judicial Affairs
Office of Pluralism and Leadership Staff
Office of Residential Education
Office of Residential Life Staff
Office of Student Health Promotion and Wellness
Outdoor Programs Office Staff
Parents’ Fund
Eric Ramsey, Director of the Collis Center
Rockefeller Center Board of Visitors
Allyson Satterlund, former Director of Office of Pluralism and Leadership
Wesley Schaub, Director of Greek Letter Organizations and Societies
Sexual Assault Awareness Program Staff
Student Accessibility Services Office Staff
Undergraduate Dean’s Office Staff
Undergraduate Housing Study Team
Nancy Voge, Director of Religious and Spiritual Life
Roger Woolsey, Director of the Center for Professional Development
Michael Wooten, Director of Residential Education
Former President Jim Wright

In addition, the committee received feedback from 32 conference calls organized by the Alumni Council, including the Executive Committees of: the Dartmouth Club of Los Angeles, the Dartmouth Club of New York City, the Dartmouth Club of Washington DC, Affiliated Group, Asian Pacific American Alumni Association, Class Officers, Communities, and the Classes of 1958, 1962, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1976,

External Experts

Armando Bangochea, PhD, Program Officer and Director, Mellon Foundation
Alan Berkowitz, PhD, Consultant on Social Norms and Sexual Assault
Rob Buelow, Associate Director, Partner Education, Everfi
Lisa Friel, JD, Vice President, T&M Protection Resources
Stephen Frost, Principal, Frost Included
Paul Gruenewald, PhD, Scientific Director/Sr. Research Scientist, Prevention Research Center

Town of Hanover, NH administrators
Lori Hart, Director of Prevention Education, Pi Kappa Phi
Heather Imrie, M.Ed., Director Program Development, Catharsis Productions
Jarrel Johnson, Program Manager for Posse Program, Cornell University
Jason Kilmer, PhD, Assistant Professor, U. of Washington, Center for the Study of Health and Risk Behaviors

Samantha Koch, Director of Strategic Initiatives, Clery Center for Security on Campus
David Lisak, PhD, Researcher & Forensic Consultant on Sexual Assault
Susan Marine, PhD, Professor, Merrimack College
Gentry McCreary, PhD, Assoc. Dean of Students, U. of W. Florida
MacKenzie Moritz, Associate Director for Strategic Partnerships, The Franklin Project
Eric Mlyn, Executive Director, DukeEngage
Toben Nelson, ScD, Associate Professor, U. of Minnesota, School of Public Health
Peggy O’Neil, Executive Director, WISE of the Upper Valley
Bob Saltz, PhD, Senior Research Scientist, Pacific Institute for Research and Education
Zakiya Smith, Strategy Director, Lumina Foundation
Pete Smithhisler, President, North-American Interfraternity Conference
Gail Stern, PhD, Chief Academic Officer, Catharsis Productions
Helen Stubbs, Vice President, Higher Education, Everfi
Traci Toomey, PhD, Professor, U. of Minnesota, School of Public Health
Thomas Vander Ven, PhD, Professor, Ohio University
David Westol, CEO, Limberlost Consulting

In addition, the committee consulted with senior administrators and student life professionals at numerous peer institutions.

*This was a student-facilitated discussion conducted by the student organization Improve Dartmouth: On the Ground. The committee partnered with Improve Dartmouth to hold student-facilitated discussions among students. Between May and July 2014, the group facilitated 41 student discussions during which 740 posts containing ideas for addressing high-risk drinking, sexual assault and a lack of inclusivity at Dartmouth were posted on the website
Appendix B

A Successful House System at Dartmouth

Key Facilities

The key physical facilities required in each House to achieve the essential elements of a House community are:

- Faculty family residence attached to, or very close by, the House
- House Office
- Late-night cafe and associated social space with TV
- Quiet study space (ideally in the form of a Library)
- Unique activity space (small performance space, studio, etc.)
- Courtyard or outdoor green space

Essential Elements of a House Community

1. A home for an academic, social, and residential community with strong faculty leadership

The House system gives every member of the community a home, in which the social, residential, and academic aspects of college life are interconnected, and to which members can continually return throughout the length of their time at Dartmouth and as alumni. The House should be a well-defined physical space that feels like “home” for the members, while being welcoming to all other members of the Dartmouth community.

