



Report to the President from the Committee to Review Fraternities

A MEMORANDUM TO THE BOWDOIN COMMUNITY

April 14, 1988

The Committee to Review Fraternities has submitted its report, and I hasten to share it with you. Enclosed are a copy of the Chairman's letter of transmittal, a copy of the body of the Report, and copies of the first two appendices, included because they tell you in some detail who the Committee members are and how they proceeded with their study. Copies of the other nineteen appendices are available through my office if you wish them.

You will find the Report, I believe, a candid look at fraternities at Bowdoin today. Their plight, in general, is seen as the result not only of fraternity actions over recent years but also of the inaction of other College constituencies. Rather than dwell on assessing blame, however, the Report moves to those steps that might be taken to revive and preserve the best in fraternities and to do so in a way that would enable the College to treat all of its students in a fair and equal manner. It challenges fraternity students, alumni, and College officials to work together within the policies of the College as recommended in this Report. The effort will have to be carried on in good spirit with mutual trust and a shared vision. It will require a considerable investment of College loan funds and of staff and faculty time. It could have the happiest of results.

What happens at this point? All of the constituencies of the College have had ample opportunity to speak and write to the Committee. Weekends have been given over to hearings. Now it is time to act on the recommendations which a broadly representative committee has fashioned for what it perceives as the good of the fraternities and of the College. I shall, therefore, recommend to the Executive Committee that it forward the Report to the Governing Boards with its own recommendation for approval at the May 27 meeting of the Boards. To delay longer is simply to perpetuate the anxiety about fraternities that has colored this year. For those with serious reservations about the recommendations, there is still ample time to write to me or to the Trustees or to the Overseers to express concerns. The process ought to be deliberative, but it should no longer be delayed.

To conclude, I hope that the recommendations of the Committee will be accepted by the Governing Boards in May and will be welcomed by the fraternities as a means of providing them with the support so necessary for their future success. The Committee, under Merton G. Henry's able leadership, has done its job well. We are much in its debt. It is our turn now to come together as the Committee has and to act to strengthen the fraternities and Bowdoin.

A. LeRoy Greason
A. LeRoy Greason

April 25, 1988

President A. LeRoy Greason
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, ME 04011

Dear Roy:

The Report of the Committee to Review Fraternities is delivered to you herewith.

This Report is the culmination of six months of intensive work on the part of the Committee. Your attention is specifically called to Appendix B which sets forth the scope of the review undertaken. Each member of the Committee drafted at least one section of the Report.

The recommendations of the Committee are set forth after each section of the Report and are summarized at the end. The cooperation of the fraternities, the administration and other College constituencies with the Committee was excellent. Everyone was candid and straightforward.

While this is a subject on which individuals hold diverse views, we believe that if the Committee's recommendations are implemented expeditiously that the result will be a healthier, stronger and more enlightened fraternity system at Bowdoin with a resultant better social life for the college as a whole.

The Committee wishes to express its very real appreciation to Elizabeth Cary Pierson who served as staff to the Committee and without whose assistance our task could not have been completed on a timely basis.

As Chairman I want to thank all of the members of the Committee for their conscientious participation in all aspects of the review. We came to the task from many different backgrounds and with many different views. We completed our Report with unanimity and with mutual respect for one another.

Respectfully submitted,

Merton G. Henry
MERTON G. HENRY, Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
I. History of Fraternities at Bowdoin.....	2
II. College Policy on Fraternities.....	4
III. Legal Status of Fraternities at Bowdoin.....	4
IV. 1983 "Report to the President of the Commission on Student Life" (Thorne Report): An Update.....	4
V. Campus Social Life Problems.....	5
VI. Physical Condition of Fraternity Houses.....	6
VII. Financial Status of Fraternities.....	6
VIII. Membership Policies and Practices.....	7
IX. Student Conduct and Leadership.....	8
X. Rushing and Orientation.....	8
XI. Fraternity Governance.....	9
XII. Academic Programs and Community Projects.....	11
XIII. Value of Fraternities to Bowdoin as They Exist Now and as They Might Exist.....	11
XIV. Conclusion.....	12
XV. Summary of Recommendations.....	12
Appendix A, Committee to Review Fraternities.....	14
Appendix B, Scope of the Review.....	14

Additional appendices, available on request:

Appendix C, Fraternity Regulation
Appendix D, "Fraternities," excerpt from the "Report to the President of the Commission on Student Life," June 1983 and President Greason's response to those recommendations, November 1983
Appendix E, Alpha Beta Phi Sorority Inspection
Appendix F, Alpha Delta Phi Fraternity Reinspection
Appendix G, Alpha Kappa Sigma Reinspection
Appendix H, Alpha Rho Upsilon Fraternity Inspection
Appendix I, Beta Theta Pi Reinspection
Appendix J, Chi Psi Fraternity Inspection
Appendix K, Delta Kappa Epsilon Reinspection
Appendix L, Delta Sigma Fraternity Reinspection
Appendix M, Psi Upsilon Fraternity Inspection
Appendix N, Theta Delta Chi Fraternity Inspection
Appendix O, Zeta Psi Reinspection
Appendix P, Fraternity Membership, Fall 1987
Appendix Q, Fraternity Housing, Fall 1987
Appendix R, Bowdoin College Social Code
Appendix S, Bowdoin College Hazing Policy
Appendix T, 1987 IFC Rush Policy
Appendix U, Bowdoin College Alcohol Policy

INTRODUCTION

On October 1, 1987, President Greason appointed the Committee to Review Fraternities and gave the Committee the following charge:

"This is the memorandum establishing the Committee to Review the Fraternities. Its purpose is to review the recent history of fraternities at Bowdoin, especially their policies and their practices as they pertain to membership, rushing, orientation, standards of conduct, social life, community projects and financial standing, including any indebtedness and projections for payment. In addition, you should seek information about the degree and quality of opportunities for women students in fraternities as well as the quality of leadership and support offered by faculty, staff and alumni to fraternities. Finally, I ask that you examine the relation between the values engendered by fraternities and the values which shape the character of a liberal arts college. In light of this study, a judgment should be made about the value of fraternities to Bowdoin, either as they exist now or as they might exist. You are also requested to recommend what actions, if any, you feel the College should take relative to fraternities."

The Committee appointed by the President is comprised of two trustees, two overseers, two alumni, one faculty, one staff, and two students. All ten members of the Committee are graduates or undergraduates of the College, and seven of the ten were fraternity members as undergraduates. (See Appendix A for a list of Committee members with brief biographical information.)

In the past six months the Committee has undertaken the most comprehensive review of Bowdoin fraternities in the history of the College. Facts and opinions have been solicited from virtually every constituent group in the Bowdoin community. (See Appendix B, "Scope of the Review.")

This is not the first committee to review social organizations at Bowdoin. It is interesting to note that in 1831 the Governing Boards appointed a committee with Chief Justice Prentiss Mellen of the Maine Supreme Judicial Court as its chairman to consider "whether any regulations are necessary to be adopted, relative to the two rival societies now existing in the College and if so, to recommend such measures as in their judgment may be most conducive to the harmony of the students and the best interests of the College." The two societies referred to were the Peucinian and the Athenaeum Societies. In the natural evolution of student life, those two societies were superseded by intercollegiate Greek letter fraternities, beginning with Alpha Delta Phi in 1841. It has helped this Committee to keep things in perspective during its deliberations to know that the task in which we have been involved has a long history and that we are not the first committee to travel down this path.

While it is undeniably true that this review of fraternities has been prompted by a series of concerns -- at all levels of College life -- about fraternities over the past several years, the work of this Committee should also be placed in the context of the clear pattern of periodic reviews of all aspects of College life that has evolved in recent years. Academic and administrative departments undergo reviews on a regular cycle. Governance, athletics, admissions, and student life have all been reviewed in recent years. The College itself went through a reaccreditation review in 1986. This review of fraternities should be viewed in the context of the continuing re-evaluation of all facets of College life.

From the voluminous information reviewed by the Committee, it is clear that it is difficult, if not impossible, to generalize about fraternities at Bowdoin. Each of the nine fraternities recognized by the College differs in respect to its physical and financial standing, membership policies and practices, academic standing, quality of student leadership, standards of conduct, alumni support, faculty involvement, and a myriad of other areas. Each differs substantially from the fraternities that existed at the College prior to the mid-1960s.

This report sets forth the findings and recommendations of the Committee in each of the key areas raised by the President in his charge to the Committee. The Committee finds that when viewed in light of the College life as a whole, all is not well with Bowdoin's fraternities. Serious problems exist and must be addressed. The Committee does not believe the fraternity system's abolition is justified at this time, however. The Committee unanimously recommends that Bowdoin retain its fraternities but that it revitalize and reform the fraternity system in light of the findings and recommendations set forth in this report. We believe the result can be a healthier, stronger, and more progressive fraternity system at Bowdoin, which will benefit the entire College community.

I

HISTORY OF FRATERNITIES AT BOWDOIN

Fraternities began at Bowdoin in 1841 with the founding of the Bowdoin Chapter of Alpha Delta Phi. Since then a total of fifteen fraternity chapters and one sorority chapter have existed on campus and have played an integral role in the College's life. (See Table I-A at the end of this Section.)

The history of Bowdoin's fraternities can be divided into six major eras, with the highlights of each summarized as follows.

I. 1841-1899 Founding and early history of first eight fraternities, which function largely as literary societies.

II. 1900-1945 First fraternity houses built; function as literary societies declines; disruptions of WWI and WWII.

III. 1946-1959 The postwar years; heyday of fraternities.

IV. 1960-1969 Racial and religious exclusions removed from fraternities in 1963; widespread social changes mark the beginning of a gradual decline in fraternities.

V. 1970-1979 Fraternity membership declines substantially; Bowdoin admits women in 1970; Governing Boards vote in 1979 to forbid discrimination on the basis of sex.

VI. The 1980s Governing Boards vote in 1982 to withdraw College recognition from any fraternity that fails to admit women as full local members; as of 1987, nine locally-coed fraternities, one all-male fraternity, and one all-female sorority (the latter two unrecognized by the College) exist on campus; President Greason establishes the Committee to Review the Fraternities, September 1987.

A brief history of each era follows.

I. 1841-1899

With the founding of Alpha Delta Phi in 1841, fraternities soon became immensely popular at Bowdoin. Three more chapters formed on campus in the next three years, and by 1899 eight chapters were well established.

These early fraternities functioned largely as literary societies, designed to supplement a conservative nineteenth-century curriculum that ignored modern literature. They also functioned as social societies that provided a sense of belonging in a college where most students lived and dined in boarding houses. In short, they did much to enrich students' academic as well as social lives.

In *The History of Bowdoin College*, author Louis Hatch attributes much of the fraternities' initial success to their exclusivity, secrecy (even their meeting places used to be unknown to the uninitiated), and pleasure in opposing College authority. For as popular as they were among students, fraternities were far from popular with College authorities. Both the faculty and Governing Boards strongly opposed them at the beginning, primarily because of their secrecy.

Between 1846 and 1847, the faculty, Boards, and Visiting Committee considered abolishing fraternities at Bowdoin but never did. A decade later they reported that "the evils of the fraternity system had greatly diminished, yet they still condemned it and expressed an earnest desire for its abolition." The main reason they failed to accomplish it, writes Hatch, was "the impossibility of obtaining a general union of colleges against them. A few small colleges were afraid to act alone because they might drive away more students than they could afford to lose." Although many changes would occur in the system over the years, no more serious attempts would be made to abolish Bowdoin's fraternities. Fraternities survived, their numbers grew, and by the 1860s they had become an accepted, if forever controversial, component of campus life.

II. 1900-1945

In the early 1900s fraternities grew in number from eight to eleven and approximately eighty-five percent of the students belonged to them, with rivalry for members being intense. As on many other campuses, most of Bowdoin's fraternities had now developed national organizations as well, which included both undergraduate and alumni members.

With the building of the first chapter houses in the early 1900s, fraternities entered a new era: they could now house and feed their members. In February 1900, Alpha Delta Phi moved into a house it had purchased and remodeled, and that fall Delta Kappa Epsilon moved into a house it had built. Other fraternities promptly followed suit; by 1930 every fraternity at Bowdoin owned or leased a house.

By now fraternities were no longer the literary societies they had once been; more importantly, they were the basic social units on campus. They offered opportunities to develop leadership and organizational skills and encouraged high academic standards, community services, and loyalty to the College. Unfortunately they were also bastions of hazing and other controversial activities. K. C. M. Sills, first Dean and then President of the College in the first half of the century, resolved to regard them as allies and not enemies, however.⁵ "Whatever evils lurked in the fraternity system," Sills reportedly believed, "the remedy was not in weakening the chapters, but in intensifying their influence for the common good."⁶

1. Greason, A. LeRoy, "Fraternities at Bowdoin," chapel talk given at Bowdoin College, April 11, 1984, pp. 1-2.
2. Hatch, Louis C., *The History of Bowdoin College*. Portland, Maine: Loring, Short & Harmon, 1927, p. 315.
3. Ibid, p. 315.
4. Hokanson, Kimberly A., "The Role of College Fraternities in the 1980s: A Comparative Study of Bowdoin and Colby Colleges," June 2, 1986, p. 5.
5. Brown, Herbert Ross, *Sills of Bowdoin*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964, p. 91.
6. Ibid, p. 92.

