

Duke University

DURHAM
NORTH CAROLINA
27708

February 15, 2007

President Richard Brodhead
207 Allen Building
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708

Dear Dick:

We are pleased to submit the enclosed "*Report of the Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee*". Since last April, when you established this Committee; we have been engaged in a thoughtful and comprehensive consideration of Duke's campus culture and ways to improve it. We have examined issues, analyzed data, and engaged in multiple conversations with individuals and groups across campus. We have arrived at a framing of fundamental and interrelated issues that guided our consideration of our recommendations. Although campus culture is broad, we understood that our focus was primarily on undergraduate life and recognize that there is additional work to be done with regard to graduate and professional students, staff, and the larger community.

The Committee's report and recommendations reflect the general sense of the majority of the Committee. Given the Committee's size and the diverse views of its members, it is not surprising that there were differences among members about issues and recommendations. The Committee, however, at its meeting today "endorsed this report as a thoughtful reflection of its work."

The Committee recognizes that this report is just one point in an ongoing conversation that must be sustained, and that the entire University community – students, faculty, staff, and alumni – must now engage in the discussion and the process of implementation through its regular administrative and deliberative processes.

We wish to underscore the effectiveness of the CCI Committee's structure and function—a committee comprised of faculty, students, staff, and alumni that engaged in collaborative problem solving across the units of academics, student affairs, athletics, campus services, and admissions. The Committee enjoyed the challenge of its charge and its sense of common purpose in working to make Duke an even greater community. With the submission of this report, the CCI Steering Committee concludes its work.



Robert J. Thompson, Jr.
Chair, Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee



Larry Moneta
Vice-Chair, Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee

THE REPORT OF THE CAMPUS CULTURE INITIATIVE STEERING COMMITTEE FEBRUARY, 2007

OVERVIEW

Duke University is a university of the 21st century, emboldened and challenged by the dynamics of a changing world. Situated where it is—the global north, the United States, the American South—and designed as a research institution of higher learning, Duke has developed its identity, vision, and reputation over the years. By now, it has experienced a remarkable rise to prominence in the top echelon of the nation’s research universities. This success has been fueled by the recruitment and support of outstanding faculty and students, by an innovative undergraduate curriculum, by dynamic graduate and professional schools, and by what former President Sanford referred to as Duke’s “outrageous ambition” to become one of the great national and international centers of teaching and learning. As always, however, Duke is, and must be, in dialogue with the surrounding world about which its mission – academic, ethical, and social – is to produce, transmit, and transform knowledge. In an era of heightened mobility, ethnic diversity, economic flux, and digital circuitry, the University faces particular challenges in preparing students and pursuing research that deals with the complexities of today’s world. As a leading research institution that is committed to teaching students to have the savvy, sensitivity, and skills to be global citizens, Duke University was intended to be, and is, more than an ivory tower. We reaffirm our commitment to being a worldly institution, one that takes seriously its place in the world and the place all of us—as students, faculty, and staff—assume both at Duke and in the wider world beyond.

Over the past fifteen years, Duke has systematically set a course to strengthen the undergraduate experience: these efforts began with the transformation of East as a first-year campus and have continued with the implementation of a new liberal arts curriculum, a residential plan that brought all sophomores to West, the creation of the West-Edens link and Keohane quad, and the current plans for re-imagining Central Campus. The Campus Culture Initiative represents yet another step in this ongoing process, identifying challenges and opportunities to move Duke forward to the next stage of its institutional development.

The Steering Committee has worked over a nine-month period to engage in a thoughtful and collaborative conversation about the Duke community, to gain a richer understanding of campus culture, to identify areas of strength as well as areas where there are problems or issues, and to make recommendations for improvement. In this process, the Committee recognized the momentum and accomplishment of the University; it reaffirmed that much good can and should be said about the Duke community. At the same time, it came to better understand how Duke is experienced differentially by different members of its community, that there are often pressures for conformity which work against our institutional vision as an inclusive academic community, and that engaging the notion of “difference” more deeply and directly will enable the University to accelerate its rise to the top.

To address these challenges, the CCI Steering Committee identified six interconnected areas for focusing attention and making recommendations:

- Curriculum and Experiential Learning
- Faculty-Student Interaction
- Residential Life, Dining, and Social Life
- Alcohol
- Athletics
- Admissions

The Committee recognizes that stewardship of the Duke community must be a collaborative process involving all its members, and that this report and its recommendations will need to be discussed and refined on a variety of levels – by the University’s administration, faculty, students, and alumni. Indeed, the entire Duke community must take ownership and play a significant role in considering thoughtfully how best to enhance campus culture. The work ahead is to join together in this conversation with a sustained commitment to the University’s advancement.

It is the hope of the Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee that this report and its corresponding recommendations will promote important conversations, significantly help strengthen campus culture, and further advance Duke as an even greater and more excellent community of teaching and learning.

THE REPORT OF THE CAMPUS CULTURE INITIATIVE STEERING COMMITTEE FEBRUARY, 2007

Since its founding in 1838 as Union Institute and transformation in 1924 into Trinity College, Duke University has experienced a remarkable rise to prominence in the top echelon of the nation's research universities. This change has been fueled by the recruitment and support of outstanding faculty and students, by an innovative undergraduate curriculum, and by dynamic graduate and professional schools, – in short, by what former President Sanford referred to as Duke's "outrageous ambition" to become one of the great national and international centers of teaching and learning. Complementing this pursuit of excellence has been a commitment to strategic analysis and self-evaluation to identify ways to strengthen the University as a whole. As a young university, Duke is particularly proud of its institutional flexibility and creativity, as well as its institutional courage not to shy away from tough issues.

While Duke continually strives to move forward, it has always had much of which to be proud. The University is proud of its students, faculty, and staff who constantly work hard to realize the ideals of a great university, who contribute on a daily basis to their individual and collective growth, and who have outstanding accomplishments in the generation, transmission, and application of knowledge in the service of society. Duke is renowned for the quality of its programs, the progress it has made in becoming a more diverse community, and its commitment to excellence in all of its endeavors.

As we move forward in a world increasingly characterized by change and the fragmentation of many communities, Duke – no less than other universities and our society as a whole – faces challenges. But great universities are those that change to meet significant challenges, and thereby act as agents of change through their leadership. If universities are to continue to nurture in students the ability to succeed in their personal and professional lives, they must find more effective ways for students to gain a deeper understanding of themselves and others, to develop even greater cross-cultural respect and appreciation, and to commit more readily to use knowledge in the service of society. Only by asking students and faculty alike to engage more fully in building community can universities instill in their students the ability to work toward common ground and, thereby, prepare them for leadership in the 21st century.

I. THE CAMPUS CULTURE INITIATIVE AND ITS PROCESS

Within this context, last spring's lacrosse event and its ensuing controversies evoked strong emotions and discussions about issues of race and gender, class and privilege, difference and respect, athletics and academics, and town and gown. While these social and cultural issues have long been of concern in our larger society and on Duke's campus, these events publicly challenged Duke to closely re-examine itself to find more effective ways to enhance the sense of social responsibility and mutual respect among members of its community. To assess the extent to which the University's institutional practices promote these values and behaviors and to make recommendations for

strengthening Duke's campus community, in April 2006 President Brodhead launched the Campus Culture Initiative (CCI; see Appendix 1: Committee Charge).

The work of the Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee has been multifaceted, proceeding in four phases. In spring 2006, the Committee began to frame its approach to the charge and organize its work (see Appendix 2: Steering Committee Membership). From the beginning, the Committee sought to utilize relevant existing data¹ on aspects of campus culture, including the annual surveys conducted through the Office of Institutional Research and specific studies, such as the Campus Life and Learning Project and those conducted through the Trinity College Office of Assessment. In addition, the Committee connected with other groups and offices on campus that had relevant information and perspectives, such as the Women's Center, the Mary Lou Williams Center, the Center for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Life, and the Council on Civic Engagement. Over summer 2006, the Committee's work entered a second phase in which it focused on identifying key issues and opportunities for improvement and gathering data relevant to these issues. Over the Fall 2006 semester, the Committee analyzed and integrated information, formulated questions, and garnered input from the larger campus community through Town Hall meetings with faculty, students, and staff, and an array of individual and small group sessions (see Appendix 3: List of Meetings). During this time, members of the Committee met with the Presidential Council, provided updates to the University Board of Trustees, and gave the President a November 2006 oral report. The final phase began in January 2007, when the Committee developed a vision of undergraduate campus culture and formulated a set of interrelated recommendations to realize this vision, as represented in this report.

The report and recommendations presented here reflect the general sense of the majority of the Committee. Given the size of the committee and the diverse views of its members, it is not surprising that there were differences among members about specific issues and recommendations. The CCI Steering Committee, however, endorses this report as a reflection of its work.

The Committee understands that this report and the 28 recommendations it proposes will need to be subsequently discussed and considered on a variety of levels; it also recognizes that a number of committees appointed by the Provost, the Arts and Sciences Council, and the Academic Council are also concurrently working on issues critical to campus culture. Stewardship of the Duke community must be a collaborative process involving all its members, including administrators, faculty, students, and alumni. Indeed, the entire Duke community must take ownership and play a significant role in considering thoughtfully how best to enhance campus culture. The task now is to join together in this conversation with a sustained commitment to the University's advancement and to the necessary and essential work that lies ahead.