It is essential that each house be led by a resident faculty member (“Faculty Head”) whose intensive involvement and high visibility makes clear that the House is an extension of the College’s primary academic mission. The House can also include a senior academic officer, potentially but not necessarily connected to the undergraduate deans (the details of which would have to be determined). Members of the House also include faculty, staff, alumni, postdocs, and graduate students as fellows, associates, and tutors. House membership should be open to all members of the Dartmouth community.

The Houses are the focal point for academic, personal, and career advising. Faculty academic advisors and their advisees are affiliated with the same House, graduate student tutors offer weekly office hours, and wellness advising and initiatives are coordinated through Houses. Potentially, career advising programs (such as pre-med, pre-law, business and fellowships) are organized by faculty, postdocs, graduate students, staff, and other House affiliates in coordination with the administration.
On the undergraduate side, the House community is run by an elected House Committee, which has responsibility for organizing events and programs within the House and runs coordinates House facilities such as the snack bar and library.

2. A shared identity combined with complete diversity

The Houses comprise a full cross-section of the whole Dartmouth community. Students should be affiliated at random with Houses before entering Dartmouth, and in most cases would retain their affiliation throughout their undergraduate experience and beyond. Students might leave the house for a resident term in a fraternity, an LLC or affinity house, or for an FSP or other reason, but would continue to remain members of their House, and upon returning to on-campus housing they would always return to the same House.

The House identity is strongly reinforced with effective branding. Shields, colors, and mascots designed by students may be seen on shirts and hats. The Houses also define their identity through student-run House traditions and events and through facilities unique to the House that can be shared with the larger Dartmouth community.

3. Academic, social, recreational, and artistic activities based around the House community

Much of the House community is built around shared activities.

Food: Meals are a great way to build relationships. House members are encouraged to eat together, possibly through well-defined spaces in ’53 Commons and/or through special dinners in the “dark side” of ’53 Commons. There should be student-run late-night coffee or snack bar options in each House to encourage students to congregate there in the evening. This same space could also serve as a coffee house during the day, following the successful example of One Wheelock in the Collis Center.

Social and Artistic Events: Houses are prime centers for socializing, and contain spaces that can be used for parties, artistic activities, or other events. As much autonomy as possible is given to students in organizing and running these spaces. Students may sponsor and host large parties or artistic performances in House spaces (various themes of which can help build House identity).

Studying: The House contains quiet study spaces, in which students can work in the House but outside their own rooms.

Sports: Each House should provide an opportunity for team-oriented sports; for example, to field a team in all intramural sports, with a small number of students
overseeing the House’s overall intramural program. The houses compete for an overall annual intramural championship.

Distinguished guests: Distinguished guests to campus are invited to faculty residences in the Houses for discussions with students, faculty, and staff. Such guest visits at Dartmouth have previously proven popular and successful in East Wheelock.

Trips: The first-year trips program could be organized around Houses, so that the House identity begins from the first interaction students have with Dartmouth. As much as possible, trip leaders are drawn from the same Houses as the incoming first-years.

House traditions: Each House maintains its own traditions, largely through annual or termly events. These can be in the form of theater, musical performances, arts festivals, outdoor barbeques, formal dances and dinners, and are actively attended by students, faculty, and staff.

Other activities: A vast range of other activities are possible in Houses, including movie nights, hiking, concerts, skiing and snowboarding, and other group events that are attended by all members of the House community. Concert trips to the Hop are already an active component of East Wheelock programming.