When World War I and World War II so dramatically interrupted campus life, the College did its best to maintain some semblance of fraternity life: it offered to maintain the houses, to compensate the fraternities for their losses in room rent by paying their insurance premiums and mortgage interests, and to return the houses at the end of each war "in as good condition as we found them."

III. 1946-1959

When College opened in the fall of 1946, President Sills returned Bowdoin's fraternity houses to their respective owners and, in doing so, expressed the hope that they would increase their democratization. For fraternities, like other institutions of the day, reflected the shortcomings of the society that had created them: they were largely Protestant and white, excluding Jews, blacks, Asians, and other minorities. The first signs of gradual change came in 1946 with the founding of the local Alpha Rho Upsilon, "All Races United," and in 1950 when Delta Upsilon withdrew from its national and became Delta Sigma so it could pledge a black student.

Meanwhile, fraternities at Bowdoin flourished. In the mid-1950s more than ninety percent of the students were members. Relations between fraternities and the College were strong. Strict *in loco parentis* rules governed student-administration relations and were mirrored by internal fraternity rules. Almost all intramural competition was really interfraternity; all student advising was done through the fraternities; faculty participated regularly in academic as well as social affairs; social services and civic accomplishments were many; and alumni support was strong.¹⁰ It was the heyday of Bowdoin fraternities.

IV. 1960-1969

The 1960s brought widespread changes to Bowdoin's fraternities. In 1963 the Governing Boards voted to remove exclusionary racial and religious clauses from fraternities. Hazing was replaced at least in theory by orientation. With the opening of the Senior Center in 1965 and juniors beginning to study away, the strength and continuity of student leadership declined. Academic advising was taken out of the fraternities, and faculty involvement in fraternities declined.¹¹ The Vietnam War and protests against it began, student mores around the country changed rapidly, and drug use became more prevalent. Approximately ninety-seven percent of students belonged to fraternities in 1960, but by 1969 that percentage had begun to drop. The stage was set for the beginning of a gradual decline in the organizational and financial stability of many chapters.

V. 1970-1979

With the elimination of *in loco parentis* in the late 1960s and early 1970s, campus and fraternity life changed dramatically. In this environment, many fraternities alienated administrators, faculty, and alumni, the latter having been one of the fraternities' strongest allies both ideologically and financially.¹² With Bowdoin's chapter houses being owned by alumni corporations, the decline in alumni support was especially detrimental.

In the meantime, other problems arose. The energy crisis and sky-rocketing cost of oil threw off budgets, and the physical condition of many houses suffered as maintenance and repairs were postponed. Economies had to be made. Fewer students were attracted to live or eat in fraternities, and memberships dropped off.¹³ By 1971 only fifty-two percent of students belonged to fraternities. As Phi Delta Psi (formerly Alpha Tau Omega) had done in 1969, Sigma Nu closed in 1971. Alpha Delta Phi closed but later reopened. Financial problems grew worse, and the College made substantial loans to several fraternities, primarily for the upkeep of their houses. Notable exceptions did occur, particularly in houses where alumni offered generous and continuous support.

Probably the greatest challenge for fraternities during this period, however, was the admission of women students in 1970. "Through the early 1970s," states one report, "fraternities established individual and quite different practices regarding the role of women in their respective houses. All ten eventually permitted women to join, but several placed restrictions on the right of women to live in houses, vote on house policies, or even attend house meetings."¹⁴ The inclusion of women in fraternities also caused discord between most fraternity chapters and their nationals (all but two of which refused to recognize women members) and in some cases was resented by alumni.

After almost a decade of discussions, the Governing Boards voted in 1979 to extend "full and equal participation" in Bowdoin fraternities to women at the local level. No timetable was established for meeting this goal, but the faculty Student Life Committee and Governing Boards' ad hoc Student Environment Committee were instructed to "work with the undergraduate fraternity chapters and...make periodic reports to the Governing Boards."¹⁵

7. Ibid, p. 352.

8. Greason, A. LeRoy, op. cit., p. 3.

9. Hokanson, Kimberly A., op. cit., p. 6.

10. Greason, A. LeRoy, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

11. Ibid, p. 8.

12. Hokanson, Kimberly A., op. cit., p. 7.

13. Greason, A. LeRoy, op. cit., p. 9.

14. Springer, Allen L., "The Status of Women in Bowdoin Fraternities: A Chronology," September 10, 1984, p. 1.

15. Ibid, p. 1.

VI. The 1980s

For all their problems in the past twenty-five years, fraternities have continued to play a major role at Bowdoin in the 1980s, providing a focus for social activities for both members and many nonmembers. Although membership is about as low as it has ever been historically, approximately fifty percent of today's students still belong to a fraternity. About a third of the members live in the chapter houses, which, with the exception of the recently leased sorority house, are owned and operated by alumni house corporations. There currently are seven national fraternities on campus (one all-male, two nationally coed, and four locally coed); three local coed fraternities; and one local all-female sorority. By all accounts these organizations are a diverse group, varying considerably in their quality of student leadership, physical and financial standing, membership policies and practices, and standards of conduct.

Though still strongly supported by some parts of the College community, fraternities have had their share of physical, financial, and social problems in the 1980s. Some have difficulty filling their houses and dining rooms. Many houses are in serious disrepair (only one currently approaches College housing standards).

The status of women in fraternities remains problematic and has been extensively reviewed on at least four occasions since 1979. In 1982 the Governing Boards voted to withdraw College recognition from any single-sex fraternity. Consequently, the all-male fraternity (Chi Psi) and all-female sorority (Alpha Beta Phi), though members of the Interfraternity Council, are otherwise unrecognized by the College.

Other problems associated with some fraternities in recent years have included poor student leadership; lack of participation in the academic and intellectual life of the College; waning alumni support; and serious disciplinary problems, including alcohol abuse, hazing, sexual harassment, and property destruction. Disciplinary problems certainly are not confined to fraternities, but many people on campus believe they are exacerbated there, primarily because alcohol is readily available.

In spite of the fraternity-related controversies and problems that have arisen over the years, Bowdoin generally has a long history of support for its fraternities. As recently as 1983, the "Report to the President of The Commission on Student Life" (Thorne Report) said, "The Commission wishes to encourage the fraternities to flourish in the Bowdoin community..."¹⁶ Unfortunately, as the 1986 reaccreditation report by the New England Association of Schools & Colleges noted, the net result of Bowdoin's many problems with fraternities today is that people at all levels of the College -- administrators, faculty, staff, and students -- spend an inordinate amount of time and energy on fraternity matters.¹⁷

16. "Report to the President of the Commission on Student Life" (Thorne Report), June 30, 1983, p.24.
17. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools & Colleges, "Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Students of Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine," 1986 reaccreditation report, p.20.

TABLE I-A

ACTIVE AND FORMERLY ACTIVE FRATERNITIES AT BOWDOIN*

Active	(*Denotes local chapter)
1841	Alpha Delta Phi
1843	Psi Upsilon
1844	Chi Psi (unrecognized by College since 1982)
1844	Delta Kappa Epsilon
1854	Theta Delta Chi
1867	Zeta Psi
1900	Beta Theta Pi
1946	Alpha Rho Upsilon*
1951	Delta Sigma* (formerly Delta Upsilon)
1965	Alpha Kappa Sigma* (formerly Kappa Sigma)
1983	Alpha Beta Phi Sorority* (unrecognized by College)
Formerly Active	
1857-1950	Delta Upsilon (now active as Delta Sigma*)
1895-1965	Kappa Sigma (now active as Alpha Kappa Sigma*)
1918-1971	Sigma Nu
1920-1929	Phi Delta Psi* (active from 1929-1962 as Alpha and Tau Omega)
1962-1969	
1929-1962	Alpha Tau Omega (originally active as Phi Delta Psi*)

*Based on Baird's Manual of American College Fraternities, 19th edition, edited by John Robson. Menasha, Wisconsin: Baird's Manual Foundation, Inc., 1977.

COLLEGE POLICY ON FRATERNITIES

For the past twenty-five years the College has had an official policy on fraternities. At their annual meeting in 1963, the Governing Boards adopted the following policy on fraternities:

"Be it resolved that Bowdoin College recognizes the system of fraternity chapters which has developed on its campus as a valuable educational instrument, that will be strengthened whenever possible. The Bowdoin fraternity system provides a means for rapidly assimilating each new freshman class into the student body; it gives upperclassmen training in leadership; the Dean and other administrative officers find in it an effective means for a student government; the fraternities provide a size of student sub-group appropriate to develop loyalties both to themselves and to the College. Finally, it is College policy to insist that membership in Bowdoin fraternities be free of any restrictions based on race, color, or creed; to encourage the widest possible fraternity membership among the undergraduate body; to favor early pledging and initiations as soon as possible after an undergraduate's matriculation; and to continue to foster such additional policies as will tend to make the fraternities even more constructive elements of the total College environment."

In May 1979, nine years after the advent of coeducation at Bowdoin, the Governing Boards adopted another vote, which in effect modified the 1963 vote. That vote stated as follows:

"VOTED: That it is the policy of Bowdoin College that full and equal participation in the affairs and governance of chapters of Bowdoin fraternities be extended to women students; and to put this policy into effect, the Student Life Committee and the Student Environment Committee shall work with the undergraduate fraternity chapters and shall make periodic reports to the Governing Boards."

In May 1982, after the reversion of Chi Psi to the status of a single-sex organization, the Boards adopted another vote which stated:

"Any fraternity that fails to comply with the College's policy regarding the status of women in Bowdoin fraternities by August 29, 1982, shall be made independent of the College. The College, through its administration, shall take all steps necessary to implement the independent status of any local chapter not in compliance as of August 29, 1982, including, but not limited to, actions which provide that:

1. The College discontinue the collection of room and board bills and the provision of dining service benefits to independent houses;
2. College rules requiring that all students who live in campus housing maintain a full board bill with the College should not be relaxed to permit students to transfer their board bills to independent houses;
3. Physical Plant personnel and other College resources will not be made available for repairs on independent houses, and the College will not entertain requests for loan assistance on particular projects for independent houses;
4. Appropriate public agencies should be informed that the College is not responsible for maintaining security in independent houses; and
5. Independent houses will not be mentioned in College publications, and their membership will not be identified for purposes of College records."

These three votes constitute the official College policy on fraternities. The Committee recommends that the Governing Boards rescind these three votes and adopt a new policy that is based on this Committee's recommendations.

Recommendation

1. The Committee recommends that the Governing Boards rescind their 1963, 1979, and 1982 votes on fraternities and adopt a new policy, based on this Committee's recommendations, which reads as follows:

VOTED: That Bowdoin College continue to recognize those fraternity chapters that conform to College policies as appropriate for developing student leadership and for providing housing and dining facilities consistent with the values of the College. It is College policy that membership in Bowdoin fraternities conform to the provisions of Section 8.0 of the College By-laws; that no chapter of a national fraternity that does not permit full membership regardless of sex shall be maintained on the Bowdoin campus after September 1, 1991; that any fraternity chapter not conforming with College policies be totally severed from any connection with the College whatsoever; and that the administration and other parties adopt such additional policies, rules, and regulations as will tend to make the fraternities constructive elements within the College environment.

LEGAL STATUS OF FRATERNITIES
AT BOWDOIN

There has long been a perception on the part of some people that Bowdoin fraternities are independent social organizations occupying houses owned by alumni associations and that the College has only limited legal power to regulate the fraternities.

The Committee asked College Counsel to review the legal authority of the College to regulate fraternities. The opinion from College Counsel is set forth in full in Appendix C.

There is ample legal authority to support the proposition that, absent any contractual commitments to the contrary, a private educational institution may regulate or even abolish fraternities as it determines appropriate in light of the educational goals or purposes of the institution. Further, the College may condition the recognition of fraternities upon their compliance with such reasonable rules and regulations as the College may prescribe.

At a private college such as Bowdoin, the Governing Boards are vested with all powers necessary to carry out the educational goals of the institution. These powers typically include the right to determine policies, objectives, and long-range plans for the institution. It is from these powers that courts find that educational institutions have the power and authority to regulate or prohibit social organizations such as fraternities.

The Constitutional argument frequently asserted in fraternity cases is that the educational institution may not regulate fraternities as that would interfere with the fraternity member's right to freedom of association under the First Amendment of the Constitution. The application of the First Amendment to a private college has not been supported by any case law. Since a private school is not a creature of government, the application of the right to freedom of association under the First Amendment is not applicable.

There are two legal categories of fraternities at Bowdoin. Those fraternities that comply with the College policy on fraternities (see Section II of this report) are deemed "recognized." Those that do not comply are deemed "unrecognized." The Committee finds that the intent of the vote of the Governing Boards in May 1982 has not been resolutely followed and that the status of unrecognized fraternities needs further clarification.

At Bowdoin, the College provides a host of services to recognized fraternities that comply with College policy. These range from collecting and disbursing room and board fees to providing dining room supervision, loaning funds, providing fire and police security services, and employment of personnel working at the fraternities, all of which may constitute a sufficient legal nexus to constitute College liability for events occurring at fraternities.

To classify the legal status of fraternities at Bowdoin for all College personnel, students, parents of students, and local municipal officials and neighbors, the Committee recommends that the following steps be taken.