¹ The nature of the measures and corresponding data varied from controlled, longitudinal, panel studies of representative cohorts of students in the Campus Life and Learning Project, through surveys conducted annually across private research universities, to information and perspectives reported by individuals.

II. DUKE AS A DYNAMIC INSTITUTION

Universities are dynamic, continually evolving places, and in many ways, Duke University is synonymous with institutional change. From its earliest days as the Brown Schoolhouse to its conversion to Trinity College and subsequently to our modern-day University, Duke has taken advantage of opportunities and circumstances to adapt and transform itself. Duke has risen from a predominately regional university several decades ago to a national and international one of the highest rank today. And its trajectory has been particularly steep in recent decades. Over the past fifteen years, Duke has systematically set a course to strengthen the undergraduate experience. Some would argue that the 1995 conversion of East Campus to the First Year Campus marks the beginning of the University's recent commitment to enhance the undergraduate experience. Subsequent to that highly transformative decision, undergraduate reforms have included dramatic enhancements to curricular and experiential learning opportunities, the development of the Community Standard, new residential models and requirements, and a marked increase in the diversity of the student body. Simultaneously, faculty composition, roles, and demands have undergone their own transformation, as Duke's prowess as a research university grew exponentially. Students, too, have changed as the criteria for admissions have become more challenging.

The stimuli for these important changes in Duke as an educational institution have sometimes come from intentional institutional planning and thoughtful deliberation about the University's future, as was the case with the Duke's strategic plans, *Building on Excellence* (2001) and *Making a Difference* (2006). At other times, Duke has implemented changes, prompted by unanticipated circumstances, events, and incidents – both internal and external to the campus community, such as the 1968 MLK Vigil. In a moment that represents the impetus from unanticipated events, the Campus Culture Initiative represents another imperative for critical self-reflection. The University's challenge at this juncture is to take maximum advantage of this moment in its history to experience another transformative episode, one that future generations will look back to with the same regard and appreciation as they do for earlier decisions that expanded the Duke community physically, intellectually, demographically, and geographically.

III. THE COMMITTEE'S GUIDING VISION: THE DUKE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

Foundational to the CCI, and to this report, is a vision of what Duke University – as an academic community and undergraduate culture – aims to achieve and embrace. Over the past decades, Duke has worked to provide a strong liberal education tailored to the particular strengths of a research university. Duke's institutional self-definition is reflected in its strategic plan, *Making a Difference* (September 2006), a principal goal of which is to foster in the University's graduates the ability to generate, evaluate, and apply knowledge in the service of society, and to become leaders who make a positive difference in the world.

To develop fully their abilities and talents, undergraduates must engage meaningfully in the life of the Duke academic community. An academic community can be viewed as an

interactive and ongoing conversation in which the community and its members grow in wisdom and understanding through inquiry and interaction. This conversation is not just confined to the classroom, but extends to every aspect of campus life and is the underlying narrative running through both academic and social encounters. Participation in this conversation is a privilege of being part of an academic community, and no social group should be excluded from that conversation; indeed, the quality of the conversation and scope of learning is significantly enhanced by the diversity of identities, experiences, and thoughts, and by the respectful nature of all participants' interactions. At Duke, this conversation takes place at a university founded recently enough to prize vision, ambition, and courage in the ongoing task of creating its own identity. The setting of the Duke conversation, by its location, is in the South, a region in which certain social groups have historically been excluded, and, by its time, in a period in which commitments to personal freedom and individual achievement, concerns over psychological stress and cultural diversity, and demands for moral engagement and social responsibility co-exist in complex ways. The University has a critical responsibility to ensure that this conversation is conducted along the lines of inclusion, civility, and respect, and in consonance with its institutional commitments and values. To exercise this responsibility, the University must work to recognize and empower those whose conduct of the conversation has been most enhancing for the community and those in whose lives and work the conversation has borne most fruit, and to identify and alter behaviors and habits that inhibit or devalue the conversation to which Duke aspires.

IV. INSIGHTS FRAMING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The CCI Steering Committee's work has focused on improvements that would realize and enhance its vision for Duke's undergraduate education. In this process, the Committee identified much good that can, and should, be said about the Duke community. At the same time, the Committee came to better understand problems that exist – ranging from simple acts of uncivil speech and intolerance to what some have called a “culture of excess” – and it worked to identify points of progress that could help Duke achieve its institutional aspirations. As the Committee wrestled with issues central to campus culture, it gained several insights that informed its thinking and its recommendations. The Committee came to appreciate the extent to which Duke needs to better articulate the meaning and educational value of difference in an academic community and the extent to which Duke needs to engage difference more deeply and directly. It came to a fuller awareness that strong forces currently exist for conformity to a particular view of what it means to be a Duke student. It understood the need to give stronger affirmation to alternatives to purported norms and to foster greater development of personal responsibility and community accountability. Finally, in framing its recommendations, the Committee came to endorse the integrative value of the University's “developmental model,” which sees students' growth and development as a progression over the course of their four college years.

ENGAGING DIFFERENCE

Last spring's events evoked intense feelings, which had accumulated over time, and reactions on campus and beyond were polarized along dimensions of difference and group identities: gender/sexuality, race and ethnicity, and athletics. The Committee realized anew that gender/sexuality matters, that race and ethnicity matter, and that athletics matters in complicated ways. This is not to say that each member of these groups felt or expressed the same thoughts, but group identities were one contributing factor to the polarization that occurred. The sense of identity that an individual derives from being a member of a group serves basic needs for belongingness, distinctiveness, and respect, providing group members with an interpretive lens to bring meaning to the social world and their place in it. Group identities, however, also can have negative consequences, such as stereotyping, viewing others negatively, and pressures for conformity.

The strong reactions to the events of last spring were not confined to social life but also pervaded the classroom and larger community, threatening the belief of many that they belonged to, and were valued members of, the Duke and Durham communities. Some comments and opinions expressed were perceived by other members of the community to be hostile and insensitive to the possibility that others might feel differently. Some women and members of minority groups, and some athletes and their coaches felt devalued by the university community. Others could not understand how their commitments and good work – in race relations or community service, for example – seemed to be discounted so easily. The campus community was taken aback by the feelings and views expressed that often revealed fundamentally different experiences and perceptions of Duke along racial and gender lines.

Race: On Duke's campus, there are those for whom race, ethnicity, and identity are a daily concern; there are others for whom these are not concerns; and still others who seem unaware of these concerns at all. In short, Duke is experienced differentially, and despite efforts of students, former students, faculty, and administrators to address issues of race and ethnicity, some students, faculty, and staff do not always feel welcome. Indeed, reports to the President's Council on Black Affairs and statements from the Black Student Alliance have persistently highlighted race and ethnicity-based issues regarding housing, classroom culture, and social life experienced by Duke's students of color, including experiences with and/or perception of racial disrespect. These concerns have not been limited to Black students, but have also been expressed by other racial and affinity groups.

One response was to undertake the Campus Life and Learning Project to further the University's understanding of the multiple and interrelated factors that influence the quality of the educational experiences of undergraduate students from different racial and ethnic groups in Trinity College and the Pratt School of Engineering. Funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and subsequently by the University, this longitudinal project studied two consecutive cohorts of Duke students (those enrolling in 2001 and

2002 and graduating in 2005 and 2006). Some of the findings now available from the project indicate that:

- Across different racial and ethnic groups, student networks during the first two years, at best, remain as racially or ethnically homogeneous as they were during high school. At worst, they become even less racially or ethnically diverse.
- Black students as a group have lower GPAs than white students, even when adjusted for pre-college differences in test scores and background.
- In their first year at Duke, about 15% of Black students reported that Duke instructors treated them badly because of their race/ethnicity, compared with about 10% of Asian students, 8% of Biracial or Multiracial students, 5% of Latino students, and less than 3% of White students.
- During their second year at Duke, about 44% of Black students reported discrimination by faculty/staff, students, or other members of the university community, compared to about 28 % of Biracial or Multiracial students, 19% of Asian and Latino students, and about 11% of White students. When Black students were asked about where discrimination occurred, the responses were about evenly divided between residence hall, classroom, and other on-campus locations, with a smaller minority reporting off-campus locations.

These findings emphasize the degree to which race continues to matter and illustrate the gap that remains between Duke's aspirations and the perceptions and experiences of some minority students. In response to these findings regarding academic performance, Trinity College has implemented a system to track relevant markers and to assess ongoing initiatives through the Academic Resource Center. In addition, the University is currently in the process of establishing an ombudsman as a resource for students to pursue incidents of discrimination.

Survey data gathered annually by Duke's Office of Institutional Research provides information about students from Duke and a cohort of 20 private universities. These data address a number of issues important to campus life including the range of interactions across racial and ethnic boundaries, and the relationship of this interaction to students' intellectual and personal development:

- Duke Caucasian students and fraternity and sorority members are less likely than their peers at comparable institutions to engage in interactions with diverse peers.
- Duke students are less likely than their peers at comparable institutions to indicate that college contributed to their development in ability to relate well to others.
- Across cohorts and institutions, students who had substantial interracial interaction report significantly higher levels of skill development with regard to formulating creative ideas, relating well to others, functioning effectively as a team, identifying moral and ethical issues, developing an awareness of social problems, and appreciating the arts.

These findings are important because meaningful and sustained interaction across racial and ethnic boundaries is necessary, for both majority and minority cultures, to realize the

full educational benefits of a diverse community. Moreover, contemporary homeplaces and workplaces – those within and outside of the United States – are complex, requiring students to develop and negotiate a more nuanced relationship with difference.