Funding: In general, it is important that students conceptualize and organize House activities. These activities require generous funding so that the Houses can provide a compelling and attractive social environment for students.
Appendix C

Increasing and Sustaining Diversity and Inclusivity: A Multi-Pronged Strategy

The committee envisions a multi-pronged strategy for increasing and sustaining diversity and inclusivity at Dartmouth. This strategy is comprised of the following interconnected components: (A) Admissions Pipeline; (B) Admissions Process and Financial Aid; (C) Fostering a sense of Community and Belonging.

A. Admissions Pipeline: Assembling a diverse student body begins with Admissions. The College already has pathways into schools serving communities with a high concentration of high-achieving, high-income students, and pathways into less high-income communities (e.g. Native American communities). However, we could do more to recruit the many high-achieving, low-income students who tend not to apply to elite colleges due to their lack of access to selective public high schools, their lack of proximity to pockets of fellow high-achievers, or the low probability that they will encounter a teacher who attended an elite institution.\(^2\)

The following proposals aim to increase the number of applications we receive from high-achieving low- and middle-income students.\(^3\)

(1) Leverage our Alumni Network: National research suggests that the overwhelming majority of high-achieving low-income students do not apply to any selective colleges or universities. To increase the number of applicants from this segment of the population we need to continue to think beyond standard admissions practice.\(^4\) We propose that Dartmouth explore leveraging its alumni network, which is more densely distributed throughout the country, to help reach a greater number of high-achieving low-income students. One can imagine that after receiving some training, alumni who are located outside of major metropolitan areas could serve as admissions ambassadors who visit high-achieving low-income students and put them in touch with an admissions officer.

(2) Build New Pipelines: By partnering with intermediaries and forging direct relationships we can build partnerships with schools and communities with a high


\(^3\) For the purposes of this report, a family is considered low-income if its annual income is under $50,000 and a family is considered middle-income if its annual income is at least $50,000, but under $100,000. http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2014/demo/p60-249.pdf

\(^4\) Hoxby and Avery state that it is common for admissions officers to target regions of the country that have a high concentration of high-achieving students. However, high-achieving low-income students tend not to reside in close proximity to a critical mass of high-achieving students. As a result, this standard admissions practice is probably not as effective as one might hope from the standpoint of connecting with these low-income students (Hoxby and Avery, The Missing One-Offs).
concentration of under-represented minorities and low-income students.

B. Admissions Process and Financial Aid: The committee questions whether drawing 59% of our student body from the top 6% of the income distribution allows the College to assemble appropriately diverse classes. We believe the College must cast a wider net to attract a talented, exceptional and more diverse student population by:

(1) Adopting a Need Affirmative Admissions Policy: One consequence of our need-blind admissions policy is that each admissions cycle many well-qualified low-income students are placed on the waitlist or are rejected by the College. While the College works to attract more applications from high-achieving low-income students, as was suggested above, we propose that the College adopt a “need affirmative” admissions policy. That is, we propose that Dartmouth take the socio-economic background of each applicant into account and actively recruit and admit high-achieving students from low- and middle-income backgrounds.

(2) More fully supporting the “hidden costs” of College for students from low- and middle-income backgrounds: Books, computers, supplies, and other expenses like travel abroad are often not part of financial aid packages, and students on financial aid are often expected to supplement their tuition with leave-term earnings that are prohibitively high. We propose that Dartmouth offer more attractive financial aid packages that cover not just tuition but “hidden” costs as well.

(3) Initiating a Financial Aid Capital Campaign: In order to support the goal of a more socioeconomically diverse campus, we recommend the College undertake a major long-term capital campaign to raise enough money for financial aid to enable the College to increase the number of low- and middle-income students by ten percentage points from 25% to 35% (approximately $500 million). Having more robust financial aid coffers will allow the College to be more aggressive in our recruitment of low- and middle-income students, and should help to increase our yield.

(3) Leveraging Faculty to Increase the Yield: To increase our yield among admitted under-represented minorities and low-income students, the College should adopt a more personal and intentional recruiting strategy. For instance, faculty members could contact admitted high-achieving low-income and URM students to encourage them to join our community. This is part of the E.E. Just Programs recruiting strategy, which has shown preliminary success in increasing our yield among underrepresented minority students interested in STEM.

