## Classification of Respondents

### The FREQ Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C3</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 1: 20 Hour Limit to New Member Education Hours

Obs  C6

1 30 hours is a solid amount of time

2 This is not nearly enough time to get to know the members of the chapter—especially if 15 hours of this weekly maximum gets taken up by study hours.

3 I feel that more impactful diversity would be beneficial.

4 Placing arbitrary limits on NME time will do nothing toward eliminating the culture of hazing that permeates Vanderbilt Greek Life.

5 Not enough time to for strong bonds between members of each pledge class; current 30 hour schedule already provides ample time to participate in other campus activities and devote time to study. Further limiting time devoted to new member education process is counterproductive for the development of IFC chapters with productive members.

6 As a member of one of the few chapters that actually abides by the current 30-hour rule, quite frankly, this would never work. My chapter had a values-based non-hazing New Member Education Program. This experience was extremely formative for myself, and I know for the rest of my pledge class, as well as our current new members. Reducing the hour-maximum would hurt chapters like mine who actually abide by the rules. I also have friends in many other chapters. I know for a fact that these chapters (which I will not name) have NME hours well over 30 hours. This requirement would lead to more than half of Greek Row going to IFC judicial. This is just the facts. I would instead try to work proactively with the individual New Member Educators of each chapter, so as we can create a culture of values-based NME processes that mirror my own chapter.

7 By creating a maximum of 20 hours weekly, the school will be reducing the significance of joining a fraternity and limit the ability of the new members to learn the ways of the chapter. Party patrol training, green dot training, and other similar events are all time consuming activities that are important and fall under the umbrella of new member education. We think that we have a lot more to teach than can be taught in 20 hours a week. Our national headquarters mandates that all new members be ritual proficient. This requires hours of teaching and practice to memorize and present a 5,000 word speech from memory. The point of joining a greek house is to learn about the house and to develop relationships with the people inside the house. The new member classes want to spend time together and the best place to do that is by being at the house during the week for the current amount of hours.

8 I disagree with this proposal, although I'm aware that this proposal has good intentions. In my opinion, having a maximum amount of time that the new members can interact with brothers will only place unnecessary restrictions on the new member education process. The new members want to spend time getting to know their fellow new members and learning about their chapter, and violations of this rule would probably occur without any ill-intent, thus causing chapters to get in trouble for a violation of a technicality.

9 The New Member Education process would not be able to be fully realized with only 20 hours in a week, and would make the experience much worse.

10 I do not believe 20 hours per week for New Member Education is an adequate amount of time. Also, I would need a definition of what constitutes a New Member Education Hour to make a recommendation for what this figure should actually be.

11 New Member education is crucial to the longevity of the chapter as the new member will soon take on roles as leaders within the chapter. I truly do not understand why a governing organization (like OGL) would seek to hinder the introduction of new members into existing organizations. Any limit on new member education hours works directly against the complex process that must occur for new members to be correctly introduced to and educated about the chapter.

12 The NME process in its current format is the reason why our Greek life community has continued to dominate the campus in terms of GPA and participation. While most chapters rarely ever approach 30
hours of NME a week, sometimes it’s necessary. If you eliminate ten possible hours from the program, you are eliminating hours of mandated study time and constructive activity, which I believe would be greatly to the detriment of Greek life.

13 As a New Member Educator, I find this recommendation unrealistic and problematic. If we allow for only 20 hours, with 10 of those being study hours, then my curriculum vastly suffers on a week by week basis. I wouldn’t even be able to see the New Members every day. New Member Ed is supposed to be an intensive and challenging portion of fraternity life. I am more than happy to make accommodations to those who need sleep or more studying, but I find that many of my new members wish to spend as much time with each other as possible, so that they can form relationships and challenge each other to be great. Moreover, limiting New Member Ed to 20 hours may encourage unsolicited and secret practices, which may lead to more hazing on this campus due to the lack of oversight.

14 New member education is a time for new members to bond with one another and with members of the chapter. Placing this maximum on new member education will reduce the strengths of these bonds and lead to less rewarding friendships and less connections with other members within a chapter.

15 Enforcement of the existing 30 hour limit on New Member Education is nearly nonexistent. Changing the recommendation without seriously stepping up enforcement is not worthwhile.