Gender/Sexuality: Gender and sexuality matter at Duke in complex ways, both inside and outside the classroom. In an attempt to understand this complexity of the experiences of female, male and transgendered students and of gay, bisexual, and heterosexual sexualities, the Committee called upon a number of sources, including the research of the Women's Initiative, the experience of the Women's Center, faculty in Women's Studies, the work of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered (LGBT) Task Force, findings from the Campus Life and Learning Project, and discussions with undergraduate students. Where available, the Committee relied on data gathered and analyzed across these various sources. Although troubling and intolerable aspects of campus culture such as incidents of sexual assaults and homophobia occur but are underreported for a number of reasons, these are no less deserving of the University's attention. The Committee took seriously the concerns and reported experiences of the many individuals with whom it spoke.

Academically, Duke's female students perform well. In the graduating class of 2006, for example, women as a group had a higher grade point average than men, and among Trinity students, more women than men completed a thesis for graduation with distinction. The classroom situation for the LGBT community understandably cannot be assessed with markers of group performance, such as grade point average or graduation with distinction. Comments by the LGBT community, however, indicated varying degrees of perceived enlightenment on the part of students and faculty about issues and perspectives that effect classroom dynamics.

There were aspects of social life that were characterized as problematic with regard both to gender and sexuality. Here, the Committee identified a number of issues to be addressed: aspects of the social environment that communicates disrespect of women and alternative sexuality, sexual assault fueled partly by a party scene that includes significant amounts of drinking, and the control of social space predominately by heterosexual males.

The Women's Initiative, as well as the Committee's own discussions, revealed a social environment often disempowering for women. Some Duke women describe a cultural ethos that is contradictory: women, like men, assume (and are expected to assume) high career ambitions, yet their social capital is often judged by physical appearance and sexuality. A number of students expressed the view that women's self-esteem is dependent upon attention and approval of men. One consequence of this social dynamic appears to be in some areas of student leadership, where women are significantly underrepresented.

Regarding contemporary relationships, college life has been described as lacking a dating culture, and intimacy is pursued more through hook-ups: casual sexualized connections that do not lead to a longstanding relationship. Most students acknowledge the presence of a hook-up culture that is heavily influenced by alcohol. While some find this to be

simply the state of affairs and some say it is empowering to all, including women, problematic aspects include the fine line between sexual acquiescence and assault and the pressure women feel to engage in a sexual activity in which much of their social capital is invested. Both men and women often describe this aspect of social culture as problematic.

Concerns about women's self esteem and sexual assault were linked repeatedly to a characterization of social space at Duke as "male-dominated." Controlling the real estate means setting the rules of social engagement which can undercut gender as well as sexual equity and lead to assault. Some members of the LGBT community report experiencing these same social dynamics. The LGBT Task Force has described Duke's campus as one where policies are often in fact gay- (or bi-, or transgender-) friendly but where the lived experience of LGBT students is that of intolerance, exclusion, and harassment.

In summary, these understandings about the social dynamics of race, gender, and sexuality converge, indicating that one aspect of the University's campus culture that puts its institutional and educational vision at risk is the perception and experience by some that Duke is an "alternative unfriendly" environment. Clearly, to improve campus culture, Duke must achieve a more inclusive academic community. To do so, the University needs to craft policies and practices that promote a more common identity as members of a community in which people of all backgrounds share a common purpose and values, treat each other with respect, engage differences, and hold themselves and each other responsible for acting in accordance with these shared core values.

Last spring's events revealed that Duke must do better in learning how to engage difference constructively. The University needs to go beyond fostering the expectation of tolerance for differences in cultures, beliefs, opinions, and behaviors, beyond learning "to agree to disagree" to avoid conflict. The University needs to promote moving beyond tolerance to respect and beyond "just putting up with" differences to finding positive value in each individual and the diversity among us. Respect is manifested in affirmation of the worth of traditions and identities other than one's own and in the civility with which members of the community engage each other. Authentic engagement with difference will at times result in conflict. Just as the conversation cannot end with superficial tolerance of difference, it also need not end with conflict, and the University's challenge is to prepare students for the increasing clashes of cultures and beliefs and their engagement and comfort with those who are culturally different. Engaging differences fosters more complex thinking and leads to greater self-understanding and identification of other possibilities and ways of life. To realize the educational benefits of difference, however, Duke must function as a community that fosters openness to new ideas and ways of thinking and that promotes fuller engagement with difference. *A diverse, inclusive, and engaged community that affirms difference is the social context necessary for the transformative educational experience that Duke intends to provide.*

FORCES FOR CONFORMITY AND BUILDING COMMUNITY

The identity of an institution evolves over time and is shaped and reshaped by its members. Through its work, the Committee has come to understand the power of the ways in which the Duke campus is viewed, experienced, and portrayed by its members,

as well as by those outside of the campus community. In particular, the “*Work hard-Play hard*,” “*Day time Duke-Night time Duke*” and “*Effortless Perfection*” depictions of the “typical” Duke student reflect a strongly expressed view of the purported norm for being a Duke student that, in turn, becomes a formative and self-perpetuating force. Similarly, others provide depictions of campus culture and Duke students that can quickly be over generalized as the norm. For example, the most extreme representation of the social hierarchy, the “Duke 500” presented in *Rolling Stone*,² exists on campus but certainly does not reflect the experiences of the majority of Duke students. Whatever the actual number of these students might be, however, their influence is disproportionate. Students readily acknowledge pressures to conform to this purported Duke norm and their apprehensions about being accepted if they should choose an alternative way or identity.

The University as a community has the opportunity and responsibility to challenge the purported norm, to define what is, and what is not, normative for Duke, and reset the default more positively. Duke’s challenge is to focus its efforts on presenting multiplicity and variety as the actual norm, with many ways to engage the opportunities for growth and fun provided in an academic community. Privileging inevitably communicates values, and the University must examine whom it is privileging and for what purposes, from admissions through funding and space allocation policies and procedures for academic, residential, and social groups.

Just as the Duke community is learning to constructively engage difference, it is also learning how to encourage its members to live up to the highest aspirations of the community and how to hold itself and each other accountable to act in accordance with community expectations for integrity, respect, and civility. Force and coercion have no place in an academic community that relies on reason, dialogue, and the competition of ideas. It is in this regard that the University must challenge the purported norms for social behavior. Through the efforts of the Honor Council and the Academic Integrity Council, the “Duke Community Standard” has evolved over time as an aspirational statement of student behavior that recognizes that students share with faculty and staff the responsibility for promoting a climate of integrity. Last summer, the Provost charged a committee to review the Community Standard and the ways in which the policy and practices could be more effective in promoting a culture of integrity in all academic and non-academic endeavors.

The University also has a responsibility to be clear about expectations and enforcement policies and the ways in which these are essential for the well-being of individuals and for the well-being and work of the University community. As students mature, they develop the capacities for self-regulation and civic engagement necessary not only for their own intellectual and personal growth but also for the health of the community. As with education in general, community development is at its best a collaborative process involving all members of the community. Duke University seeks to foster this collaborative responsibility among students, faculty, and staff for the stewardship of the community in the pursuit of its common goals.

² Janet Reitman, “Sex & Scandal at Duke,” *Rolling Stone Magazine*, Issue 1002 (June 15, 2006), pp. 70-109.

DEVELOPMENTAL FRAMEWORK

The University recognizes that its students are quite accomplished on entering Duke but yet are still in a formative process of neurocognitive, personal, and social development. Furthermore, undergraduates have important developmental tasks to accomplish in their transition from adolescence to adulthood. The fundamental goal of undergraduate education is to enhance development and foster this transition. Foremost among these developmental tasks that students have to accomplish is to come to terms with new capabilities for thinking, feeling, and acting and to shape their identity accordingly. A second task is developing autonomy, not just in terms of independence, but also with regard to the capacities for self-motivation and self-regulation. The capacity for self-regulation emerges with neurocognitive development, which continues to occur during the undergraduate years, and the development of autonomy is fostered by social environments that afford choice and freedom from external pressure to behave or think in a certain way. A third task is to continue the process of developing competencies. This means not just acquiring knowledge and skills, but also the capacities for independent thought and discernment and interpersonal skills in terms of the capacity for empathy. This also means developing cultural competence as a component of one's character, which requires acceptance that heritage and experiences influence how individuals see themselves and others and openness to moving out of one's comfort zone to engage differences.

Duke's challenges are to recognize the inherent individual differences in the rate of development, to mitigate the forces that promote conformity to a particular view of what it means to be a Duke student, and to promote independence of thought and multiple ways of being. Duke's opportunity is to provide a campus culture in which openness and engagement with difference of all types – intellectual, cultural, social, religious, and socioeconomic – are expected and supported and to more effectively integrate the curricular and co-curricular dimensions of the undergraduate experience. To do so, the University must ask in what ways do academic, social, residential, dining, athletic, and recreational components of the undergraduate experience contribute to students developing the skills, dispositions, and character necessary for productive and meaningful lives.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CAMPUS CULTURE STEERING COMMITTEE

Building upon these understandings, the Steering Committee identified six interconnected areas for calling issues into question and making recommendations: Curriculum and Experiential Learning; Faculty-Student Interaction; Residential Life, Social Life, and Dining; Alcohol; Athletics; and Admissions. The Committee believes that, taken together, these recommendations could significantly make a difference in Duke's campus culture, encourage students to take a fuller and richer advantage of their undergraduate experience, and better prepare them for leadership in the 21st century.