(4) Replicating the E.E. Just Program: By focusing on academic excellence and community building, the E.E Just Program endeavors to increase the number of Dartmouth undergraduates from under-represented groups who pursue degrees and careers in STEM, with the additional aspiration that some of the E.E Just Scholars will
pursue advanced degrees upon graduation. In its current incarnation, under the stewardship of the E.E Just Chair, the program is showing great progress in achieving its aim and has served as an effective recruiting tool in the fierce battle for talented students interested in STEM. We propose that the College create similar programs in each of the academic divisions in Arts and Sciences. Associated with each of these programs would be a distinguished chair to be held by a leading scholar with a proven interest and track record in supporting underrepresented communities in the academy. In addition to the distinguished chair, each program would have another faculty line to be held by an associate director of the program who is equally committed to its objectives.

C. Fostering a Sense of Community & Belonging: As Dartmouth becomes a more diverse community, the College must strive to become more inclusive by creating a welcoming and empowering environment for all of its community members and celebrates the resulting intellectual vitality. With this in mind we propose the following:

(1) Join the College Transition Consortium (CTC): Many students at elite colleges will face struggles. In particular, it is not uncommon for students to question whether they really belong at their chosen institution; however, these feelings can be particularly acute among communities historically excluded from these institutions. Research by psychologists suggests that strategically timed and targeted interventions can help low-income and under-represented minority students realize that certain hurdles they encounter are actually experienced by all students at selective institutions, rather than seeing these obstacles as confirmations of their lack of “fit” for the institution. These interventions, which have been tested on a small scale, have a minimal impact on majority students, but have a profound impact on the ability of low-income and under-represented minority students to make the transition and succeed. The College Transition Consortium (CTC) aims to create a 4-year partnership between various universities to improve academic outcomes for disadvantaged students during their transition to college.

(2) Develop a Recruitment and Retention Plan for Faculty & Staff of Color: Assembling and retaining a superlative faculty and staff takes vigilance and vision. Presently, the College is without a comprehensive recruitment and retention plan for its staff and faculty, placing Dartmouth at a competitive and strategic disadvantage. As the recent

---

55 More about the E.E Just Program can be found at: http://eejust.com


departure of many faculty and staff of color suggests, this inattention to recruitment and retention has taken a particular toll on its employees of color. The exodus of faculty and staff of color is even more troubling when considered in the context of extreme behavior. When students of color are victims of sexual assault or racism or when national events strike a chord within the community, they frequently turn to staff and faculty of color for comfort and guidance. Diversity among faculty and staff are critical both to recruiting the strongest under-represented students, and to their academic success once they arrive: these faculty and staff serve as role models and mentors. The Administration recognizes this problem and the President and Provost have initiated work in addressing this issue.

We propose that the college implement a comprehensive strategy to recruit and retain faculty and staff of color. This might involve the following:

• Departmental strategic diversity plans: In consultation with the Provost and Dean of Faculty, each academic department would form a strategic diversity plan consonant with its academic and intellectual missions. The plan should touch on all aspects of department life, with an emphasis on the undergraduate experience and the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty;

• Climate Surveys and Exit Interviews: In order to recruit and retain the best faculty and staff, the College must be attuned to the experiences, needs and aspirations of its employees. At present there is no systematic or consistent mechanism through which the College can identify areas of success or failure in terms of employee satisfaction and retention. In an effort to rectify the situation, we propose that the College conduct a (biennial) climate survey of the staff and faculty and conduct exit interviews with all of its departing faculty and staff members. While each employee’s experience at Dartmouth is a unique story, we hope that by collecting this data and sharing it with the community the College will be better positioned to identify trends and themes within its work environment and devise an effective and sustainable action plan to mitigate deficiencies and capitalize on our strengths;

• Replicate the E.E. Just Program: See Item B(4) above for details. The lines created by this expansion present an opportunity to diversify our faculty;