Recommendations

1. All College ties with any unrecognized fraternity or sorority must be severed on an absolute and total basis. Those organizations should not be permitted to participate in College organizations such as the Interfraternity Council. The Dean of Students' Office should have no contact with those organizations as such and should treat any students who are members of and living in such organizations on the same basis as other students living in private off-campus housing would be treated.
2. The College should require each recognized fraternity to furnish it with evidence of liability insurance coverage in such amounts as the College Treasurer, who is responsible for College insurance matters, may from time to time prescribe. Such coverage shall be a prerequisite to continued recognition.

1983 "REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE
COMMISSION ON STUDENT LIFE" (THORNE REPORT): AN UPDATE

In June of 1982, President Greason formed the Commission on Student Life (Thorne Commission) and gave it the following charge:

"...Bowdoin is not simply a small, liberal arts college -- and a good one at that. It is also a residential college, and if a student's experience of attending Bowdoin is to realize its potential, the extracurricular, social and recreational life of the campus ought to complement in interesting and worthwhile ways the academic life of the classroom.

Your charge, therefore, is to examine all aspects of residential life at Bowdoin..."

With that charge, the Commission, representing Governing Boards, alumni, administration, faculty, and students, undertook a year-long review of student life at Bowdoin. Its "Report to

the President of the Commission on Student Life" (Thorne Report), issued in June of 1983, identified some major needs for improvement, particularly in the areas of housing, dining, social life, and co-curricular life. Not surprisingly, the long history of fraternities at Bowdoin secured them a chapter in the report. This chapter appears in full in this report as Appendix D.

The main purpose of the Commission on Student Life was "to make recommendations which will ensure a positive, healthy environment in which all students can learn and live, offer variety in facilities, programs, social life and intellectual life, and promote unity in groups of all sizes." Of the seventeen recommendations issued in the report, five pertained directly to fraternities as they existed at Bowdoin in 1983. Today, five years later, the challenge of those recommendations remains.

A review and update of each of those five recommendations regarding fraternities, as set forth in the 1983 Thorne Report, follows. Appendix D contains those recommendations and a discussion of them, as well as President Greason's response to them.

"Recommendation #12: The Commission recommends that the College adopt a clear set of physical plant standards for all fraternity buildings."

The spirit of this recommendation was to address the principle of equal services for all Bowdoin students, with the hope that "by setting standards, the College can increase the quality of life in the fraternity houses and kitchens, and make them stronger organizations as a result." The goals of this recommendation were two-fold: to raise the physical standards of the fraternities' housing and dining facilities and to retain a supervisory role over the houses, with the ability to enforce College standards to ensure the safety and well-being of the students.

Although the fraternities have made progress in certain areas regarding this recommendation, for the most part their physical facilities still fall far short of College standards, as thoroughly reviewed in Section VI of this report. Only one fraternity currently approaches College standards. Furthermore, the College does not appear to have any supervisory role over fraternity houses, nor has the College enforced the standards it set.

"Recommendation #13: The Commission recommends that the College assist fraternities in the attainment of College standards. The standards will be mandatory, effective three years after adoption. If necessary to satisfy these standards, a fraternity may find its own funds, borrow from the College, or give or sell its house to the College."

Although the College has assisted fraternities by making loans available to help them attain College standards, it clearly has not made those standards mandatory.

"Recommendation #14: The Commission recommends the approval of the Governing Boards of a policy that no fraternity be allowed to exist in violation of College standards."

In issuing this recommendation, the Commission stated that "The College must not tolerate the refusal of an organization to comply with its standards. To do so would be detrimental to the welfare of students;...Fraternity houses should not be allowed to exist in violation of College standards even if they have chosen to receive no Centralized Dining services, College fire protection, or other physical plant services." According to the inspection reports prepared for this Committee (see Section VI), five years later virtually none of the fraternity houses meet College physical plant standards.

"Recommendation #15: The Commission recommends that the College adopt a clear set of dining standards to govern the quality of food in fraternity kitchens. An individual from Centralized Dining Service should be appointed to supervise fraternity dining standards."

Although considerable progress has been made in the dining standards of some houses, the College has not adopted a clear set of dining standards for fraternities and has not appointed an individual from Centralized Dining Service to supervise fraternity dining standards. As a result, fraternity dining standards vary widely, being very good in a few houses and quite mediocre in others.

"Recommendation #16: The Commission recommends that the College adopt a second-semester rush policy."

This recommendation has not been adopted, primarily because of the implications it would have for the College's limited dining facilities. The Interfraternity Council currently is considering adopting a second-semester rush nonetheless, and in Section X of this report this Committee strongly recommends it, effective as soon as adequate dining facilities are available.

The Thorne Report closed by saying:

"The reality of these recommendations is that one or more houses may not be able to survive without a subsidy. The loss of any fraternity is regrettable, but the expense of maintaining, or subsidizing, an inefficient fraternity is unfair. In the event of fraternity closures, we hope that the College will acquire and use the buildings as facilities that continue to maintain a small group atmosphere for students to enjoy."

Conclusion

Five years after the Thorne Report, the issues underlying the Commission's recommendations regarding fraternities remain pertinent. The same issues have been thoroughly reviewed by this Committee as well, and we reaffirm the Commission's 1983 recommendations. Indeed, they are essentially incorporated into the recommendations made in this report.

This Committee also reaffirms the Commission's belief that "the fraternity system can play a useful role in the social and co-curricular life of the College."

v

CAMPUS SOCIAL LIFE PROBLEMS

The Committee recognizes three major social problems on campus today: limited social facilities, alcohol abuse, and sexual harassment. All three have a bearing on fraternity affairs and are discussed here in that context.

Limited Social Facilities

Adequate space for social activities in College-owned facilities is virtually nonexistent. Those areas in Wentworth Hall that were designed for this purpose have been largely taken over by the critical need for more dining space, and the few remaining rooms have become so overbooked that casual social use is not possible. Likewise, the Moulton Union, which served the College well when enrollment was half what it is today, is now so overcrowded and heavily booked for formal functions that it no longer serves as a social center. Social spaces created in various dormitories have been unsuccessful due to their small sizes and inappropriate locations. Almost everyone who spoke with the Committee identified this current lack of social space as a serious problem.

The most obvious consequence of limited social facilities is that fraternities--to which only half the students belong--have become the center for most campus social activities. These activities consist largely of campuswide open houses, parties of various sizes, keg parties, etc., and their behavioral consequences leave much to be desired. Almost all reported cases of alcohol abuse and sexual harassment occur in fraternity houses, which is hardly surprising since this is where College social life is centered. It is a commonly expressed opinion on campus that the fraternities' social role has been forced on them unfairly and puts undue burdens on them.

For the sake of all students, it is essential that the College create adequate College social facilities without further delay. Failure to do so would be unfair both to the student body and the fraternities.

Alcohol Abuse

Alcohol abuse is a serious problem at Bowdoin, as it is on most college campuses today. Its effects on student behavior are of major concern to College officials, townspeople, neighbors, and law enforcement officers.

The Committee is well aware that alcohol abuse is not confined to fraternities but did hear considerable testimony that it is most serious in fraternities. Although a sincere effort to carry out a dry rush this past fall was largely successful, it is clear that at other times no real effort is made to comply with Maine's drinking age law. Most fraternity members who spoke with the Committee admitted they made virtually no effort to control underage drinking because of the difficulty of enforcing it. To do so would probably require a system of ID cards and doorkeepers, they said. They also felt that any serious effort to control drinking in fraternities would drive students to drink more in the dormitories, and indeed, the Committee did hear of drinking problems in the freshmen dormitories during dry rush last fall. Dormitories are perceived to be "safe," in that law enforcement officers do not conduct raids there, whereas they do in fraternities.

In addition to violating the drinking age law, fraternities appear to have little understanding of their potential liability for sponsoring a party and attempting to take no responsibility for alcohol consumption. Fraternities must be fully cognizant of the fact that the organization that owns a facility and sponsors a party may be criminally or civilly liable for anything that happens on or off its property, including serving minors and letting people overindulge.

In the dormitories, the control of drinking has relied on the time-honored proctor system. Unfortunately, most proctors are no longer upperclassmen but sophomores, whose age, experience, and judgment may be little different than those whose actions they attempt to affect. Many members of the College community believe the College employs a double standard with respect to excessive drinking in the dormitories versus the fraternities, exhibiting indifference to dormitory drinking but hard-line discipline for fraternity drinking.

With respect to community and neighborhood relations, nearly all complaints about student behavior are related to alcohol abuse in fraternities.

The Committee commends the Counseling Service, the Alcohol Peer Advisers, and the Interfraternity Council for the educational programs and services they offer students and encourages them to continue such efforts.

Sexual Harassment

In its 1986 reaccreditation report, the New England Association of Schools & Colleges had this to say about sexual harassment at Bowdoin:

"Most serious is the widespread feeling among women students that much of the problem of reported student-to-student sexual harassment is attributable to activities which take place in some of the fraternities.

Even--if possible--more worrisome, is the suggestion that much of what happens--including allegations of general harassment, victimization and acquaintance rape--is not reported, since it involves as victims women who are members of the fraternities and whose sense of loyalty to the group make it difficult for them to reveal to outsiders problems they consider internal."

Any assessment of the effects of alcohol consumption on behavior would be incomplete without considering the issue of sexual harassment. Nearly everyone who addressed this subject testified that serious and sometimes violent sexual harassment is directly related to alcohol abuse. These incidents occur several score times each semester and vary from near rape, attempted rape, and bodily injury to serious emotional hurt.

Recommendations

1. The College must resolve as soon as possible the need for adequate social space for students.
2. The Committee encourages all members of the College community to help curtail alcohol abuse and to encourage responsible behavior. The College should establish an Alcohol and Sexual Harassment Task Force to coordinate educational programs and concerns related to these two issues. Alumni and parents should be informed of the College's efforts in an attempt to solicit their support.
3. The College should make it absolutely clear to all students that they are expected to comply with Maine State drinking laws and with College alcohol policies.
4. The College must enforce drinking rules uniformly among all students.
5. A system of ID cards and doorkeepers should be instituted at all College and fraternity parties to control underage drinking. Campuswide parties that are open to unlimited numbers of people and that violate fire and safety codes shall not be permitted in any recognized fraternity or in any College facility.
6. The dormitory proctor system should be improved by requiring that proctors be juniors or seniors rather than sophomores; by assigning more proctors; by offering required training programs for proctors; and by adequately compensating proctors for their duties.
7. Such issues as alcohol use, sexual harassment, hazing, and fraternity life in general should be addressed in greater depth in freshmen orientation programs.

VI

PHYSICAL CONDITION OF FRATERNITY HOUSES

Historically, fraternity houses have provided a substantial portion of the rooming and dining facilities for the College. With the increase in the size of the College to circa 1,350 students, the decline in the number of fraternities, and especially the physical deterioration of fraternity houses beginning in the late 1960s, this historic role has declined. In the fall of 1987, 182 students lived in nine recognized fraternity houses. This is equivalent to three Bowdoin dormitories.

In 1983 the Thorne Report recommended "that the College adopt a clear set of physical plant standards for all fraternity buildings" and that the fraternities be given three years to meet those standards. The College agreed to loan money to the fraternities to help meet the physical plant standards. Such loans have been made to several fraternities, fund raising campaigns have been conducted by others, and one fraternity has borrowed from its national.

Since 1983, progress has been made in the area of health and safety repairs (e.g., fire alarms, fire escapes, sprinklers, wiring, and asbestos removal) and in meeting some structural problems and kitchen deficiencies. The visitation of all houses by the Committee in November 1987, however, indicated that much remains to be done and that the physical facilities appear to be far below College housing standards. In some cases they are an embarrassment to the College.

In December 1987 the Committee asked the Physical Plant Department to inspect each of the eleven houses used by the nine recognized fraternities and by the unrecognized fraternity (Chi Psi) and sorority (Alpha Beta Phi). The scope of the inspection was to assess the physical condition of each house relative to safety, quality of accommodations, structural conditions, and general livability and to estimate the cost of bringing the facilities up to College standards. The Committee expresses its appreciation to David N. Barbour and Patti Hinckley for their prompt and thorough reviews, which are attached to this report as Appendixes E through O. The Committee understands that copies of these reports have been distributed to all chapter house alumni associations.

The condition of the fraternity houses varies greatly in all respects. With the exception of the Zeta Psi house and to lesser degree the Theta Delta Chi and Alpha Kappa Sigma houses, however, the fraternity physical plants are still far below College housing standards. Each house faces major expenditures to bring its physical plant, including kitchen facilities and furnishings, up to the same College standards as those applied to dormitories.

The estimated cost to bring each of the recognized fraternity houses up to College standards is as follows:

Alpha Delta Phi	\$115,000 to \$125,000
Alpha Kappa Sigma	\$ 80,000 to \$100,000
Alpha Rho Upsilon	\$195,000 to \$240,000
Beta Theta Pi	\$100,000 to \$150,000
Delta Kappa Epsilon	\$100,000
Delta Sigma	\$145,000 to \$170,000
Psi Upsilon	\$150,000 to \$190,000
Theta Delta Chi	\$ 35,000 to \$50,000
Zeta Psi	\$ 25,000 to \$30,000

Using the higher of each estimate, the total cost to bring the recognized fraternity houses up to College standards is estimated at \$1,155,000.