CURRICULUM AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Duke has accomplished something rare in higher education, which is a point of pride and national recognition: it has successfully revised the Arts and Sciences general education curriculum and established inquiry-based learning, multiple modes of inquiry, and crossing boundaries of knowledge as its defining characteristics. The Cross-Cultural Inquiry mode, in particular, relates to the Campus Culture Initiative. Currently, students are required to take two Cross Cultural courses to enhance their abilities to evaluate complex and difficult issues from multiple perspectives, to identify culture and cultural difference across time or place, and to encourage critical and responsible attention to issues of identity, diversity, globalization, and power.

Some 36% (1,091/3,054) of all Arts and Sciences courses now carry the Cross Cultural Inquiry code. Review of Cross Cultural Inquiry courses by offering department indicates the following distribution: Language and Literature (30%), History (12%), Cultural Anthropology (5%), African and African-American Studies (4%), and Women's Studies (2%). These data suggest that opportunities to engage cultural differences in an international context are more prevalent than those within a national context. The intent of this curricular requirement, however, was to ensure that Duke students develop the cross-cultural competencies to address the difference that confront us on a daily basis in this country. As the requirement now stands, it is not clear that all students will have this type of curricular experience before graduation. Therefore, one way to promote more understanding of, and engagement with, difference is to further refine the Cross Cultural Inquiry requirements to address differences of importance in the United States, and specifically, differences associated with race, ethnicity, class, religious, gender, and/or sexual preference. Discussions should also be initiated with the Pratt School about incorporating a similar curricular expectation for engineering students.

Duke has also been a leader in developing experiential learning as a pedagogy of engagement, in which the lessons of the classroom are applied and tested in real-world environments. In recent years, Duke has pioneered research-service-learning (RSL), which combines service-learning with community-based research. These sorts of real world experiences can lead students to develop an increased sensitivity to difference, a greater capacity for perspective-taking, and a deeper commitment to social justice. Engagement with the community – whether understood as Duke, Durham, the region, or the world – can also help to integrate individual student lives, foster connections between curricular and co-curricular spheres, and strengthen the many communities in which they are members.

The University needs to strengthen its civic engagement activities on campus and build a fuller and richer infrastructure to link students, faculty, and staff working in the areas of service and civic engagement across divisional, departmental, and curricular/co-curricular lines. Such resources as the Council on Civic Engagement, the Community Service Center, the Office of Service-Learning, and the “Learning to Make a Difference” website provide support for faculty and students engaged in civic, service, and community-based activities. The University, however, needs to commit significant resources to increase the

breadth and depth of civic engagement among Duke undergraduates and to create a Center for Civic Engagement to bring and coordinate, under one administrative umbrella, various current parallel efforts. Such a Center could offer workshops and faculty support to help integrate service-learning, community-based research, and service into the undergraduate experience.

And finally, Duke needs to seek ways to continue to explore issues of difference within its institutional and community discourse. One initiative to launch such a dialogue might be to host a conference “*Engaging Difference in the 21st Century*.” Such a conference would build on the 1997 academic conference “*What Difference Does Difference Make?*” This latter event laid the foundation for curricular initiatives, Multicultural Center programs, and connections of faculty advisors with ethnic and affinity groups. Establishing a series of such programs on a regular basis would ensure a continuous infusion of ideas, perspectives, and approaches into the campus dialogue and curricular and co-curricular initiatives.

To enhance the curriculum and experiential learning, the Steering Committee offers the following recommendations:

1. *Modify the Cross Cultural Inquiry curricular requirements so that one of the two required courses has a primary focus on racial, ethnic, class, religious, and/or sexual/gender differences in the United States*
2. *Develop the necessary infrastructure to support and promote an increased array of experiential learning opportunities – international, domestic, and those that focus on Durham – that connect to substantive areas of scholarship and institutional priorities and that address one or more of these objectives: creating community, engaging difference, and promoting cross-cultural understanding*
3. *Initiate ongoing forums on issues of difference through such means as a conference that promotes dialogue and guides consideration of approaches and initiatives*

FACULTY-STUDENT INTERACTION

The rise in Duke University’s status as a major research university has been achieved by maximizing the scholarly reputation and productivity of its faculty. Correspondingly, there has been less recognition given to faculty teaching, engagement with students outside of the classroom, and service to the academic community. To recruit and/or retain exceptional scholars, teaching responsibilities have often been reduced, and scholarly productivity is accurately perceived to be what matters most in decisions of tenure and promotion, compensation, and status in one’s field. Changes in faculty culture are necessary, therefore, if Duke is to accomplish its vision as a great research university committed to undergraduate education.

While scholarly productivity must continue to be the primary faculty expectation, it can no longer be sufficient. What is needed is a new social contract between the University and the faculty that establishes the expectation that all regular rank faculty appointments in Arts and Sciences, the Pratt School of Engineering, and the Nicholas School of

Environment and Earth and Ocean Sciences have three primary responsibilities: scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service to the academic community. These expectations, however, cannot be envisioned in terms of “one size fits all.” Rather, the specific distribution of efforts will be individually specified and vary over time depending on responsibilities and research productivity.

To enable and better support faculty scholarship, teaching/mentoring, and service, the Committee recommends several changes to be further developed, discussed, and evaluated through collaborative efforts with faculty and Deans of Arts and Sciences, the Pratt School of Engineering, and the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences. Among these are the consideration of an expanded leave policy to reward teaching and service through increased leave time, a more equitable distribution of teaching loads across departments, and redefining teaching loads to include mentoring as well as standard courses and service to the academic community. Furthermore, Duke must more intentionally align graduate and undergraduate education; for example, recent efforts to promote “vertically integrated research teams” of undergraduates and graduate students and their faculty mentors that support more undergraduate independent studies and theses and also provide valuable assistance and supervision experience to graduate students, has proven to be effective across a number of disciplines.

The University must also decrease the faculty administrative burden and streamline its often inefficient model for faculty governance by closely examining the number, size, and mode of functioning of committees and faculty bodies. For example, the Steering Committee identified more than 70 standing committees at just the university and school levels, and faculty often function on these committees as individuals, rather than as a representative of their departments or programs.

In addition to considerations of faculty time, the University must continue its efforts to promote the rigor and quality of undergraduate education, the quality of teaching and learning spaces, and teaching and research supervision. Duke’s strategic plan calls for each department and program to institute a regular review of its curriculum, pedagogical approaches, and advising program. Departments and programs will need support to develop rigorous methods for the evaluation of teaching and learning and ensure that independent studies and theses are rigorous, require sustained student engagement and result in substantial academic papers or presentations that are evaluated and graded in accordance with the highest standards. Just such efforts are already underway in several departments with the assistance of the Trinity College Office of Assessment.

Enhanced faculty-student interaction is central to strengthening Duke’s campus culture. The Spring 2005 Enrolled Student Survey, administered by Duke’s Office of Institutional Research, provides one indication of student appraisal of current faculty-student interaction: when asked to evaluate how well Duke fosters faculty-student interactions outside of the classroom, 45% responded “very poor or poor” and 9% responded “well or very well.” When asked to indicate the greatest single barrier to out-of-class interactions, 17% responded “lack of faculty interest” whereas 39% reported “lack of student interest” and 28% indicated the “lack of venues.” Over the years, faculty have also expressed frustration when there is little undergraduate response to their efforts to make themselves available outside of the classroom; office hours and academic advising sessions routinely go unused by students. Thus, faculty-student interaction outside of the classroom is one

area for improvement in which there is both a shared desire and a shared sense of responsibility. The challenge is how to effectively promote meaningful and mutually rewarding faculty-student interaction outside of the classroom.

The Steering Committee recognizes that little can be expected from just increased faculty “push” for engagement with students and that increased “pull” by students is also needed for specific engagements to have personal value. The Committee heard many examples of successful and mutually rewarding engagements, and what they had in common was a connection of students and faculty around a mutual interest that often began in, but carried beyond, the classroom. As the number of students undertaking an independent study or thesis have increased, both faculty and students recognize the “value added” of directly engaging undergraduates in the inquiry and discovery processes.

In addition to mentoring research, the University must also seek to increase opportunities for faculty to engage with students in their social and residential lives. Faculty sponsorship of House Courses and extracurricular interest groups, such as in the visual and performing arts, provide venues for such intersection of interests. The Faculty-in-Residence Program has also proven to be an effective vehicle for outside of the classroom interactions and is in the process of being extended to include West and Central Campus. The expanded system of Residential Coordinators facilitates the hosting of programs in quads around specific themes or topics selected by students to which faculty are invited. Programs that enable faculty and students to dine together are successful but underutilized, and point to the compelling need to address the segmented dining practices and facilities that function as food courts rather than opportunities and places for community interaction.

Duke has made admirable gains in increasing the presence of women and minority faculty. At times, however, the impression has been that increasing diversity and increasing excellence were two separate, rather than related, objectives. Furthermore, the presence of women and minority faculty is as important for fostering faculty-student interaction as it is for academic excellence. Efforts to attract women and minority faculty to Duke will be enhanced by communicating diversity as a goal and value intimately attached to its institutional goal of excellence in research and undergraduate education.