16 I find that a 20 hour maximum per week would prevent new members from assimilating into the chapter. It would prevent the new members from truly connecting with the brothers in the chapter due to the lack of time. However, this recommendation could be implemented if there was an extension to the length of pledgeship. In essence, it is not the amount of time per week that is an issue, it is the amount of time in aggregate.

17 With only 20 hours a week, especially with the amount of mandatory study hours, brothers and new members would not be able to build connections that is associated with a brotherhood. They also would not learn the rituals and other functions which bond us additionally.

18 What constitutes the 20 hours? What if a new member wants to hang out with older brothers, and therefore goes over the limit? Is the chapter therefore at fault? I think there are too many questions and it is unfair to micromanage like this.

19 A lot of the hours per week (15) are already allotted to having mandatory study hours. To be completely honest, I did more studying during new member education than I did before, or have done since – and I took a very difficult course-load. If you cut down the weekly new member education to 20 maximum, it will only decrease the amount of study hours from 15 - 5 mandated by the new member process. The suggestion to decrease the time commitment does not seem necessary either because I felt more than capable to maintain my difficult course load and club involvements (which had meetings during study hours so I had even less than required) and go through new member education as it is currently set up. In fact, my highest grades were during new member education because of how much structure and organization I had.

20 It is important during new member education for new members to spend time together. During the new member education process I got to know my brothers on much more personal level. I think that imposing this regulation will take away from the bonding experience.

21 I really think this number depends on what will be classified as a NME hour. In my chapter, we made the new members have 3 hours of study hours every day over the entire week. If those were considered NME hours, we wouldn’t be able to do that and other activities that are integral to the new member education process because these hours would take up all of the time. I think that what’s really important is for each chapter to work with the Office of Greek Life to implement a new member education curriculum that is non-hazing and focuses on the values that guide each and every fraternity. My fraternity’s new member education process is entirely values driven and I think that new members GPA’s rise during the process, their campus involvement remains high, and they come out of the process men who are better able to serve their community. If every chapter had a process like this, there would be no more hazing and no problems with the NME process.

22 I’m indifferent on this one.

23 Pledging is about making friends with brothers and their pledge class. Give them time to do so.
The New Member Education process is designed so that active brothers in every class are able to get to know the new members. With 20-hour maximum weeks, that means 15 hours will be study hours and 5 hours a week to form meaningful relationships with actives, and learn about the fraternity. That is 30 hours over the course of 6 weeks to get to know 90+ brothers while developing into an active Greek leader. That averages out to be 20 minutes of time to get know each brother which is impossible.

20 hours a week is not enough time to bond with 20+ kids in a pledge class and the brothers already in the house. Having an ample amount of time to form relationships is essential in creating a culture of brotherhood rather than friendship.

This recommendation is completely unnecessary and cripples the new member education process. If 15 out of those 20 hours are dedicated to study hours then that only leaves a total of 5 hours for the entire week dedicated to new member education. This is not enough time to properly educate the newest members on fraternity history and the expectations for brothers of our chapters.

Less than three hours a day is not adequate time to achieve the pledge class and brotherhood unity that we strive to create during the New Member process. I do not believe a maximum weekly number of hours needs to be implemented, but if it does it should be more like 35 hours a week.

I don't know how the task force would keep track of new member Ed hours when the change is made. Can you tell when a person has reached the 20th hour compared to the 30th. A change in wording doesn't mean anything if not enforced. I don't think it will cause that much of an impact and cause a lot of disparity between chapters and offices.

I don't think there should be a maximum on the number of hours. I understand this limit is supposed to prevent hazing, but I don't think it would achieve this affect. Fraternities would find ways to hide the amount of time their new members are spending with brothers. Additionally, I know my fraternity works extremely hard to provide constructive activities for new members to accomplish, so putting a maximum amount of time they can be educated would take away from this.

As a representative for a non-pledging fraternity, I have a different opinion on a new member process than most. However, I can't believe this to be productive to the growth of Greek life. The pledging and new-member education process is what builds pride, knowledge, and community within fraternities. When you cap that, you take that bond away.