The condition of the fraternity physical plants (except Zeta Psi's) five years after the Thorne Report is a serious indictment of the undergraduates who have trashed houses, of alumni corporations that have neglected the properties they own and of the College for not pursuing the goals of the Thorne Report more vigorously. The Committee recognizes the valiant efforts of alumni and undergraduates to stem this tide of deterioration in some instances. Bowdoin, however, can no longer tolerate the housing and dining of students in sub-standard facilities, regardless of who owns those facilities.

Information was also brought to the Committee's attention that nonstudents are living in some fraternity houses and that some fraternity houses are rented to unsupervised groups in the summer. These practices should be discontinued.

Recommendations

1. Effective August 1, 1990, students should be prohibited from rooming or dining in any recognized fraternity that is not certified by the Physical Plant Department as meeting College standards.
2. Effective August 1, 1990, recognized fraternity facilities should be inspected and certified by the Physical Plant Department on the same cycle that dormitories are.
3. To help fraternities meet College physical plant standards, the College must be prepared to (1) make mortgage loans of the necessary funds to the fraternities at one point below market rates or (2) take title to the fraternity property by gift, bring it up to College standards, and lease it back to the fraternity chapter.
4. The housing and dining capacities of each recognized fraternity should be established and the fraternities required to have occupancy within ten percent of capacity.
5. The College should adopt and enforce a policy that no one except Bowdoin undergraduates can live in any recognized fraternity house without written approval from the Dean of Students and that summer rental of recognized fraternity houses will be under strictly supervised conditions.

VII

FINANCIAL STATUS OF FRATERNITIES

The financial status of Bowdoin's fraternities varies considerably. Of the nine recognized fraternities, three are essentially debt free. Four fraternities hold a mortgage with the College and one other holds a mortgage with the College as well as its national. In most cases loan payments to the College have been irregular and in a few cases are several years overdue. As of January 1, 1988, the five fraternities holding loans with the College owed the College a total of more than \$250,000. Three fraternities have significant debts with Brunswick Coal and Lumber.

In terms of real estate, the houses and properties of the nine recognized fraternities currently have an estimated market value of nearly 2.8 million dollars and an assessed value of nearly 1.5 million dollars.

The table in this section presents information on the financial status of all eleven fraternities at Bowdoin. With the exception of Alpha Beta Phi Sorority, this information reflects the financial status of the house corporations (which in the case of the other ten fraternities own their houses) and not the accounts of the undergraduate treasuries.

Information under items 1 through 9 was provided for the Committee by Dudley H. Woodall, Treasurer of the College. Information under items 10 through 12 was provided by the alumni corporation treasurers. The tax information under items 13 through 16 is on file in the tax assessor's office at the Brunswick Town Office.

Item 8, accounts receivable to College, is a "working" account and, except in the cases of Alpha Rho Upsilon and Delta Sigma, is not perceived by the College as true debt.

Item 9, dining reserves with College, is generated from the profit or loss of house dining operations, exclusive of depreciation charges. These reserves are held by the College but are available to the houses for renewal and replacement of facilities -- usually kitchen- or dining-related -- and sometimes for capital improvements, as approved by the administration. The College currently pays the fraternities 5.8 percent interest on the reserves.

Item 13, assessed value of house and property, is calculated by the Brunswick tax assessor as sixty percent of estimated market value.

The Committee has two recommendations to make regarding fraternity finances.

Recommendations

- Effective July 1, 1989, all house corporation and student treasurers should be required to file standard and regular financial reports with the College Treasurer and the Dean of Students' Office on an annual basis.
- The College should enforce a regular schedule of loan payments.

MEMBERSHIP POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Current Fraternity Membership
National Affiliations of Fraternities
Degree and Quality of Opportunities for Minorities and Women

Current Fraternity Membership

For the academic year 1987-1988, approximately 1,360 students are enrolled at Bowdoin. According to statistics compiled by the Dean of Students' Office (see Appendix P) 633, or 47 percent, belong to one of the nine recognized fraternities. Of these 633 fraternity members, 61 percent are men and 39 percent women. The unrecognized fraternity and sorority, Chi Psi and Alpha Beta Phi, report an additional 62 members.

The nine recognized fraternities provided housing to 182 students, or approximately 29 percent of their members, in the first semester of the academic year (see Appendix Q). Alpha Beta Phi housed an additional 6 students that semester and Chi Psi an additional 21.

National Affiliations of Fraternities

Of Bowdoin's nine recognized fraternities, six are currently affiliated with a national fraternity: Alpha Delta Phi, Beta Theta Pi, Delta Kappa Epsilon, Psi Upsilon, Theta Delta Chi, and Zeta Psi. The unrecognized fraternity, Chi Psi, is also affiliated with a national.

The roles of the national fraternities represented at Bowdoin seem to vary from chapter to chapter. Their benefits include financial resources for loans, educational seminars, limited scholarship assistance, career guidance for undergraduates, an alumni network in various fields of interest, a link with other campuses, and a sense of continuity and tradition. In return for their resources and services, the national fraternities assess fees from both their undergraduate and alumni members and require adherence to fraternity by-laws and requirements. Some of the student and alumni fraternity members who spoke with the Committee felt strongly about the importance of their national affiliation, yet others identified no clear benefits to national affiliation and felt it was unnecessary.

The membership policies and practices that the national fraternities impose on their chapters also appear to vary at Bowdoin. All but two of the national fraternities represented at Bowdoin, however, share one membership restriction that runs absolutely counter to the spirit, if not the express language, of College policy. With the exception of Alpha Delta Phi and Psi Upsilon, all of the national fraternities prohibit the membership of women at the national level.

In 1979 Bowdoin's Governing Boards voted to extend "full and equal participation" in fraternity affairs to women. In 1982 they voted that any fraternity failing to comply with that policy would be made independent of the College. Thus, the current conflict between College policy and the membership policies of five of the seven national fraternities on campus has forced Bowdoin's fraternities either to develop "shadow" local chapters that admit women or to sever ties with the College. Chi Psi is currently the only chapter that has severed its ties with the College, which it did in 1982. The other four chapters with a national affiliation continually create new membership and governance schemes in an effort to comply with the competing demands of their national and the College. All four currently admit women as local members only. To satisfy College policy, they have created an elaborate system of local "executive" boards of which women can become members and thus have a voice in local matters.

By sustaining the current structure of discriminatory national fraternities and quasi-coeducational local fraternities for the past decade, Bowdoin has permitted the development of two wholly incompatible values and has forced students to embrace two mutually discrepant standards. It is an obvious contradiction. As a result, fraternity leaders have become understandably confused and have contributed enormous energies toward the impossible task of accommodating both the College and the national fraternities. In addition, the Dean of Students reports that administrative monitoring of coeducational compliance in fraternities has become painfully ineffective as well as an exercise in hypocrisy.

The Committee has serious doubts about the value of national affiliation for any Bowdoin fraternity but realizes that such an affiliation is an individual choice among chapters. Because coeducation in fraternities represents a central College tenet, however, the College can no longer tolerate national fraternities that discriminate against women. As of September 1, 1991, no national fraternity that does not permit full membership regardless of sex should maintain a chapter on the Bowdoin campus.

Degree and Quality of Opportunities for Minorities and Women

Although there is no evidence to suggest that the degree or quality of opportunities for minorities is limited in any Bowdoin fraternity, the Committee does recognize the tendency of fraternities, and any social group, to attract and admit new members with similar backgrounds and interests. Therefore, the Committee recognizes the inevitability of exclusivity in membership with its obvious negative ramifications. We are unaware, however, of any fraternities at Bowdoin with policies, written or unwritten, that could be interpreted as discriminatory against minorities, nor did we hear of any cases of minority discrimination.

Table VII-A

FINANCIAL STATUS OF FRATERNITIES

(See notes for individual fraternities at end of table)

	Alpha Beta Phi	Alpha Delta Phi	Alpha Kappa Sigma	Alpha Rho Upsilon	Beta Theta Pi	Chi Psi
1. Mortgage w/ College	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
2. Maturity	-	9/1/88	-	10/1/89	3/3/88	-
3. Rate	-	9.5%	-	11.5%	8%	-
4. Principal outstanding 10/31/87	-	27,662.50	-	101,190.00	9,500.00	-
5. Principal in arrears 10/31/87	-	24,662.50	-	6,649.62	9,000.00	-
6. Interest in arrears	-	3,664.34	-	3,384.98	6,553.00	-
7. Last prin./int. payment made	-	5/20/87 p. & i.	-	2/19/87 p. 4/20/87 i.	2/27/79 p. 1/19/80 i.	-
8. Accounts receivable to College 12/8/87	NA	294.19	789.95	8,359.62	579.70	NA
9. Dining reserves w/ College 6/30/87	NA	16,303.00	7,159.00	NA	5,875.00	NA
10. Mortgage w/ national	NA	No	NA	NA	No	?
11. Estimate of repayment schedule	-	?	-	see note	?	?
12. Significant outstanding debts to oil suppliers, etc.	No	800.00 Br. Coal & Lumber	No	10,000.00 Br. Coal & Lumber	1,000.00 Br. Coal & Lumber	?
13. Assessed value of house & property (60% of est. market value)	NA	264,600.00	106,600.00	171,200.00	132,600.00	236,600.0
14. Estimated market value of house & property	NA	441,000.00	177,666.00	285,333.00	221,000.00	394,333.0
15. Annual real est. tax	NA	6,667.92	2,686.32	4,314.24	3,341.52	5,962.3
16. R.e. tax paid?	NA	22.50 still due 2/23/88	Yes	Yes	Partially: see note	Yes

NA=not applicable

Table continued on page 15

NOTES

Alpha Beta Phi is not recognized by the College, hence receives no services. It currently leases a house in which six women live. Rent, utilities, etc., are paid to date by the occupants.

Alpha Delta Phi Corporation billing has been regular; payment has been irregular.

Alpha Rho Upsilon Corporation is negotiating a sale/lease-back arrangement with the College. If all goes as planned, the house will be turned over to the College on Commencement '88. The fraternity has no dining room, hence no dining reserve.

Beta Theta Pi Corporation billing has been frequent. There have been no payments in recent years, nor has the College made a concentrated effort to collect. Brunswick tax assessor reports \$1,670.76 plus interest still due on real estate taxes as of 2/23/88.

Chi Psi is not recognized by the College, hence receives no services. Items 10 through 12 are in question because the alumni corporation treasurer would not divulge any information about the corporation's finances to the Committee.

Delta Sigma Corporation is considering a sale/lease-back arrangement with the College.

Theta Delta Chi Corporation's \$70,000 mortgage (10.5% interest rate) with its national is due 3/5/96. The corporation plans a capital campaign, after The Campaign for Bowdoin winds down, to retire this debt. The status of the corporation's \$4,000 debt with the College is unclear.

The availability of meaningful opportunities for women in fraternities appears to be more complex. There are essentially five classes of fraternities on campus: the local, all-female sorority; three local fraternities that offer full membership to women; two national fraternities that offer full membership to women; four national fraternities that offer full membership to men but only local membership to women; and one national fraternity that excludes women altogether.

The five fully coeducational fraternities appear to offer the same membership and leadership opportunities for male and female members; women are full members and are permitted to hold any office. The constraints that the four national fraternities offering local membership to women impose on the Bowdoin chapters, however, severely compromise the opportunities for women who join them. These chapters, their nationals, and the College live uneasily with a jerrybuilt system that appears to exist only to satisfy the competing demands of the College and the nationals, not to offer a genuinely meaningful place for women. Even in some of the more progressive houses, men visibly dominate leadership positions. Thus, the character of the fraternity system at Bowdoin retains a strong masculine flavor despite the College's clear policy of "full and equal participation" for women. The Committee heard testimony about houses where women are made to feel unwelcome, of houses that accept women members only to comply with College policy, and of houses with no women or a disproportionately low number of women living in them.

The Committee is concerned that in many cases members of these nationally affiliated chapters accept this "shadow" arrangement rather than risk losing the benefits that women have at the local level. We are concerned that the pressures of living with such a system strain rather than encourage a healthy spirit of coeducation. We are concerned that while such an arrangement may be enough to satisfy current College requirements, it falls short of the standard implied in Bowdoin's philosophy of genuine coeducation in all aspects of Bowdoin life.

The limitations that Bowdoin's fraternity system places on women has not been lost on the world outside Bowdoin. In its 1986 reaccreditation report, the New England Association of Schools & Colleges had this to say:

"The institution will need to assess over time whether the benefits of fraternity membership outweigh the negatives. It must, in the meantime, address several issues...It is believed that women are not only not allowed equal status in some fraternities but are subjected to humiliation and abuse and are permitted membership only because the existence of the house may depend on their presence...For the sake of women in particular and the College community as a whole, it is imperative that the College clearly define the rules for fraternities and enforce them."

A forceful insistence that fraternities create an environment that actively encourages women to participate fully in the life of these organizations is vital. Fundamental to this approach is an institutional expectation that women hold the highest leadership offices in fraternities and that they have the opportunity to reside in houses in numbers reasonably proportional to their membership. To do otherwise is to default on the College's commitment to gender equality.