To strengthen the role of faculty in the life of undergraduates and to enhance faculty-student interaction, the Steering Committee offers the following recommendations:

- 1. Reaffirm faculty engagement with undergraduates as a core value of Duke University; make changes with regard to recruitment, leaves, teaching/mentoring loads; and decrease administrative burdens to better support the balance of faculty scholarship with teaching/mentoring responsibilities*
- 2. Adopt a more efficient and effective approach to faculty service on committees by reducing the proliferation and size of faculty committees and by instituting a representational model of faculty committee assignment*
- 3. Support faculty and departmental efforts to enhance the coherence, rigor, and quality of undergraduate teaching and learning experiences*

4. *Provide incentives and increase support for students to engage with a faculty mentor around a question/project that results in a thesis and increase opportunities for faculty to engage with students around areas of mutual interest*
5. *Redouble efforts to recruit women and minority faculty by emphasizing diversity not as an add-on activity, but as a value intimately attached to Duke's central institutional goal of excellence*

RESIDENTIAL LIFE, SOCIAL LIFE, AND DINING

One of the strengths of Duke's undergraduate education is that it is grounded in the context of a residential experience. As a residential university, Duke seeks to foster a richly diverse environment that supports classroom learning, promotes opportunities for students to connect with each other and with faculty to develop a strong and enduring sense of belonging, and provides opportunities for students to grow and develop, especially as they wrestle with issues of identity, autonomy and responsibility. The University seeks to build a residential community where students traverse intellectual and cultural boundaries across generations and over time, gaining cultural competency as a lived experience. In this type of community, relationships are rooted in mutual respect and civility, the dignity and self worth of all members are celebrated, and its members feel safe and secure.

Duke's residential life plan maps directly onto the University's developmental model, a model that currently integrates the vision for the East and West Campus experiences and that will be fully realized with the redevelopment of Central Campus. Each of these three campuses has a unique role to play: East Campus, with its diverse mix of all first-year students in its residential houses, provides a more inward looking orientation to the life and values of the academy and an opportunity to for students to develop their voices as members of a community. West Campus, with its system of quads, is intended to provide sophomores and upper-class students with deeper and more substantial intellectual and social engagements in preparation for more independent experiences, such as study abroad, service learning, and internships. Finally, Central Campus, with its apartment style-living and planned rich environment of language departments, cultural opportunities, and the arts, will provide the culmination, refining and consolidating students' intellectual and personal skills and fostering increased interaction with the Durham community and the world beyond Duke.

In 1995, the University launched the first phase of this model when it redesigned East as the first-year campus and enhanced the first-year experience through such means as the Focus Program, the Faculty-in-Residence Program, the Freshman Advisory Counselor Program, the Marketplace, Lilly Library programming and outreach, an expanded first-year Orientation, residentially-based first-year advising, and the development of East Campus "neighborhoods," all of which taken together provide an extensive array of support and interaction. The success of the East Campus experience in developing community and affirming the diversity of the first-year class is generally acknowledged; indeed, a common phrase on campus is that "Duke has done the first year right."

One of the positive aspects of the decision to house all first-year students on East Campus was that it captures the inherent diversity in the class. In contrast, “self-segregation” along racial lines became evident on the upper-class residences on West Campus, Trent Hall, and Central Campus. Indeed, even before students finished their first year, social hierarchies began to emerge and be reaffirmed through selective living group recruitment and housing choices. One of the motivations to close Trent Hall, build the West-Edens Link, and require all sophomores to live on West campus was to create more West Campus residential space to address perceived inequities in assignment and to have West Campus and Central Campus better reflect the racial composition of the undergraduate population. Some small gains were achieved in this regard, but in Fall 2006, the percentage of the respective racial and ethnic groups who resided on West Campus was 81.1% of the Caucasian students, 76.1% of the Hispanic/Latino students, 72.7 % of the Asian students, and only 58.4% of the African Americans students.

The decision to have all sophomores live on West resulted in sophomore minority students no longer having the option to live on Central. In conjunction with that policy change, the University made explicit commitments to minority students and to women to take steps to make West Campus more welcoming, including the movement of selective living groups out of the main quad residence halls. In addition, Student Affairs has been actively and incrementally restructuring and enhancing the West Campus experience through such efforts as the configuration of six West Campus quads, the establishment of quad councils, the expansion of the Faculty-in-Residence program on West, and the phased renovation of the plaza, West Union, and the West Campus residence halls.

While all of these initiatives have sought to carry over to West Campus the sense of the diverse community that characterizes East Campus, two significant factors undercut these efforts: the lack of social space and the privilege given to selective living groups to control West Campus residential and social space.

There is compelling and long-recognized need for social spaces on West Campus that can accommodate large group activities. Creating new large group spaces is absolutely key to the Committee’s recommendations to improve undergraduate social life. Such spaces would provide equity of access for any quad, fraternity or sorority, organization, or social group to host events, and programming could be instituted in such venues to promote large, inclusive student gatherings of students. Finally, large group social space is essential in moving parties and other gatherings out of dormitory rooms.

The privilege given to selective living groups, and to men in particular, affects campus culture disproportionately. Of the 2,690 beds on West Campus in 2006-07, 793 beds (30%) are assigned to selective living groups, with fraternities occupying 443 beds (16%), and other selective living groups occupying 350 beds (13%). Of those in selective living groups, 77% are male and 23% are female. The privileging and distribution of space in any community is a tangible symbol of its priorities. Access to real estate means setting the rules of social engagement, and the University must face the fact that residential space, and control of it, continues to be experienced as gendered and alternative unfriendly because of the way it favors certain groups. The current differential

room assignment process, which distinguishes between selective living groups and other student blocks, is neither equitable nor does it reflect Duke's obligation to empower all students fairly.

Moreover, it is important to remember that East Campus previously afforded space to women as the historic Woman's College and, subsequent to the incorporation of the Woman's College into Trinity College, to those who sought an alternative to the West Campus living experience. One unanticipated outcome of the creation of the first-year campus was the elimination of an alternative housing environment for those students who sought to avoid the West Campus social culture. Students not wishing to engage in the "*Work-hard-Play hard*" culture of West Campus often moved to Central or off campus, further disrupting campus community. While the anticipated development of Central as a vibrant upper-class campus will address some of the need for different types of residential and social spaces, to fully realize the potential of an undergraduate living and learning community welcoming to all, Duke must promote a system of housing that fosters a more diverse and inclusive community, enables group affiliations and a wider variety of social programming, and assures more equitable distribution and governance of residential and social space.

For these reasons, the Steering Committee believes that, in conjunction with establishing new social and dining spaces on West Campus and the opening of new residential space on Central Campus, the preferential assignment of residential space to selective living groups must be discontinued. It is important to emphasize that the Committee's recommendation to discontinue the assignment of residential space to selective living groups is not based on a concern about the value of selective living and social/affinity groups but rather the recognition that the historical process of assigning common residential space to groups is inequitable in the context of the varied demographic character of the community that Duke has become. It also does not foster the engagement with difference that is an educational imperative for residential and social, as well as academic, life. While decoupling residential space and selective living groups is necessary to address the inequities of privileging control of social space, the Committee recognizes the need to foster social/affinity groups and Greek organizations that promote the development of friendships, camaraderie, common purpose, and social networks.

Dining and related facilities must also better support the University's educational and programmatic goals. The current dining experience was designed years ago to reflect managerial, financial and service assumptions that were then regarded as appropriate. These assumptions included expectations that undergraduate dining would generate university revenues as part of a larger array of auxiliary operations (including the bookstore, parking and housing operations), all expected to support institutional financial needs. Duke Dining has been nationally regarded for its attention to the student consumer marketplace and for enabling cost-effective, customer-friendly, and choice-oriented service. As a result, the dining program emphasizes speed, variety, and cost effectiveness. Moreover, this auxiliary model of dining has minimized capital investments in facilities. Consequently, the Marketplace (currently providing fewer than 400 seats to support the nearly 1,700 students, plus faculty and staff on East Campus) has not been expanded, nor

are the dining facilities in West Union and the Bryan Center adequate, comfortable, or up-to-date. Only a handful of niche alternatives sprinkled throughout academic buildings, such as the Refectory, the von der Heyden Pavilion, and Twinnies Café, offer the sort of positive, engaging dining facilities conducive to fostering community. Significant improvements to residential, dining and social facilities are necessary to provide a contemporary student life infrastructure – one that will foster faculty-student interaction, student self-governance and entertainment, and student inter-group interactions. Further, dining, in particular, should not be viewed as a for-profit operation or even a break-even operation; rather, the university should acknowledge that subsidizing dining represents an important mechanism for creating the infrastructure of a positive campus climate.

These changes in residential life and dining will augment social life by creating venues for interaction, both small and large, and by promoting social organizations within each of the University's three campuses. Duke has a rich array of social, religious, service, and thematic groups that have the opportunity to enrich the lives of their respective members and the community as a whole by aspiring to, and affirming what is best in these traditions. Thus, Duke can advance toward the vision of a “community of communities” engaged in common purpose.