• Reinvigorate the "Target of Opportunity" Hires: To provide greater support and encouragement for strategic diversity plans we propose that the College increase its financial support and raise the profile of its "Target of Opportunity" initiative by issuing a call for candidates each academic year. For example, an academic department might include in its strategic diversity

58 The following is a link to video created by Dartmouth’s NAACP which speaks to the issue of faculty diversity: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PmKqZKGlG90

plan the intention to branch out into subfields that contain a higher concentration of minority scholars. The Target of Opportunity hire could be used by this department to attract a prominent minority scholar in this field. Finally, as part of the negotiations with this candidate, the Dean of Faculty should offer future lines to help the senior scholar and the department build a group in this subfield, where one will expect to obtain a more diverse candidate pool;

- Greater support for Employee Resource Networks: To facilitate the formation of sustainable communities and support personal growth among faculty and staff, various communities have established Employee Resource Networks. These networks include the Black Caucus, Native American Council, Latino Council, GLTBQA Network, International Employee Network, Veterans Network, Pan Asian Caucus and the newly formed EmpowHer. The College currently provides each active network with an annual budget of $500. To encourage more robust and innovative programming within these networks, we propose that the College increase the level of support by a considerable amount;

- Building a team of committed administrators: For this vision of a more diverse faculty and staff to come to fruition the President will need to supplement and support the already significant efforts of the Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity;

- Leveraging campus leaders: We propose that each assistant dean of the faculty appoint respected faculty members from their division who have a commitment to diversity and inclusivity to serve as an Inclusivity Advisor. After receiving training, faculty serving in this capacity will support the College’s diversity and inclusivity initiatives by serving as a liaison between the deans and various departments;

- Accountability: A strategic plan to recruit and retain faculty and staff of color will be ineffective without accountability. We recommend that any system of accountability include (i) a clear delineation of responsibilities and expectations; (ii) empowerment of offices and administrators to act and hold others accountable; (iii) professional consequences for failure to fulfill one’s responsibilities; (iv) in the case of faculty recruitment, a clear link between the allocation of faculty lines and a department’s advancement of the College’s diversity and inclusivity initiatives.

(3) Develop Comprehensive Training for Faculty, Staff and Students: To create a more inclusive environment, faculty, staff and students need regular training on issues of unconscious bias, diversity, inclusion, sexual assault, and motivational interviewing. With respect to tenure-track faculty, we propose it be mandatory that starting with the 2015-16 academic year all new tenure-track professors be trained in these areas at regular intervals throughout their Dartmouth career.

(4) Support Intergroup Dialogue (IGD) and other collaborative cultural exercises: One
element of the recommended Dartmouth Thrive program (Recommendation 7) is the inclusion of cultural competencies, including Intergroup Dialogue (IGD). Intergroup dialogues are “facilitated, face-to-face meetings between students from two or more social identity groups that have a history of conflict or potential conflict.” These dialogues are based on the premise that “sustained and meaningful intergroup contact, dialogue and education are necessary to address issues of conflict and to promote the creation of just, multicultural campus communities.” Dartmouth has been running a pilot program in IGD for the last year; this should be regularized. In addition, Dartmouth should consider regularizing the “Telling my Story” initiative on campus, which strives for open dialogue through collaborative creative practice.

(5) Ensure Accessibility: We encourage more focused administrative attention on structural enhancements to promote accessibility in the physical plant; on pedagogy; and on programming around disability-related issues.

(6) Create a Committee on Institutional Diversity and Inclusivity: As a long-term project, we propose the formation of the Committee on Institutional Diversity and Inclusivity (CIDI). This committee consisting of faculty, staff and administrators would report directly to the President and the Provost. It would review department strategic diversity plans and monitor progress, make departments aware of training and other resources, serve as a link between departments and central administration with regard to funding, and provide the community with a biennial assessment of the College’s diversity and inclusivity initiatives. This committee would be distinct from the recently reconstituted Diversity Council.

---

Appendix D

Dartmouth Thrive: A Conceptual Schema
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