Recommendation

1. No national fraternity that does not permit full membership with regard to sex shall be permitted to maintain a chapter on the Bowdoin campus after September 1, 1991.

IX

STUDENT CONDUCT AND LEADERSHIP

Student Conduct

At registration, every Bowdoin student signs a pledge saying, "I understand and agree to abide by the Social Code." The preamble to this code, which appears in full as Appendix R, states the following:

"The Bowdoin College Social Code describes certain rights and responsibilities of students. Although it does not attempt to impose a specific morality on all students, certain standards of behavior are required so that the campus community may be a center of learning.

The success of the Social Code requires the active commitment of all members of the community to the principles on which life at Bowdoin is based. Each student is expected to conduct himself/herself responsibly and to ensure that his/her guests do so, maintaining full respect for his/her fellow students and for the guests of the College as well as the entire College community."

Are fraternities and their members immune to this code? The answer, of course, is no. Despite any perceptions to the contrary, individual fraternity members and chapters are subject to the same rules and regulations that apply to all Bowdoin students. As with any Bowdoin student, adjudication of an individual fraternity member's behavior that violates College policy is the responsibility of the Student Judiciary Board upon referral by the Dean of Students. Adjudication of chapter behavior that violates College policy has never been officially clarified but has traditionally been the responsibility of the Dean of Students.

The Committee has heard that in the recent past some fraternities at Bowdoin have sponsored, tolerated, and excused conduct deemed unacceptable in other parts of the campus. We have also heard that fraternities rarely reprimand their own

members and that, in some instances, certain groups have obstructed administrative investigations by erecting a "wall of silence."

Neither the fraternities nor the College should tolerate inappropriate behavior. Both entities should insist on responsible conduct from fraternity members and chapters and should take firm action against those who breach organizational and community standards. Rather than protect members who violate regulations, fraternities have an obligation to the College community to report such activity promptly or to expect harsh administrative action. The practice of impeding misconduct investigations by concealment or misrepresentation weakens the College and fraternities and disrupts the educational process.

Clearly, fraternities must develop an attitudinal change before they can affect the behavior of their members. Too often, individuals join organizations to avoid intrusive supervision by the administration. While this choice may result in personal growth and development, the notion of unbridled freedom frequently fosters irresponsible conduct. Rather than promoting this image, fraternities must re-educate their members in the values of conduct consistent with a liberal arts education.

It must be abundantly clear to every Bowdoin student that the Social Code and other College policies apply equally to all students. Although responsibility for individual behavior normally rests with the individual, fraternities should be held accountable for student violations of College policy that occur on their grounds. They should also be held accountable for individual or group violations of College policy that occur off their grounds if the violations are part of a fraternity-sponsored or fraternity-related activity.

Student Leadership

A healthy college social organization succeeds through well-trained and motivated internal leadership. Unfortunately, Bowdoin's fraternities, like many student organizations on campus, seem to suffer from a lack of experienced student leaders. For instance, houses have no collective uniform periods of service for their officers, and this lack of standardization militates against effective leadership-training workshops. Some groups provide informal training for their new officers, but others simply learn on the job, often at the expense of valuable improvement in self-governance. Leadership also tends to change frequently, often each semester.

Most student organizations discover that juniors and seniors usually provide the most competent and experienced leadership. Sophomores, however, comprise an inordinately large number of fraternity officers at Bowdoin. Thus, those students who usually have the least leadership skills frequently oversee physical plants worth more than \$250,000. And although they hold office, their authority is not always respected by juniors and seniors.

Prudence would seem to dictate that older students, particularly seniors, should take greater responsibility for operating their houses. Ideally, juniors and seniors should comprise at least half the house residents. Also, major officers should be required to live in the house. Fraternities cannot afford to have their most able and experienced members living outside the houses and serving primarily as advisers rather than actively participating in important house business.

Conclusion

Guidelines for student conduct and leadership need to be established for Bowdoin's fraternities. Although Bowdoin may not need as elaborate a code book as that published, for example, by Dartmouth College, the Committee does feel that Bowdoin needs some written specifics to guide both the fraternities and the College in these issues.

Recommendations

1. Responsibility for the adjudication of fraternity chapter behavior that violates College policy should officially reside with the Dean of Students.
2. Specific written guidelines should be established for student conduct and leadership in fraternities.
3. Written governance and operating procedures for fraternity chapters should be clearly defined.
4. Uniform periods of service for fraternity officers should be adopted, with major officers being required to serve one-year terms.
5. Major officers should live in the fraternity houses.
6. The College should conduct leadership-training seminars for all fraternity officers and should require their attendance.
7. Orientation programs should be conducted for new officers to familiarize them with the duties and responsibilities of their positions.

X

RUSHING AND ORIENTATION

Students interested in joining a fraternity normally participate in the "rush" process. During rush, fraternities sponsor parties and meals to meet prospective students and to introduce them to the fraternity. Current College policy permits a two-week rush, beginning during the new-student orientation week and continuing into the first week of classes. For the past three years, fraternities have also sponsored a second-semester spring rush.

Virtually all freshmen who actively participate in rush receive a "bid," or a formal invitation to join a fraternity. The last day of rush is known as "drop night," when students choose which bid, if any, they will accept. New members are known as "pledges," and the next few weeks of new-member orientation are often referred to as the "pledge period."

College policy currently dictates that orientation end with an initiation night no later than four weeks after drop night. Fraternities are required to provide the Dean of Students with a schedule and description of their orientation and initiation activities before drop night. They must also adhere to the Bowdoin College Hazing Policy (see Appendix S) and must make this policy known to members and pledges. Orientation and initiation activities must be limited to fraternity houses and grounds. Violations of these guidelines are violations of the Bowdoin Social Code.

In 1987, the College and the Interfraternity Council (IFC) agreed to a "dry rush" policy (see "1987 IFC Rush Policy," Appendix T). This was a response not only to Maine State drinking laws and the College alcohol policy (see Appendix U) but to a concern that students make intelligent, informed choices about fraternity membership. Although this rush was largely successful, it was followed by a modified second-semester rush that was only partially dry.

Despite one successful dry rush and despite state laws and College policies, it is clear that problems still occur during rush and orientation. The Committee heard firsthand reports this year of hazing, sexual harassment, violations of the College and IFC alcohol policies, and of initiation activities taking place off fraternity grounds. Particularly disturbing was the fact that many students did not seem to have a clear understanding of what constitutes hazing; several incidents which were in violation of College policy and state law were cited that students had not identified as hazing. Also, few fraternities appear to take seriously the need to explain College orientation and initiation policies to pledges.

The Committee recognizes that rush and orientation are essential to the lifeblood of fraternities and supports the fraternities' efforts to responsibly renew their membership. At the same time, a review of the current system indicates some problems and a need for modifications.

Recommendations

1. A second-semester only rush should be adopted as soon as expanded dining facilities are available. The Committee understands that the IFC is considering such a change already and strongly endorses it. Given the enormous pressures facing new students in the fall, the present rush period distracts from their orderly introduction into the College community. A delayed rush would allow freshmen to make decisions about fraternities after adjusting to College life in general. The financial implications of a second-semester rush, however, may pose problems for a few fraternities.
2. All rush functions should be dry.
3. Unrecognized fraternities or sororities may not participate in rush.
4. Rush should be limited to ten days, ending on the second Saturday after freshmen arrive on campus in the fall or, in the spring, the second Saturday of the new semester.
5. A specific date should be set for initiation night within four weeks from the start of classes. This date should be listed in the student handbook under the fraternity guidelines.
6. Fraternities must, as currently required, give the Dean of Students a schedule and description of their orientation and initiation practices.
7. The "Bowdoin College Hazing Policy" should be rewritten to include clearer and more specific examples of hazing. All new students should be thoroughly briefed on the policy.
8. The College should establish and enforce clear sanctions for dealing with violations of rushing, orientation, and hazing.
9. Orientation programs should go beyond traditional initiation practices. Degrading but conventional elements of initiation such as fear, intimidation, line ups, and rote memorizations violate hazing laws and undermine the central mission of the College. A more formal program of pledge education should be adopted. This program should acquaint new members with the purpose and character of the fraternity and should address such campus social concerns as the College alcohol, hazing, and sexual harassment policies, racism, and the College social and honor codes, with particular reference to academic violations such as cheating and plagiarism. Faculty advisers or the Dean of Students should meet with pledge classes to assist in addressing these issues. Learning College and fraternity songs, histories, and traditions should also be encouraged during orientation.

XI

FRATERNITY GOVERNANCE

Fraternities and the College
Administration
Dean of Students' Office
Interfraternity Council
Faculty and Staff
Alumni and Alumni-Student Interfraternity Council

Fraternities and the College

For twenty-five years the College has had an official policy statement on fraternities (see Section II), yet no College policy has ever defined the relationship between the College and its fraternities. Consequently, there has never been any official framework against which to evaluate fraternities. This absence of a clearly defined institutional policy has been detrimental both to fraternities and the College community as a whole. Administrators remain confused about their legal and educational roles and responsibilities, and fraternities find operating in "organizational limbo" disconcerting. The situation generates unnecessary tensions within the College community and noticeably distracts from the educational process.

Because it has undeniably assumed a limited supervisory role with the fraternities, the College must carefully and thoroughly define its relationship with them. The Committee strongly believes that a well-defined institutional policy on fraternities would strengthen the fraternity system and considerably ease the day-to-day relationship between fraternities and the College.

Administration

With the elimination of the College's in loco parentis role about twenty years ago, the relationship between the administration and the fraternities appears to have declined. The Committee heard considerable evidence that communication between these two entities has not been clear and consistent and that fraternities have received different messages from different administrators, for example, about compliance with state alcohol laws. Some fraternity members have even received the impression (apparently justifiably) that the houses are expected to serve as the locus of illegal alcohol sales to minors in order to divert such problems from the dormitories.

Administrative leadership clearly has been lacking. As one administrator said to the Committee, "Perhaps fraternities are simply a reflection of what we've allowed them to become. Have we failed them as much as they've failed us?" It is absolutely essential that the administration speak with one voice to the fraternities on all matters and equally essential that the administration articulate an absolute requirement that fraternities comply in every detail with state and local statutes and College policies.

Dean of Students' Office

Responsibility for overseeing the undergraduate activities of fraternities resides with the Dean of Students' Office. Although fraternity life is essentially an extracurricular activity, Dean Lewallen conservatively estimates that dealing with fraternity or fraternity-related affairs occupies twenty-five to forty percent of his time. He finds acting as adviser and disciplinarian to the fraternities a difficult conflict and finds the fact that he cannot act as an official adviser to the Interfraternity Council (which is not College-recognized) disadvantageous.

Several people who spoke with the Committee identified a critical need for an Assistant Dean of Students whose job would consist of advising fraternities and other student social groups. "The talent required of a fraternity adviser who could effectively interact with students, faculty, alumni, and other administrators does not currently exist in one person at the College," said one administrator. The conventional approach of dividing such an important responsibility between several people seems inappropriate. The Committee strongly supports the creation of such a new administrative position, particularly at a time when significant changes are being recommended in the fraternity system.

Interfraternity Council

The IFC is composed of a president, vice-president, and the fraternity presidents and meets once a week to discuss common problems and ways in which fraternities can contribute more effectively to undergraduate life. It also governs rush and orientation policies and spearheads the role of fraternities in community service.

All of Bowdoin's fraternities currently belong to the IFC, including Chi Psi and Alpha Beta Phi, which are not College-recognized because of their single-sex status. As a consequence, the IFC is not College-recognized either (although a description of it appears in the Bowdoin College Student Handbook). It seems clear that if the IFC is to be a truly effective body, it needs College recognition and assistance, the latter both advisory and financial.

The Committee recognizes many positive efforts by the IFC, particularly in light of the fact that it has not received any College support. The Committee believes that with College support the IFC could play a major role at Bowdoin. In addition to establishing fraternity policies and helping fraternities solve internal problems, the IFC could take a leadership role in many campus activities. These could include promoting intellectual, cultural, social, and charitable activities;

promoting cooperation among fraternities and the greater community; promoting high standards of conduct both for chapters and their members; promoting responsible pledge activities; sponsoring leadership-training seminars; and addressing such social concerns as alcohol abuse and sexual harassment.

The IFC should not be responsible for policing or disciplining fraternity members, except in the case of violations of non-College policy that concern only the fraternities.

Faculty and Staff

Twenty years ago, faculty and staff constituted an important presence in Bowdoin fraternities. Each house had one or more faculty advisers, faculty and staff and their spouses were frequently invited to dinner, and some fraternities had annual banquets or other events to which faculty and staff were invited.

In the intervening years, faculty and staff involvement has declined dramatically. The decline undoubtedly is due to a combination of changing attitudes toward professionalism among the faculty and staff and to an increasing student perception that fraternities provide a sanctuary where academic matters can be held at bay. Most faculty and staff exhibit little interest in fraternities today and do not feel particularly at home in them. Their lack of interest is exemplified by an almost total dearth of comment as solicited by this Committee. Lack of interest on the part of both students and faculty/staff is reflected in the fact that only five of the eleven fraternities currently have an adviser. The Committee finds this situation undesirable.

A question recently arose on campus about the liability of faculty and staff advisers to fraternities. The College should make certain that faculty and staff advisers of recognized fraternities are covered as far as any personal liability is concerned by the College's By-laws and liability insurance coverage.