To improve residential life, social life, and dining, the Steering Committee offers the following recommendations:

- 1. Use the opportunity provided by the Central Campus project to re-envision and expand residential, dining, and social space on the West and East campuses*
- 2. Establish the quad as the residential social organizational structure on West Campus to foster interaction within and between diverse communities and groups*
- 3. Create additional spaces on West Campus, particularly large group spaces, accessible by all student social organizations/groups, which can be used for dining and/or social functions*
- 4. Assign West Campus housing, in concert with the opening of Central Campus and the creation of additional social spaces on West, through a policy that enables small, non-contiguous blocking of students,³ but discontinues the practice of assigning housing to selective living groups and social/affinity/interest groups*
- 5. Change the Dining Services model so that operations are oriented towards community building among students, and between faculty, students, and staff; in particular, Dining Services should not be run as a profit center, but rather be an investment by the university in the social environment of the community*

³ The Committee seeks to enable small groups of a size less than 12 students to live together, but not to allow contiguous blocks that would dominate the space; that is, rooms may be adjacent within the block, but blocks may not be contiguous within a quad. The particular number of students in the block is not specified because some degrees of freedom will be needed as implementation proceeds and to realize the intention in spaces of varying sizes and configurations with the residence halls.

ALCOHOL

Alcohol issues are not one single problem, but rather a series of three, interrelated problems that are viewed in multiple ways: “bad behavior,” “impaired health,” and “lost weekends.” All three tend to involve heavy drinking – drunkenness – rather than drinking *per se*. With regard to bad behavior, drinking is a factor in much of the serious misbehavior, assault, property damage, injury, unwanted sex, and neighborhood disruption involving undergraduates. Drinking also creates a substantial legal liability to the University and is a significant risk to Duke’s reputation. In terms of impaired health, a large minority of undergraduates engage in heavy drinking on a regular basis, putting their academic performance and their health at risk. Recent biomedical research on adolescent brain development underscores that heavy drinking can cause brain damage. The immediate threat is that students will be injured while drunk. Overdose appears to be a particular problem for first-year students: 37 were transported to the Emergency Room last year, and there were 7 transports of first-year students just during orientation week this year. The risk of another alcohol-related death in the Duke community is very real. Furthermore, several dozen students are seen in CAPS every year with serious symptoms of alcoholism, and far more than that will graduate with a heavy-drinking habit. Alcohol use also complicates other mental health problems and heightens impulsive behavior, both contributing to and creating high risk in vulnerable students. Beyond bad behavior and impaired health is the problem of alcohol-induced lost weekends; much weekend social life at Duke is organized around getting drunk, an activity that is alluring for many students, but ultimately unsatisfying. Where, how, and with whom Duke students socialize are important influences on campus culture.

The Office of Institutional Research surveys provide data on how Duke undergraduates report their experiences compared with their peers at comparable institutions and the relationship of partying to studying and academic performance:

- Duke students report higher levels of drinking in college and more frequent binge drinking (three or more occasions of 5 or more drinks in the last 2 weeks) than their peers at comparable institutions. It is, however, Duke students in Greek letter organizations, not independents, who set Duke apart from its comparison schools.⁴
- Duke students report less time studying and more time partying than their peers at comparable institutions.⁵
- Students who spend more time partying and binge drinking tend to devote significantly less time to studying and have significantly lower academic performance in comparison to other students.

⁴ For example, in the 2003 survey, binge drinking was reported by 43% of Duke fraternity members and 29% of sorority members compared to 14% non-fraternity and 8% non-sorority members.

⁵ For example in the 2003 survey, 20% of Duke students compared to 29% of their peers reported studying 20 or more hours a week and 14% of Duke students reported partying 11 or more hours a week compared to 9% of their peers.

These data indicate the degree to which Duke's challenges and opportunities relate to alcohol. The Committee identified a number of alcohol concerns that require further, systematic, evaluation, the first of which relates to the dilemma faced by professional staff because of the state law establishing 21 as the minimum drinking age. While universities do not sanction underage drinking, their policies often reflect a selective enforcement policy that targets some kinds of drinking and not others. This approach, taken by Duke and most other residential campuses, underscores the lack of clarity in current philosophy and policies. A focus on infractions around drinking leads to a punitive approach to drinking, while an emphasis on the lack of a healthy social life leads to an educational approach without sanctions. The right balance in terms of individual and community well-being needs to be determined through systematic study.

Duke's current array of programs, official rules, and informal enforcement practices lacks operational clarity. A survey of a number of professional staff members found that their top priority was to have clear guidance about how they should respond to alcohol-related infractions. The operational norms are further confused by the tradition of officials tolerating overt violations on some occasions, such as occur at tailgating, basketball bonfires, and Last Day of Classes. The lack of a clear set of principles for enforcement is a particular burden for Resident Advisers and Residential Counselors, and in October 2004, the Campus Council passed a resolution urging Residence Life and Housing Services to set clear enforcement priorities.

Complicating these issues is the fact that Duke lacks adequate treatment services. While Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) has the capacity to diagnose and mount brief interventions for students with serious drinking problems, it is not equipped to provide longer-term treatment. This lack of intensive local outpatient treatment options results in tremendous difficulties referring Duke students for treatment while they remain enrolled. Furthermore, many students' health insurance policies do not provide adequate coverage for this type of treatment, resulting in significant barriers to accessing appropriate care.

Finally, the University lacks what public-health workers call a system for monitoring progress against alcohol-related problems involving Duke students. There is currently no regular report of indicators of alcohol abuse and harmful consequences that could be used as a basis for judging whether the Duke trend is favorable or unfavorable and as a basis for evaluating specific interventions. Developing a useful formal monitoring system compels the University to clearly delineate its goals and corresponding policies and procedures to evaluate, and be accountable as a community, for its progress. This requires creating a system, based on public health principles, to identify incidents of dangerous levels of drinking and drunken behavior to determine trends and patterns and evaluate interventions. It also requires adopting an empirically-grounded framework, including an annual survey, systematic studies, and review of each case of alcohol overdose, to guide policy and initiatives, and within which to evaluate the effectiveness of practices.

To promote a more responsible approach to the culture of campus drinking, the Steering Committee offers the following interrelated recommendations:

1. *Re-orient social life on campus to reduce the centrality of alcohol and enable more non-alcohol events and venues*
2. *Establish attractive venues for controlled distribution of alcohol for students of age, including a large space able to accommodate 300-400 people*
3. *Clarify alcohol regulations and enforce these regulations consistently. Specifically, target disorderly and disrespectful behavior and dangerous drinking*
4. *Increase staffing and resources for the oversight of policies and practices and for alcohol/substance abuse prevention and treatment services*
5. *Implement an evidence-based approach, based upon public health principles, to alcohol policy, initiatives, and accountability.*

ATHLETICS

Athletics is an important element in the identity of Duke University. Division I competition within the NCAA has been a distinctive source of prestige and distinction, serving as a common bond across the entire University, across generations, and between the University and the community, of which Duke's men's and women's basketball successes are perhaps the most obvious examples. Duke has taken pride in its success in athletics. This success has several dimensions, embodied in commonly heard statements such as "great athletics and great academics," "Duke doesn't cheat," and in the fact that Duke student-athletes reflect the make up of the institution as a whole and graduate at the same rate as non-athletes.

Nationally, however, there are strong and persistent forces that create an "athletic-academic divide," between varsity athletics, on the one hand, and academic life on the other, particularly at selective universities and colleges. As documented in Bowen and Levin's 2003 book, *Reclaiming the Game: College Sports and Educational Values*,⁶ the demands on student-athletes are ever-increasing in terms of early specialization, and practice, training, and travel times, while the expectations for academic engagement also are increasing. These national trends impact Duke as well, resulting in measurable differences between student athletes and non-athletes in terms of preparation, experiences, and academic performance, differences that are growing and evident across all three sports tiers of student athletes, both men and women. The athletic culture, in general, is perceived by some to be characterized by a sense of privilege, abuse of alcohol, sexual objectification, and anti-intellectualism. While most Duke athletes are representative and responsible members of the academic community, they increasingly report being subjected to negative stereotypes by members of the academic community.

The Steering Committee recognizes that there are divergent views about the role and place of athletics at Duke University and suggests that the essential question to be addressed is: "How can Duke make the adjustments necessary to continue to participate

⁶ William G. Bowen and Sarah H. Levin, *Reclaiming the Game: College Sports and Educational Values*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

in the NCAA at the Division I level in all sports and achieve its aspirations to be a great university?” In particular, the Committee identified important areas of common concern: admissions, time demands, and oversight.

Most of the 600 student athletes currently enrolled at Duke compile fine academic records, graduate on time, and contribute significantly to the undergraduate community. In fact, they would be valued members of the University community and role models whether or not they were engaged in a varsity sport. Concerns increasingly arise, however, because of competitive recruitment pressures that place students’ academic performance and full participation in campus life at risk. This risk has become clear recently, in the wake of a university decision to allow football, with its many more scholarships, to recruit more athletes at the lower levels of admissions criteria as do men’s and women’s basketball, the other Tier 1 revenue sport athletes. Analyses conducted over the last four years indicate that this decision has increased the number of students who are not adequately prepared to benefit from, or contribute to, the work of the academic community, even with enhanced academic support services. This places Duke’s admirable graduation rates at risk, reinforces negative stereotypes, and does not serve the best interests of these students themselves, their peers, or their faculty. In addition, varsity athletes, as a group, are disproportionately concentrated in fewer than half a dozen majors in the humanities and social sciences and in certain classes both within and beyond those majors. The admissions trade-offs extend beyond Tier 1 revenue sports. Up until the entering class of 2000, with the exception of men’s and women’s basketball and football, there were no significant group differences in the admissions profile of student-athletes playing the other sports and non-athletes. That is no longer the case: all three tiers of athletes now differ from non-athletes and from each other in Admissions Reader Rating scores.

In 1987, the NCAA took steps to legislate the length of the playing season, confining Division I teams to half the year (26 weeks) for “traditional” and “non-traditional” seasons. “The intent was to reduce the pressure on students to devote an inordinate amount of time to varsity sports,” write Bowen and Levin, “but by the fall of 1998 it was obvious that students were spending more, not less, time on athletics.”⁷ They further recommend that “Seasons should be shorter; ...determined efforts should be made to ensure that ‘voluntary’ activities are truly voluntary,” and guidelines should “flatly prohibit missing a class, lab, or seminar for practice.”⁸ All the trends in recent years, however, have placed more – not fewer – demands upon student athletes, a situation that can place their health at risk and take an undue toll on the participants, their peers, and the institution as a whole. An important step that needs to be taken to lessen the athletics-academics divide is to work to mitigate athletic practice and travel time demands.

In terms of oversight, the University must bridge the academic and athletic divide by better integrating athletics in the undergraduate administrative structure, by making greater use of faculty on the Athletic Council, and by involving faculty in decisions about admissions and athletic policies. Such steps would foster the integration of student

⁷ Bowen and Levin, p.281.

⁸ Bowen and Levin, p. 282, 283.

athletes, as well as their coaches and support staff, in Duke's undergraduate educational mission.

The Steering Committee offers the following recommendations regarding athletics:

1. *Integrate athletics with the undergraduate administrative structure for academic and social life, including faculty membership on oversight committees*
2. *Raise the low end of the admissions requirements for athletes*
3. *Reduce the number of athletes admitted near the low end and reduce the number of teams afforded the prerogative to recruit athletes near the low end*
4. *Ensure full participation of student-athletes in campus academic and social life by decreasing practice and travel time demands on student-athletes*
5. *Provide academic support services for athletes that are targeted to the development of learning styles and skills essential for full participation in undergraduate academic life*

ADMISSIONS AND RECRUITMENT

By many measures, the admissions office has done an outstanding job of contributing to the rise in Duke University's prominence. Particularly with regard to increasing diversity, the admissions office has had a transformative impact, as reflected in the 41% students of color in the Class of 2010. The admissions office has also been responsive to university initiatives, as evidenced most recently by increasing the admission of students with artistic talents and engaging faculty in the review process for those applicants. A number of studies have been commissioned to better understand the characteristics of those who are and who are not attracted to Duke and why. There have also been ongoing appraisals of how Duke is perceived, whether current perceptions are accurate, and how the University might want to be perceived. Similarly there has been important consideration of the Duke brand and its influence on admissions, and there has been productive discussion about how the University might want to sharpen and refine its profile.

Over the years, the overall quality of Duke's students has risen. Students increasingly matriculate with extraordinary records of accomplishment and subsequently take advantage of the University's opportunities for intellectual growth. There are, however, some who do not engage fully in the intellectual work of the community. The University is concerned by the lack of some students' openness to new experiences and the kinds of deep learning that are the goals of liberal education and that provide a strong foundation for future life and work. Duke seeks to be a magnet for students who have the requisite openness and commitment to engagement necessary to benefit from, and contribute to, the full range of its educational experiences. As an indication of this intuitional priority, the Committee suggests evaluating applicants' response to a required application essay question on engagement and experiences with difference. In addition, faculty should be more integrally involved in the admissions decisions of students, athletes and non-athletes alike, by extending the model of Pratt faculty involvement to Trinity.

To ensure that the University represents this full range of educational experience, Duke must increase financial aid to attract minority students and international students at the top of the applicant pool. The University must aggressively recruit high-achieving

applicants from underrepresented groups by appealing more to those students' intellectual accomplishments and by reaching out to a more diverse group of schools and communities. To make the recruitment process as effective as possible, the University should review its recruitment materials, processes, and events to see that they align with its commitment to engaging difference and showcase its many cultures and communities. The Committee also recommends that the University improve its ethnically-based recruitment weekends with a more academic focus and communicate that Duke's approach to recognizing differences is through inclusiveness, not segmentation.

Admission selection criteria must also be reviewed to ensure full participation of all undergraduates in campus life. Accordingly, the Committee recognizes the need to raise the low end of the admissions standards, including those for legacies, development candidates, and athletes, so that all admitted students not only have the potential to graduate but have the preparation and commitment necessary to contribute fully to the intellectual life of the community.

To conduct this review effectively, the Committee recognizes the need to develop an admissions feedback system on student performance and an analysis of experiences that promote success during students' Duke academic careers. By institutionalizing such a system, the University will have information critical to inform and continuously refine admissions metrics, such as the Reader Rating system, admissions targets, and recruitment goals. This feedback system should complement a regular review of all components of the recruitment process, thereby ensuring consistency with the Duke's institutional values and goals of admitting students who respect and seek a community whose wealth of ideas and opportunities for learning represent the highest standards of excellence, who seek and achieve intellectual discipline and personal integrity, who are able to participate fully in the university's academic requirements, and who model, in conduct and commitment, the university's value of diversity and excellence.

To enhance the University's recruitment and admissions process, the Steering Committee offers the following recommendations:

1. *Increase the role of faculty in the admissions process*
2. *Ensure that recruitment materials, processes, and events communicate Duke's commitment to engaging difference and showcase Duke's many cultures and communities*
3. *Aggressively recruit international students and high-achieving applicants from underrepresented groups and increase financial aid to attract those students*
4. *Raise the low end of the admissions standards so that all students have the preparation and commitment to contribute fully to the intellectual life of the community*
5. *Develop a feedback system for student performance and a regular review of the recruitment process to ensure alignment with Duke's institutional goals*

CONCLUSION: CONTINUING THE CONVERSATION

From the beginning, the Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee has sought to engage in a thoughtful and collaborative conversation about the Duke community, to gain a richer understanding of campus culture, and to identify areas of strength and make recommendations to advance Duke to the next stage in its institutional development. Over the past eight months, the Committee met weekly to engage actively with, and to examine critically essential and interrelated aspects of undergraduate life. It has reviewed historical data, research reports, and surveys; it has held student, staff and faculty discussion forums; and it has invited comments from members of the Duke and Durham communities. The Committee has engaged in individual conversations with numerous students and student groups, it has read e-mails and messages that have come to its attention, and it has met with those who sought to share their views. The recommendations proposed above reflect the Committee's collective sense of the next steps needed to significantly enhance the undergraduate experience.

The Committee recognizes that it has outlined an ambitious array of recommendations that will need be further discussed and implemented through the University's regular administrative processes. Some recommendations, such as how to promote civic engagement, support initiatives that are already under consideration, while others, such as changing the dining model, have significant budgetary implications. Still others, such as changes in faculty culture, will need extensive deliberations within departments and across schools. Indeed, the entire Duke community must play a significant role in considering thoughtfully how best to enhance campus culture. The real work ahead is to join in this conversation with a sustained commitment to the University's advancement.

At the same time, the Committee also acknowledges that there is much that it has not done. Using its charge as a baseline, the CCI Steering Committee intentionally focused its work on the undergraduate experience and did not address issues of campus culture related to other constituencies, such as graduate and professional students, staff, or the larger Durham community. Time also did not allow the Committee the opportunity to forge connections with similar initiatives to address University culture, such as those underway in the Division of Human Resources. The Committee did, however, find the CCI Committee structure and function – a committee broadly comprised of faculty, students, staff, alumni and a committee that collectively engaged in collaborative problem-solving across the units of academics, student affairs, athletics, campus services, and admissions – an effective model for strategic planning.

Great universities are dynamic and continually evolving institutions that adapt to, and promote, cultural change. Duke University has a tradition of excellence and vitality that fosters growth and innovation. In fact, Duke's commitment to advancement is among its most sterling characteristics. It is the hope of the Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee that its work and recommendations can help strengthen campus culture and further advance Duke as an even greater and more excellent community of teaching and learning.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: President Brodhead's Charge to the Campus Culture Initiative

Appendix 2: Members of the Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee

Appendix 3: Meeting List

Campus Culture Initiative: Charge to the Steering Committee
Richard H. Brodhead, President
April 18, 2006

Allegations springing from the party held by the men's lacrosse team have prompted strong feelings and much discussion about issues of race and gender, class and privilege, difference and respect, and campus and community. These issues have been of concern both on this campus and in our larger society for many years. Duke University has done much in the past to address these issues; nonetheless, we must use this occasion to take the measure of our campus culture and see where it could be improved. We need to promote a culture where all students seek to take responsibility for their behavior and to be fully respectful of the rights of others.

Duke has a tradition of stepping forward to address issues of fundamental importance to our educational mission. These have ranged from the defense of academic freedom, to increasing diversity, to curricular reform, to issues affecting women. In addressing campus culture, I encourage the Steering Committee to articulate a vision of what Duke can be, analyzing existing practices and formulating initiatives needed to realize the vision.

I ask that the Steering Committee:

- Formulate a clear statement of the values and behaviors that should guide Duke students in their relations with others;
- Evaluate and suggest improvements in the ways students develop personal responsibility, social responsibility, and civic engagement;
- Assess how students relate to each other and other members of the campus and community across bounds of race, gender and other social divisions and recommend ways to promote mutual respect;
- Assess the extent to which our institutional practices promote the values and behaviors we expect of students;
- Assess the role that faculty play in the development of student values and behavior, and make recommendations for increasing interaction between students and faculty in campus life; and
- Recommend initiatives to promote a more responsible approach to the culture of campus drinking, since alcohol abuse underlies many forms of thoughtless and dangerous conduct.