Alumni and Alumni-Student Interfraternity Council

Alumni traditionally have been among the fraternities' greatest supporters, both ideologically and financially. Like faculty involvement, however, alumni involvement with fraternities has also declined in the past twenty years or so, although the change has been quite variable from house to house. Some houses have been largely abandoned by their alumni; others have continued to enjoy vigorous support; and in others, one or a few alumni have provided leadership and support in a vacuum of other alumni interest. In the last case, such individuals have produced an impact far beyond what might be predicted from their numbers, and they deserve great credit.

One effort to improve alumni support to fraternities was the formation in the early 1980s of the Alumni-Student Interfraternity Council, which consists of one representative from each alumni corporation and all members of the IFC. The ASIFC meets monthly eight times a year and exists primarily to assist fraternities with such practical matters as maintenance, finances, and dining issues. Like the IFC, it is not recognized by the College.

The Committee believes that the ASIFC could be considerably stronger if it were recognized and supported by the College. While recognizing many positive efforts by the ASIFC, the Committee also suggests that it take a more active role, particularly in undergraduate fraternity life. Helping generate alumni support, acting as an intermediary between alumni and undergraduates, educating alumni to the current needs of undergraduates and to College policies, assisting the fraternities with programming, and even being present in the houses occasionally during such activities as rush, drop night, and initiation would all be beneficial to the undergraduates.

It is no accident that those fraternities at Bowdoin that have enjoyed effective alumni support, whether coming from a few or many individuals, are in much better shape physically, organizationally, and financially than those houses lacking such support.

Conclusion

A well-defined institutional policy on fraternities and the involvement of representatives from all parts of the College community are vital to a successful fraternity system. The Committee recognizes that it is difficult to promote interest and participation in the fraternities among some groups and expresses profound gratitude where such has existed.

The Committee believes that a healthier and more progressive fraternity system is possible at Bowdoin and hopes that administrators, faculty, staff, and alumni will be interested both in promoting and participating in an improved system.

Recommendations

1. A comprehensive document should be written by the College, after the adoption by the Governing Boards of this Committee's recommended policy on fraternities (see Section II), that:
 - defines the relationship between the College and fraternity chapters, including a statement of how fraternities relate to the mission and goals of the College and a statement of the responsibilities and privileges of fraternities;
 - defines minimum standards for College recognition of fraternities;

-defines what support fraternities can expect of the College;
-defines rules, regulations, and sanctions for fraternity behavior; and
-defines operational procedures for fraternity chapters.

2. The College should appoint an Assistant Dean of Students who would be responsible for advising fraternities and other student social organizations but who would not be responsible for discipline, which would continue to reside with the Dean of Students. Suggested duties of the Assistant Dean of Students will include:
 - advising fraternities and other campus social organizations;
 - advising the IFC;
 - advising the ASIFC;
 - working with faculty, staff, and alumni advisers to fraternities;
 - helping create fraternity policies;
 - educating fraternity leaders in such areas as liquor laws, hazing laws, and other legal issues; and
 - providing leadership training for fraternity officers.
3. Both the IFC and the ASIFC must be College-recognized organizations. The proposed Assistant Dean of Students should serve as the official adviser to the IFC and ASIFC.
4. Membership in the IFC must be limited to College-recognized fraternities only. Membership in the ASIFC should be limited to College-recognized fraternities only.
5. The purpose, responsibilities, and operational procedures of the IFC and ASIFC should be clearly defined.
6. All fraternities should have faculty or staff advisers who would become familiar with chapter operations, be available for consultation, and meet regularly with the fraternity. Ideally, houses should solicit their own advisers, but lacking such efforts, the administration should intervene.

There have been many instances of constructive advising by staff members lacking an academic connection, and such participation should be encouraged. However, it also appears desirable that each house have at least one *bona fide* faculty adviser, who would usually be in a better position to advise about academic matters and to promote fraternity involvement in the intellectual life of the campus.

It may be easier to induce a few faculty or staff members rather than just one to advise a fraternity. Group advising would also have the advantage of allowing both men and women to participate, an important matter at a time when the College demands full equality between the sexes.

7. The College should make certain that faculty and staff advisers of recognized fraternities are covered as far as any personal liability is concerned by the College's By-laws and liability insurance coverage.
8. The College should draw up guidelines defining the responsibilities of fraternity advisers.
9. Fraternity advisers should meet together as a group at least once a year and with the IFC and ASIFC at least once a year to share information and ideas and to evaluate the health of the fraternity system.
10. Fraternity advising should be recognized by the College in much the same way that committee service is recognized.
11. The administration should hold at least one forum a year with undergraduate fraternity representatives so the two groups can share information and concerns with each other.
12. The College should identify key alumni in the fraternity houses, express Bowdoin's appreciation to them, and encourage them to continue playing a vital role in the fraternity system.
13. The College should make a greater effort to inform alumni about issues affecting the College and fraternities, including such matters as legal liability and compliance with statutes and College policies.
14. If possible, each fraternity should have a local alumni adviser. The College should be willing to help a fraternity secure such an adviser if necessary.
15. Each fraternity should have an undergraduate officer who serves as an alumni liaison and coordinates alumni outreach. Suggested duties might include meeting with alumni representatives at least twice a year, maintaining an up-to-date alumni mailing list, publishing a biannual alumni newsletter, and publishing a calendar of events for alumni.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Academic Programs

Bowdoin fraternities function primarily as living and social centers. Most do not sponsor programs for their members or the college community that directly reinforce the curriculum or promote intellectual and cultural life on campus.

During the fraternity review, the president or another officer of each fraternity and the president of the Interfraternity Council (IFC) were asked to answer four questions concerning their fraternity and academic programs.

1. Do you, as a fraternity, sponsor any lectureships, seminars, debates, or cultural activities?
2. Do you have a faculty adviser?
3. Do you, as a chapter, offer any academic scholarships or prizes?
4. Do you have faculty dinners or other activities with faculty?

Their responses are summarized as follows.

Question 1. Six of the eleven fraternities sponsor no lectureships, seminars, debates, or cultural activities either for their members or the College community. A few activities are sponsored by the other five fraternities: Alpha Delta Phi hosts an annual speaker at their Roosevelt Cup dinner, Psi Upsilon sponsors an occasional forum or debate, Zeta Psi currently holds debates after the weekly Chapel talks, Delta Sigma has weekly after-dinner faculty talks, and Chi Psi has two after-dinner faculty talks per semester. The IFC currently sponsors weekly Chapel talks by faculty and students on a wide variety of subjects.

Question 2. Five fraternities currently have a faculty adviser. Three others are trying to get one.

Question 3. Two fraternities offer scholarships or academic prizes. Alpha Kappa Sigma offers four \$200 scholarships each year, and Alpha Rho Upsilon sponsors the James Bowdoin Cup, which is given annually to the College varsity athlete with the highest grade point average.

Question 4. Nine fraternities sponsor faculty dinners, ranging in occurrence from weekly to annually. Because they have no dining rooms, Alpha Beta Phi and Alpha Rho Upsilon do not have faculty dinners.

Although the fraternities are sometimes accused of being anti-intellectual, the Committee thinks the accusation probably is not a fair one. For one thing, individual chapters vary greatly, as do the academic accomplishments of their members. One opinion the Committee heard from several people on campus, from administrators to students, was that fraternities are not so much anti-intellectual as nonintellectual.

The Committee reviewed the "Study of Grade Distributions for Fraternities and Independents as of June 1985, 1986, and 1987," which was prepared by the Dean of the College's Office. Not surprisingly, individual houses varied greatly in their academic standing, from one that was consistently above average to a few that were notably below average. Although fraternity members as a group did have a lower percentage of High Honors grades than independents, the Committee found the study inconclusive and agreed that it did not indicate that fraternities are anti-intellectual per se. Furthermore, since other campus organizations are not judged on the basis of their academic standing, it seemed unfair to judge fraternities by such.

Although Bowdoin's primary purpose is the pursuit of academic excellence and the Committee encourages fraternities to assist in that purpose, the Committee also questions whether or not fraternities should be expected to provide enriching intellectual and cultural events, particularly on a campus already overwhelmed by a multiplicity of such events. Even if they have the energy and creativity to do so, is it realistic to expect them to have the financial resources? Are students in other living and social centers -- the dormitories, Coles Tower, or off-campus apartments, for example -- expected to provide such activities? Or are the expectations of fraternities different, given their original traditions? Although fraternities clearly should not be permitted to detract from the educational process, the College needs to recognize that they are primarily social organizations.

Community Projects

Ten of Bowdoin's eleven fraternities and the IFC participate in community service and charitable efforts, benefiting both the College community and the world beyond it. The degree of involvement varies considerably among chapters, with some being only minimally involved, others moderately.

On the local level, fraternities volunteer time or resources to such projects as the Bath Children's Home, Big Brother/Sister programs, blood drives, the Brunswick Council of Church's Soup Kitchen, the Brunswick Recreation Department (helping with the annual Halloween party for area children), the 55-Plus Center, March of Dimes, Maine State Special Olympics, The Salvation Army, and the Santa Claus Fund. They also raise money for such organizations as Habitat for Humanity, the Jimmie Fund, Oxfam, Red Cross, Save the Children, UNICEF, and United Way.

The Committee recognizes that fraternities should not be required to sponsor intellectual or cultural activities or to participate in community projects but commends those that do.

We believe fraternities can be a tremendous source of creativity and energy, that they have the human resources and potential to address many important issues, and that they can serve as valuable leadership training grounds. Those fraternities that do promote intellectual, cultural, and community events enhance the educational process, benefit the College and community, and demonstrate their value as organizations.

VALUE OF FRATERNITIES TO BOWDOIN
AS THEY EXIST NOW AND AS THEY MIGHT EXIST

The character of a liberal arts college is structured by a deep commitment to academic excellence and by a diversity of intellectual opportunities. Yet the expectations and values that are fostered and developed at an institution like Bowdoin permeate beyond the academic arena. As a residential college, Bowdoin is also concerned with offering a residential experience and extracurricular life that complement the humanistic values that underlie the liberal arts. In addition to providing guidance for academic and personal growth, it is concerned with instilling students with a sense of community awareness, concern, and responsibility.

In their long history at Bowdoin, fraternities have played and continue to play an integral role in the residential and extracurricular life of the College. For many years they have offered a popular living and dining alternative for students, a focus for social activities for members as well as nonmembers, and a training ground for students to develop leadership, organizational, and self-governance skills. They have fulfilled the need that develops at any large institution for students to band together in smaller groups, they have cemented lifelong friendships, and they have encouraged loyalty to the College. Externally, at least, they have also espoused the highly valued Greek ideals of "fraternity," such as leadership, character development, scholarship, and community service. According to the New England Association of Schools & Colleges' 1986 reaccreditation report, "There is among large parts of the (College) community continued support for the fraternities and the belief that their part in the development of their members and their contribution to campus life are unique."

The Committee agrees that certainly the goals of fraternities are unexceptionable. Yet, as the New England Association of Schools & Colleges' reaccreditation team did in 1986, we question "the extent to which these goals are realized in many fraternities and whether, instead, some kinds of undesirable behavior may not be encouraged and increased by the close ties binding fraternity members together." For while virtually all of Bowdoin's fraternities vigorously subscribe to honorable principles, the fact is that many of them currently devalue their commitments through such persistent excesses as promoting or excusing illegal alcohol consumption, substance abuse, hazing, raucous behavior, and sexual harassment. Indeed, it has been a series of abuses of the idea of "fraternity" over the past several years that prompted this Committee's review.

Responsible fraternities should realize that illegal or irresponsible behavior bears little resemblance to the Greek tradition and should genuinely seek to match rhetoric with practice. They should realize that it is not enough to be social centers without goals, to be simply retreats from campus concerns.

Fraternities and their members should have as much interest in promoting the high values that Bowdoin encourages as all other students and organizations. Their attitude should not be "How can we do X, Y, or Z and still remain in compliance with College policy?" but rather, "What can we do not only to maintain but to promote or enhance those values the College encourages?" Ideally, compliance with College regulations and policies should not be a problem for fraternities; they should be able to focus on more productive objectives.

Recognizing that students will always band together in small groups at any institution and that the College has a responsibility to provide a variety of opportunities for its students, the Committee feels that an active, diverse, and responsible fraternity system can play an important role at Bowdoin. If Bowdoin's fraternity system is to remain an integral part of the College community, however, the fraternities and their members must engender the values and standards of the institution. These should include but not necessarily be limited to the following: recognizing and complying with federal, state, and local laws and with College regulations and policies; encouraging academic excellence, high standards of conduct and leadership, and a healthy spirit of coeducation; maintaining high standards for living and dining facilities; addressing campus social problems; and establishing good relations with neighbors.

Undergraduate fraternity members are not the only constituents who establish what types of values fraternities engender. To a large extent, they take their direction from administrators, house corporations, and alumni. If Bowdoin's fraternity system is to improve and thrive, all interested parties must have a genuine appreciation for the potentially valuable role fraternities can play. Fraternities cannot become valuable assets to the College if undergraduates do not have the College's guidance and full support.