I ask that the Steering Committee provide me with an interim report of its work in progress no later than December 1, 2006, and a final report of findings and recommendations no later than May 1, 2007.

APPENDIX 2: CAMPUS CULTURE INITIATIVE STEERING COMMITTEE

Chair: Robert Thompson, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Trinity College

Vice Chair: Larry Moneta, Vice President for Student Affairs

Faculty:

Anne Allison, Chair and Professor, Department of Cultural Anthropology

Philip Cook, Professor, Sanford Institute of Public Policy

Robert Cook-Deegan, Director, IGSP Center for Genome Ethics, Law and Policy

Jeffrey Forbes, Assistant Professor of the Practice, Department of Computer Science

Noah Pickus, Associate Director, Kenan Institute for Ethics*

Marie Lynn Miranda, Associate Research Professor, Nicholas School of the Environment

Barry Myers, Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering

Suzanne Shanahan, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology

Peter Wood, Professor, Department of History

Administrators:

Zoila Airall, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs

Steve Nowicki, Dean of the Natural Sciences

Ben Reese, Vice President of Institutional Equity

Jackie Silar, Associate Athletics Director

Sam Wells, Dean of the Chapel

Students:

Trisha Bailey ('07)

Melissa Mang ('09)**

Chauncey Nartey ('07)

Iman Washington ('07)

Elliott Wolf ('08)

Graduate Student:

Audrey Ellerbee (G '09)

Alumni:

Charlotte Clark T '79, MEM '83 (Durham, NC)

J. Derek Penn T '79 B '84 (New York, New York)

* Replaced Elizabeth Kiss in June 2006 after Kiss's departure for Agnes Scott College to serve as its President

** Served through the end of summer 2006

APPENDIX 3: MEETING LIST

Between April 2006 and February 2007, the Campus Culture Initiative Steering Committee met on a weekly basis (32 meetings), as subgroups (25 meetings), and as conveners of special topics (14).

This appendix lists the guests invited to the Steering Committee and subcommittee meetings, meetings with the community, and meetings with Duke's senior leadership.

Co-Chair Robert Thompson had individual meetings with Robyn Wiegman (Women's Studies), Richard Hain (Mathematics), Joe Alleva (Athletics), Clint Davidson (Human Resources), Kemel Dawkins (Campus Services) and Jim Wulforst (Dining) about the Campus Culture Initiative. Thompson also met with 13 undergraduates, and Co-Chair Larry Moneta met with 4 undergraduates in individual meetings specifically about CCI outside of the list of meetings with student groups.

CCI Meetings with Senior Leadership

Date	Senior Leaders	CCI Steering Committee Participants
5/8/2006	Brodhead	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
8/7/2006	Brodhead	Bob Thompson
11/13/2006	Brodhead, Haltom, Lange, Riddell	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
11/16/2006	Brodhead, Lange	CCI Conveners
11/28/2006	Senior Leadership Group	Bob Thompson
11/28/2006	Brodhead	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
12/4/2006	Brodhead	CCI Conveners
12/13/2006	Senior Leadership Group	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
1/29/2007	Brodhead, Lange	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
2/14/2007	President's Council	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta

CCI Meetings with Community

Student Groups and Organizations

Date	Audience	CCI Steering Committee Participants
8/30/2006	DSG Legislature	Larry Moneta
Sep-06	Baldwin Scholars	Zoila Airall
Sep-06	Campus Council	Larry Moneta
9/19/2006	Alspaugh Dialogue - Alcohol	Bob Cook-Deegan, Elliott Wolf
9/25/2006	Intercommunity council	Larry Moneta
10/5/2006	Residential Advisors	Larry Moneta
10/12/2006	LGBT Center - Alliance & Common Ground	Suzanne Shanahan
10/13/2006	Residential Advisors	Larry Moneta
10/15/2006	NPHC (National Pan Hellenic Council)	Karla Holloway, Zoila Airall
10/16/2006	Beaufort Program student leaders	Larry Moneta
10/27/2006	Alspaugh Dialogue - Dean Sue on Culture at Duke: 'Old Duke, New Duke' and 'We Work Hard, We Play Hard'	Bob Cook-Deegan
10/18/2006	Residential Advisors	Larry Moneta
10/18/2006	Order of Omega	Larry Moneta
10/23/2006	BSA, NCCU students	Zoila Airall, Bob Thompson, Trisha Bailey, Chauncey Nartey, Iman Washington
10/25/2006	DSG Legislature	Robert Thompson, Zoila Airall
11/6/2006	Open session with Greeks	Larry Moneta, Zoila Airall, Charlotte Clark
11/6/2006	STUD (Students to Unite Duke)	Iman Washington
11/14/2006	Graduate & Professional Student council	Robert Thompson , Larry Moneta
12/5/2006	ASA	Iman Washington, Chauncey Nartey
12/7/2006	BSA	Iman Washington, Chauncey Nartey

Faculty Bodies

Date	Audience	CCI Steering Committee Participants
9/28/2006	A&S Department Chairs	Anne Allison, Steve Nowicki, Bob Thompson
10/12/2006	A&S Council	Robert Thompson
10/31/2006 - 11/1/2006	DUS Meetings	Robert Thompson

Town Hall Meetings

Date	Audience	CCI Steering Committee Participants
10/24/2006	Town hall meeting - faculty	Robert Thompson, Karla Holloway, Peter Wood, Trisha Bailey, Elliott Wolf
10/25/2006	Town hall meeting - students	Robert Thompson, Zoila Airall, Elliott Wolf, Audrey Ellerbee, Iman Washington
10/26/2006	Town hall meeting - staff	Robert Thompson, Zoila Airall, Elliott Wolf, Jacki Silar

CCI Meetings with Community

Small Group Sessions for undergraduates

Date	Audience	CCI Steering Committee Participants
9/13/2006	Small Gp Session - Gender/Sexuality	Anne Allison
9/13/2006	Small Gp Session - Race	Zoila Airall
9/15/2006	Small Gp Session - Athletics	<i>canceled</i>
9/15/2006	Small Gp Session - Athletics	<i>canceled</i>
9/17/2006	Small Gp Session - Alcohol	Suzanne Shanahan
9/20/2006	Small Gp Session - Race	Ben Reese, Zoila Airall
9/20/2006	Small Gp Session - Gender/Sexuality	Suzanne Shanahan
9/27/2006	Small Gp Session - Gender/Sexuality	Anne Allison
10/4/2006	Small Gp Session - Gender/Sexuality	Anne Allison, Suzanne Shanahan, Robert Thompson

Meetings with Boards, Alumni Groups

Date	Audience	CCI Steering Committee Participants
9/29/2006	Board of Trustees Undergraduate Affairs Group	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
9/29/2006	Homecoming panel on CCI	Noah Pickus, Suzanne Shanahan, Sam Wells, Chauncey Nartey, Trisha Bailey
11/10/2006	Trinity Board of Visitors	Bob Thompson
12/1/2006	Board of Trustees Undergraduate Affairs Group	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
12/1/2006	Board of Trustees, Emeriti	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
12/2/2006	Board of Trustees - full Board	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
2/23/2007	Board of Trustees Undergraduate Affairs Group	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
2/23/2007	Board of Trustees - full Board	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta

Staff

Date	Audience	CCI Steering Committee Participants
11/1/2006	Undergraduate Leadership Group	Bob Thompson, Larry Moneta
11/29/2006	CAPS staff	Larry Moneta
12/18/2006	OSAF retreat	Larry Moneta
1/16/2007	Community discourse w/Student Affairs Staff	Larry Moneta

Guests Invited to CCI Meetings

Date	Guests	Office	CCI Meeting
5/11/2006	Richard Brodhead, Richard Riddell	President	Steering Committee
5/18/2006	David Jamieson-Drake	Office of the Provost, Institutional Research	Steering Committee
6/22/2006	Scott Swartzwelder	Clinical Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology and Neuroscience	Alcohol Subcommittee
	Stephen Bryan	Judicial Affairs	
6/29/2006	Bill Purdy, Jean Hansen	Student Health	Alcohol Subcommittee
6/30/2006	Michelle Rasmussen	Director, Academic Advising Center	Gender/Sexuality Subcommittee
	Joe Gonzales	Director of Second-Year Experience Coalition	
7/27/2006	Kathleen Smith	Chair of the on-campus Athletics Council and Faculty Athletics Representative	Athletics Subcommittee
8/10/2006	Kerstin Kemel	Head Coach, Women's Lacrosse Team	Athletics Subcommittee
8/24/2006	Melanie Mitchell	Kenan Institute for Ethics	Steering Committee
8/31/2006	Christoph Guttentag, Leonard Satterwhite	Admissions Office	Steering Committee
9/14/2006	George McLendon	Arts & Sciences	Steering Committee
9/15/2006	Janie Long	Director, LGBT Center	Gender/Sexuality Subcommittee
10/6/2006	Donna Lisker	Director, Women's Center	Gender/Sexuality Subcommittee
10/12/2006	Kemel Dawkins	Campus Services	Steering Committee
12/14/2006	David Malone, Tony Brown	Council on Civic Engagement	Steering Committee