In an effort to help fraternities and the College engender the types of values that can make fraternities valuable assets to the College community, the Committee makes the following recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Every year by the end of the spring semester, each fraternity should submit to the Dean of Students' Office a review of its goals and objectives for the past year and a list of goals and objectives for the upcoming year with information on how it plans to attain those goals and objectives.
2. Each fraternity should be evaluated once a year by the Dean of Students' Office and the IFC.
3. The fraternity system as a whole should be reviewed periodically to assess whether or not it is continuing to complement the College's goal of enriching student lives.

XIV

CONCLUSION -

The College's approach to the fraternities has evolved from one of *in loco parentis* in the 1950s and 1960s to one of confusion and benign neglect in the 1970s and 1980s. As the societal pendulum has swung from one extreme to the other on many subjects, so it has swung on fraternities. This Committee believes that college students need social groups of varying sizes and designs with which they may, if they so choose, affiliate. Those groups, if they are to have College recognition, must meet College standards and conform to College policies on discrimination, social conduct, alcohol, sexual harassment, and other matters.

Historically fraternities have served as the predominant social groups at Bowdoin. This Committee believes fraternities have a continuing role to play at Bowdoin provided that the recommendations set forth in this report are adopted and implemented. If the recommendations are not adopted and implemented, then we believe fraternities should undoubtedly be abolished. To leave them in their present "never-never land" without the support and encouragement they need is to assign them to a slow but inevitable demise.

The College has an obligation to provide all of its students with adequate and varied social facilities. For many justifiable reasons the College has been slow to address its need for student social facilities, including an upgrade of fraternity facilities, identified by the Commission on Student Life in 1983.

This Committee is fully mindful of the financial and other costs associated with its recommendations, which address only one phase of providing social facilities (as well as rooming and dining facilities) that meet College standards. This report calls for a recommitment of Boards, administration, faculty, staff, undergraduates, and alumni to make a revitalized Bowdoin fraternity system work.

After careful deliberation, the Committee concluded that to do less than what is recommended would assign the fraternities to certain abolition. If, however, the Committee's recommendations are approved and implemented, the Committee believes that the result should be a healthier, stronger, and more enlightened fraternity system at Bowdoin that can play a vital role in College social life in the years ahead.

XV

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

1. The Committee finds that when viewed in light of the College life as a whole, all is not well with Bowdoin's fraternities. Serious problems exist and must be addressed. The Committee does not believe the fraternity system's abolition is justified at this time, however. The Committee unanimously recommends that Bowdoin retain its fraternities but that it revitalize and reform the fraternity system in light of the findings and recommendations set forth in this report. We believe the result can be a healthier, stronger, and more progressive fraternity system at Bowdoin, which will benefit the entire College community.

College Policy on Fraternities

2. The Committee recommends that the Governing Boards rescind their 1963, 1979, and 1982 votes on fraternities and adopt a new policy, based on this Committee's recommendations, which reads as follows:

VOTED: That Bowdoin College continue to recognize those fraternity chapters that conform to College policies as appropriate for developing student leadership and for providing housing and dining facilities consistent with the values of the College. It is College policy that membership in Bowdoin fraternities conform to Section 8.0 of the College By-laws; that no chapter of a national fraternity that does not permit full membership

regardless of sex shall be maintained on the Bowdoin campus after September 1, 1991; that any fraternity chapter not conforming with College policies be totally severed from any connection with the College whatsoever; and that the administration and other parties adopt such additional policies, rules, and regulations as will tend to make the fraternities constructive elements within the College environment.

Legal Status of Fraternities at Bowdoin

3. All College ties with any unrecognized fraternity or sorority must be severed on an absolute and total basis. Those organizations should not be permitted to participate in College organizations such as the Interfraternity Council. The Dean of Students' Office should have no contact with those organizations as such and should treat any students who are members of and living in such organizations on the same basis as other students living in private off-campus housing would be treated.
4. The College should require each recognized fraternity to furnish it with evidence of liability insurance coverage in such amounts as the College Treasurer, who is responsible for College insurance matters, may from time to time prescribe. Such coverage shall be a prerequisite to continued recognition.

Campus Social Life Problems

5. The College must resolve as soon as possible the need for adequate social space for students.
6. The Committee encourages all members of the College community to help curtail alcohol abuse and to encourage responsible behavior. The College should establish an Alcohol and Sexual Harassment Task Force to coordinate educational programs and concerns related to these two issues. Alumni and parents should be informed of the College's efforts in an attempt to solicit their support.
7. The College should make it absolutely clear to all students that they are expected to comply with Maine State drinking laws and with College alcohol policies.
8. The College must enforce drinking rules uniformly among all students.
9. A system of ID cards and doorkeepers should be instituted at all College and fraternity parties to control underage drinking. Campuswide parties that are open to unlimited numbers of people and that violate fire and safety codes shall not be permitted in any recognized fraternity or in any College facility.
10. The dormitory proctor system should be improved by requiring that proctors be juniors or seniors rather than sophomores; by assigning more proctors; by offering required training programs for proctors; and by adequately compensating proctors for their duties.
11. Such issues as alcohol use, sexual harassment, hazing, and fraternity life in general should be addressed in greater depth in freshmen orientation programs.

Physical Condition of Fraternity Houses

12. Effective August 1, 1990, students should be prohibited from rooming or dining in any recognized fraternity that is not certified by the Physical Plant Department as meeting College standards.
13. Effective August 1, 1990, recognized fraternity facilities should be inspected and certified by the Physical Plant Department on the same cycle that dormitories are.
14. To help fraternities meet College physical plant standards, the College must be prepared to (1) make mortgage loans of the necessary funds to the fraternities at one point below market rates or (2) take title to the fraternity property by gift, bring it up to College standards, and lease it back to the fraternity chapter.
15. The housing and dining capacities of each recognized fraternity should be established and the fraternities required to have occupancy within ten percent of capacity.
16. The College should adopt and enforce a policy that no one except Bowdoin undergraduates can live in any recognized fraternity house without written approval from the Dean of Students and that summer rental of recognized fraternity houses will be under strictly supervised conditions.

Financial Status of Fraternities

17. Effective July 1, 1989, all house corporation and student treasurers should be required to file standard and regular financial reports with the College Treasurer and the Dean of Students' Office on an annual basis.
18. The College should enforce a regular schedule of loan payments.

Membership Policies and Practices

19. No national fraternity that does not permit full membership with regard to sex shall be permitted to maintain a chapter on the Bowdoin campus after September 1, 1991.

Student Conduct and Leadership

20. Responsibility for the adjudication of fraternity chapter behavior that violates College policy should officially reside with the Dean of Students.
21. Specific written guidelines should be established for student conduct and leadership in fraternities.
22. Written governance and operating procedures for fraternity chapters should be clearly defined.
23. Uniform periods of service for fraternity officers should be adopted, with major officers being required to serve one-year terms.
24. Major officers should live in the fraternity houses.
25. The College should conduct leadership training seminars for all fraternity officers and should require their attendance.
26. Orientation programs should be conducted for new officers to familiarize them with the duties and responsibilities of their positions.

Rushing and Orientation

27. A second-semester only rush should be adopted as soon as expanded dining facilities are available. The Committee understands that the IFC is considering such a change already and strongly endorses it. Given the enormous pressures facing new students in the fall, the present rush period distracts from their orderly introduction into the College community. A delayed rush would allow freshmen to make decisions about fraternities after adjusting to College life in general. The financial implications of a second-semester rush, however, may pose problems for a few fraternities.
28. All rush functions should be dry.
29. Unrecognized fraternities or sororities may not participate in rush.
30. Rush should be limited to ten days, ending on the second Saturday after freshmen arrive on campus in the fall or, in the spring, the second Saturday of the new semester.
31. A specific date should be set for initiation night within four weeks from the start of classes. This date should be listed in the student handbook under the fraternity guidelines.
32. Fraternities must, as currently required, give the Dean of Students a schedule and description of their orientation and initiation practices.
33. The "Bowdoin College Hazing Policy" should be rewritten to include clearer and more specific examples of hazing. All new students should be thoroughly briefed on the policy.
34. The College should establish and enforce clear sanctions for dealing with violations of rushing, orientation, and hazing.
35. Orientation programs should go beyond traditional initiation practices. Degrading but conventional elements of initiations such as fear, intimidation, line ups, and rote memorizations violate hazing laws and undermine the central mission of the College. A more formal program of pledge education should be adopted. This program should acquaint new members with the purpose and character of the fraternity and should address such campus social concerns as the College alcohol, hazing, and sexual harassment policies, racism, and the College social and honor codes, with particular reference to academic violations such as cheating and plagiarism. Faculty advisers or the Dean of Students should meet with pledge classes to assist in addressing these issues. Learning College and fraternity songs, histories, and traditions should also be encouraged during orientation.

Fraternity Governance

36. A comprehensive document should be written by the College, after the adoption by the Governing Boards of this Committee's recommended policy on fraternities (see Section II) that:
 - defines the relationship between the College and fraternity chapters, including a statement of how fraternities relate to the mission and goals of the College and a statement of the responsibilities and privileges of fraternities;
 - defines minimum standards for College recognition of fraternities;
 - defines what support fraternities can expect of the College;
 - defines rules, regulations, and sanctions for fraternity behavior; and
 - defines operational procedures for fraternity chapters.
37. The College should appoint an Assistant Dean of Students who would be responsible for advising fraternities and other student social organizations but who would not be responsible for discipline, which would continue to reside with the Dean of Students. Suggested duties of the Assistant Dean of Students will include:
 - advising fraternities and other campus social organizations;
 - advising the IFC;
 - advising the ASIFC;

- working with faculty, staff, and alumni advisers to fraternities;
- helping create fraternity policies;
- educating fraternity leaders in such areas as liquor laws, hazing laws, and other legal issues; and
- providing leadership training for fraternity officers.

38. Both the IFC and the ASIFC must be College-recognized organizations. The proposed Assistant Dean of Students should serve as the official adviser to the IFC and ASIFC.
39. Membership in the IFC must be limited to College-recognized fraternities only. Membership in the ASIFC should be limited to College-recognized fraternities only.
40. The purpose, responsibilities, and operational procedures of the IFC and ASIFC should be clearly defined.
41. All fraternities should have faculty or staff advisers who would become familiar with chapter operations, be available for consultation, and meet regularly with the fraternity. Ideally, houses should solicit their own advisers, but lacking such efforts, the administration should intervene.

There have been many instances of constructive advising by staff members lacking an academic connection, and such participation should be encouraged. However, it also appears desirable that each house have at least one bona fide faculty adviser, who would usually be in a better position to advise about academic matters and to promote fraternity involvement in the intellectual life of the campus.

It may be easier to induce a few faculty or staff members rather than just one to advise a fraternity. Group advising would also have the advantage of allowing both men and women to participate, an important matter at a time when the College demands full equality between the sexes.

42. The College should make certain that faculty and staff advisers of recognized fraternities are covered as far as any personal liability is concerned by the College's By-laws and liability insurance coverage.
43. The College should draw up guidelines defining the responsibilities of fraternity advisers.
44. Fraternity advisers should meet together as a group at least once a year and with the IFC and ASIFC at least once a year to share information and ideas and to evaluate the health of the fraternity system.
45. Fraternity advising should be recognized by the College in the same way that committee service is recognized.
46. The administration should hold at least one forum a year with undergraduate fraternity representatives so the two groups can share information and concerns with each other.
47. The College should identify key alumni in the fraternity houses, express Bowdoin's appreciation to them, and encourage them to continue playing a vital role in the fraternity system.
48. The College should make a greater effort to inform alumni about issues affecting the College and fraternities, including such matters as legal liability and compliance with statutes and College policies.
49. If possible, each fraternity should have a local alumni adviser. The College should be willing to help a fraternity secure such an adviser if necessary.
50. Each fraternity should have an undergraduate officer who serves as an alumni liaison and coordinates alumni outreach. Suggested duties might include meeting with alumni representatives at least twice a year, maintaining an up-to-date alumni mailing list, publishing a biannual alumni newsletter, and publishing a calendar of events for alumni.

Value of Fraternities to Bowdoin as They Exist Now and As They Might Exist

51. Every year by the end of the spring semester, each fraternity should submit to the Dean of Students' Office a review of its goals and objectives for the past year and a list of goals and objectives for the upcoming year with information on how it plans to attain those goals and objectives.
52. Each fraternity should be evaluated once a year by the Dean of Students' Office and the IFC.
53. The fraternity system as a whole should be reviewed periodically to assess whether or not it is continuing to complement the College's goal of enriching student lives.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracy J. Burlock '81
Norman P. Cohen '56
Leonard W. Cronkhite, Jr. '41
John L. Howland '57
Cynthia G. McFadden '78
Scott V. Milo '88
Alfred D. Nicholson '50
Ann M. St. Peter '89
Anne W. Springer '81
Merton G. Henry '50, Chairman

APPENDIX A

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW FRATERNITIES

MERTON G. HENRY '50, of Standish, Maine, is Chairman of the Committee. He is a Trustee Emeritus who served as Chairman of the Board of Trustees from 1981 to 1984 and is a lawyer in Portland, Maine. He was first an independent and then a member of Alpha Delta Phi as an undergraduate.

TRACY J. BURLOCK '81, of Brookline, Massachusetts, is an alumna member of the Committee, a banking executive in Boston, and was an independent as an undergraduate.

NORMAN P. COHEN '56, of Lexington, Massachusetts, is the current President of the Board of Overseers and a lawyer in Boston. He was a member of Alpha Rho Upsilon as an undergraduate.

LEONARD W. CRONKHITE, JR. '41, of Brunswick, Maine, is the current Chairman of the Board of Trustees. A physician, former hospital president, medical school teacher, and dean, he was a member of Chi Psi as an undergraduate.

JOHN L. HOWLAND '57, of South Harpswell, Maine, is a Professor of Biology. He was a member of Beta Theta Pi as an undergraduate.

CYNTHIA G. McFADDEN '78, of New York, New York, is an Overseer of the College, a lawyer by training, and a television producer with Columbia University Seminars on Media and Society in New York. She was first an independent and then a member of Zeta Psi as an undergraduate.

SCOTT V. MILO '88, of Lewiston, Maine, is a student member of the Committee, former President of the undergraduate Interfraternity Council, and a member of Zeta Psi.

ALFRED D. NICHOLSON '50, of Orr's Island, Maine, is a retired college Dean of Students and is President of the Alumni-Student Interfraternity Council. He was a member of Chi Psi as an undergraduate.

ANN M. St. PETER '89, of Caribou, Maine, is a student member of the Committee, an independent, and a member of the Student Judiciary Board.

ANNE W. SPRINGER '81, of Brunswick, Maine, is Director of Alumni Relations and as an undergraduate was an independent.

ELIZABETH CARY PIERSON, Smith '75, who studied one semester at Bowdoin and is married to an alumnus, has served as staff to the Committee.

- "Remarks at Alumni Council," talk given by Merton G. Henry '50, Chairman, The Committee to Review Fraternities, January 29, 1988, Bowdoin College
- "Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Students of Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine," the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools & Colleges, 1986 reaccreditation report, pp. 20-21 re fraternities
- "Report on the Status of Fraternities," June 11, 1987, Robert C. Wilhelm
- "Report to the President of the Commission on Student Life" (Thorne Report), June 30, 1983
- "Response of the President to The Report of the Commission on Student Life," A. LeRoy Greason, November 1983
- "The Role of College Fraternities in the 1980s: A Comparative Study of Bowdoin and Colby Colleges," Kimberly A. Hokanson, June 2, 1986
- "The Status of Women in Bowdoin Fraternities: A Chronology," Allen L. Springer, September 10, 1984
- "Student Life Committee 1984 Survey of Bowdoin Students," August 1984

From Other Institutions

- Amherst College
 - "Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Trustee Committee on Campus Life," January 1984
 - "Final Report of the Ad Hoc Trustee Committee on Campus Life," February 1984

- Bucknell University
 - "Report of the Committee to Study Fraternities and Sororities," March 20, 1985
 - "Response to the Report of the Committee to Study Fraternities and Sororities," Gary A. Sojka, September 11, 1985
 - "An Update: Response to Recommendation of the Committee to Study Fraternities and Sororities," October 23, 1985

- Colby College
 - "Report of the Trustee Commission on Campus Life," December 1983

- Dartmouth College
 - Constitution and Minimum Standards for Co-Ed, Fraternity, and Sorority Organizations 1987
 - "Trustees Statement on Residential Life," July 6, 1987

- Trinity College
 - "Report of the Ad Hoc Trustee Committee to Study the Fraternity/Sorority System," March 1983

- Washington and Lee University
 - "Standards for Fraternities," no date

- Wesleyan University
 - "Report of the Task Force on Residential Life," Spring 1987

Prepared Specifically for the Committee

- Academic Programs and Community Projects: Information was provided by the president or another officer for each fraternity and for the IFC.
- Alcohol Use: Counseling Service provided information on educational programs and services available to students regarding alcohol use.
- "Financial Planning Issues Concerning the Fraternities at Bowdoin College," Thomas J. Hochstettler, fall 1987
- Financial Status of Fraternities: Information on corporation finances was provided by alumni corporation treasurers.
- "Fraternities," memorandum from Dudley H. Woodall re fraternity finances, January 7, 1988
- "Fraternity Housing, Fall 1987," statistics compiled by the Dean of Students, January 1988 (Appendix Q)
- "Fraternity Membership 1987-88," statistics compiled by the Dean of Students, January 1988 (Appendix P)
- "Fraternity Regulation," memorandum from College Counsel, Verrill & Dana, January 14, 1988 (Appendix C)
- "Guidelines for Fraternities," memorandum from Kenneth A. Lewallen and Paul L. Nyhus, February 9, 1988
- Physical Condition of Fraternity Houses: Physical plant inspected all eleven fraternity houses in January 1988 and submitted detailed reports on each to President Greason (these reports comprise Appendixes E through O).

Miscellaneous

- Articles from the following publications were reviewed:
 - Bowdoin Alumni Magazine
 - The Bowdoin Orient
 - The Chronicle of Higher Education
 - The Fraternity Newsletter, Association of Fraternity Advisers, Inc.
 - The New York Times
 - The Orlando Sentinel
 - The Whispering Pines

II. INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED BY THE COMMITTEE

Students

- Michael Augustini '89, President, Theta Delta Chi
- Wendy Carlson '90, President, Alpha Beta Phi Sorority
- Valentine Foti '89, President, Zeta Psi
- Vincent Fusco '89, President, Alpha Kappa Sigma
- Peter Gergely '89, President, Psi Upsilon
- Karla Hasben '88, Afro-American Society representative
- Kirke Lawton '89, President, Alpha Rho Upsilon
- Allan Macintyre '90, President, Delta Sigma
- Edward Pond '88, President, Chi Psi
- Kevin Potter '89, President, Beta Theta Pi
- Glen Raffel '89, President, Alpha Delta Phi
- John Secor '90, President, Delta Kappa Epsilon

APPENDIX B

SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

The Committee held its organizational meeting on October 10, 1987. At that time it agreed to hold public meetings; to meet with interested parties; to solicit written comments from students, faculty, staff, alumni, Governing Boards members, and parents who could not meet with the Committee personally; to review pertinent reports and materials; and to visit the fraternity houses. The Committee pledged to have an open process and to conduct an objective review of fraternities at Bowdoin.

Altogether the Committee held six days of meetings in addition to the individual reading, writing, and discussion in which each Committee member participated.

In the six months of its existence the Committee has held two public meetings on campus at which forty-four people spoke; met in nonpublic meetings with forty-seven people ranging from administrators to fraternity neighbors to a delegation of national fraternity leaders; read and discussed a voluminous amount of written material from Bowdoin and other institutions; and received and reviewed some sixty letters ranging from recommendations to abolish fraternities to paeans of praise for them. A complete list of information sources follows.

1. WRITTEN MATERIAL

From Bowdoin College

- Bowdoin 1987-1988, catalog distributed by the Admissions Office
- "Bowdoin College Alcohol Policy"
- "Bowdoin College Hazing Policy"
- Bowdoin College Student Handbook '87-'88
- "Convocation 1987," convocation talk given by A. LeRoy Greason, September 4, 1987, Bowdoin College
- "Fraternities 1987," chapel talk given by A. LeRoy Greason, September 15, 1987, Bowdoin College
- "Fraternities and Social Life," Chapter IX from The History of Bowdoin College, Louis C. Hatch, Portland, Maine: Loring, Short & Harmon, 1927
- "Fraternities at Bowdoin," chapel talk given by A. LeRoy Greason, April 11, 1984, Bowdoin College
- "Grade Distribution for Fraternities and Independents as of June 1985, 1986, and 1987," statistics compiled by the Dean of the College's Office, February 1988
- "I.F.C. Rush Policy, 1987"
- "Memorandum," from the Centralized Dining Service to all fraternity alumni presidents and treasurers re new board and guest pass system, July 27, 1987
- "Memoranda," eight memoranda from the Dean of Students to fraternity officers re rush and orientation, August 1986-September 1987

College Personnel

David N. Barbour, Director of Physical Plant
 Robin L. Beltramini, College Gynecologic Nurse Practitioner
 William J. Fruth, Student Activities Coordinator
 A. LeRoy Greason, President of the College
 Thomas J. Hochstettler, Dean for Planning
 Kenneth A. Lewallen, Dean of Students
 William R. Mason, Director of Admissions
 Craig A. McEwen, Acting Dean of Faculty
 Richard A. Mersereau, Director of Public Relations and Publications
 Paul L. Nyhus, Dean of College First Semester
 Patricia S. Rathbone, Director of College Counseling
 Allen L. Springer, Associate Professor of Government, Dean of Students 1980-1982
 Randolph Stakeman, Assistant Professor of History, Dean of Students 1984-85
 John H. Turner, Professor of Romance Languages
 Roy E. Weymouth, Jr., College Physician

Alumni

All alumni corporation officers were invited to meet with the Committee. The following alumni did so.
 Marsha Gilliam '77, Delta Kappa Epsilon
 Loring E. Hart '48, Sigma Nu
 Brian C. Hawkins '64, Chi Psi
 Samuel A. Ladd '29, Zeta Psi
 Donovan D. Lancaster '27, Alpha Kappa Sigma
 Phineas Sprague '50, Delta Kappa Epsilon
 Geoffrey R. Stanwood '38, Alpha Delta Phi
 David E. Warren '76, Theta Delta Chi
 Clement S. Wilson '57, Delta Sigma

Miscellaneous

Delegation of National Fraternity Leaders:
 Duncan Andrews, Executive Director, Delta Kappa Epsilon
 Herbert Carroll, Executive Director, Chi Psi
 Geoffrey Fitzgerald, Executive Director, Theta Delta Chi
 M. Blake Hargrove, New England Undergraduate Representative, Chi Psi
 Kathleen M. McGlone, Executive Director, Psi Upsilon
 Gregory E. McElroy, Executive Director, Zeta Psi
 Chuck O'Boyle, Director of Alpha Services, Chi Psi
 John F. Schaller, Assistant Executive Director, Beta Theta Pi
 Ralph and Nancy Tucker, McKeen Street residents and fraternity neighbors
 Robert C. Wilhelm, Dean of the College, 1980-1987

III. CORRESPONDENCE

Comments on the fraternity review were solicited from all constituents of the College community: faculty, administrators, staff, students, alumni, and Governing Boards. Notices soliciting such comments were placed in The Bowdoin Calendar, The Bowdoin Orient, The Whispering Pines, in fifty-some fliers posted around the campus, and in letters to the faculty and Governing Boards members, both active and emeriti.

A total of sixty letters were received and distributed to the Committee. Included were thirty-five letters from alumni, four from faculty members, eleven from Governing Boards members, one from a fraternity neighbor, two from parents, one from a student, and six from miscellaneous people.

IV. PUBLIC MEETINGS

On November 19 and 20, 1987, two public meetings were held on campus to receive comments on the fraternity review. Each meeting lasted from approximately 7:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. All ten Committee members were present at the first meeting; nine of the ten were present at the second.

A total of forty-four people spoke before the Committee at the two meetings. They included two administrators, five alumni (all fraternity members), two faculty members, and thirty-five students (at least twenty-eight of whom were fraternity members).

V. FRATERNITY INSPECTIONS

On November 21, 1987, the Committee visited each of the eleven fraternity houses on campus. With the exception of Alpha Beta Phi Sorority (where the Committee was late arriving and students had had to leave), an officer in each house gave Committee members a complete tour.

Table VII-A

FINANCIAL STATUS OF FRATERNITIES (cont'd)

	Delta Kappa Epsilon	Delta Sigma	Psi Upsilon	Theta Delta Chi	Zeta Psi
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Mortgage w/ College	-	-	-	-	-
2. Maturity	-	10/1/98	-	10/15/75	-
3. Rate	-	11.5%	-	6.75%	-
4. Principal outstanding 10/31/87	-	76,710.44	-	4,000.00	-
5. Principal in arrears 10/31/87	-	0	-	0	-
6. Interest in arrears	-	0	-	0	-
7. Last prin./int. payment made	-	10/29/87 p. & i.	-	12/9/86 i.	-
8. Accounts receivable to College 12/8/87	733.36	4,519.31	846.01	1,339.41	251.16
9. Dining reserves w/ College 6/30/87	15,434.00	4,886.00	24,270.00	31,080.00	19,373.00
10. Mortgage w/ national?	No	NA	No	70,000.00	No
11. Estimate of repayment schedule	-	See note	Within one year	See note	-
12. Significant outstanding debts to oil suppliers, etc.	No	No	5,000.00 Br. Coal & Lumber	No	No
13. Assessed value of house & property (60% of est. market value)	190,700.00	197,000.00	158,000.00	197,300.00	253,400.00
14. Estimated market value of house & property	317,833.00	328,333.00	263,333.00	328,833.00	422,333.00
15. Annual real est. tax	4,805.64	4,964.40	3,981.60	4,971.96	6,385.68
16. R.e. tax paid?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

NA= not applicable

to meet with
to report
Life, January
Final Report of
Life, February

to meet with
to report
Life, January
Final Report of
Life, February

First Class
Postage Paid
Permit No. 2
Brunswick, ME
04011

BOWDOIN COLLEGE
Office of the President
Brunswick, ME 04011



BOWDOIN COLLEGE

Report to the President
from the Committee
to Review Fraternities