I think that a weekly maximum of 20 hours would significantly diminish the efficacy of a New Member Education program. Consider the fact that new members receive, at minimum 15 hours of solely study time per week. Is there enough time, in those remaining five hours, for new members to get an accurate feel for the chapter, interact with brothers, interact with their fellow new members, and learn chapter history? I believe this answer to be unequivocally 'no.' For this reason, I believe the imposition of an hours limitation is an ineffective way to foster whatever change is desired in the New Member Education process.

The high level of time commitment and the pursuant time spent together as a pledge class stand as two of the most important aspects of pledging a fraternal organization. To those who would complain, I would recommend they turn to advocating for how the time is spent, rather than trying to limit the time itself. I would absolutely support increasing and enforcing daily study hours, but I think that this need in no way diminishes the need for maintaining the current level of time commitment to new member activities.

It's a little too much. It pretty much prevents new members from participating in other organizations as well as making other friends. The study hours should also be reduced. The maximum should be 15 in my opinion.

Twenty hours per week for New Member Education is simply not enough time to teach the new members the values and history of the fraternity while acquainting them with the active members and their pledge brothers.

The new member education period is already a relatively short process, at only six weeks. Further limiting the number of weekly hours available for new member education puts a strain on our ability to properly introduce our members to the values and ideals that are central to our organization. Acceptance into a Greek organization is not meant to be an easy or trivial process. If it were, that would defeat the point of having the organization in the first place. Placing a 20-hour weekly maximum
new member education hour limit detracts from our ability to instill the values and insights of our organization into our new members and degrades the significance of joining a Greek chapter.

36 NA

37 If this cuts down on study hall time then I think it's a bad idea. Study hall is extremely helpful and having 3 required hours a day that are specifically geared toward getting work done is a fantastic concept.

38 If these 20 hours do not include study hours then it is not as much of a disagreement. However, if it does include study hours, 20 hours is simply too little to appropriately fit in all the education required in the 6 weeks. We do not just teach simple fraternity history, but a lot of this time is devoted to education in life skills, career paths, and general attributes of adulthood that are very important and helpful in molding a young man to the best of his capabilities.

39 I have been the new member educator. There is a lot more to accomplish in the 6 weeks than administrators realize. Even beyond then the new members do not yet seem prepared to take positions within the fraternity. During this time they work with each committee. Making the already short process even shorter would put the new members at a disadvantage.

40 The New Member Education Process is intended to aid in building some of the strongest relationships that the New Members will ever experience, the likes of which are very difficult to build outside of the Greek system. By reducing the amount of time that New Members are allowed to spend with one another, the Greek system would essentially cripple itself, by reducing the unity of the incoming classes and fostering fractioning within the class, as New Members would then be able to pick and choose which other New Members they would like to hang out with in their newfound free time. Personally, I strongly believe that there should be no time restrictions on the new member education process; it only lasts 6 weeks, and there is an exponential return on investment from the amount of time the New Member class spends together. Putting an even lower maximum restriction on the amount of time the New Member process is allowed to take of each New Member's day would cripple the process even further.

41 The basis of the GLTF's recommendation seems to be the 20 maximum hours that NCAA athletes are allowed. To put simply, fraternity new members are not NCAA athletes. These new members are not getting up early morning for practices and spending those 20 hours doing physical activity. As the report states, 15 hours of the current 30 are used for study hours. That leaves 15 hours for activities that actually make up the purpose of pledge education (learning about the fraternity and the chapter, bonding with pledge class brothers, etc.). Study hours are mandated in order to keep the academic's number one priority of the new member. To reduce the maximum to 20 hours, in order to maintain the academic standard, one would expect 15 study hours still, leaving 5 hours for other actual activities. It is argued that new members should be encouraged to study on their own time in Commons and such; fact is freshmen are more likely to not quite self-motivated yet. I believe it should stay as it is.

42 One of the great advantages of the New Member Education process is the ability to connect with your pledge brothers, active members, and the concept of the fraternity due to spending time there. My pledge brothers and myself find ourselves naturally migrating to the house to study and hang out because we spent a great deal of time there during new member education, and it creates a bond that has made our fraternity house and our friendship much more valuable and worth maintaining.

43 This would be impossible to enforce. Also with any more restrictions this would incentivize students to just move fraternities off campus where there are less rules and regulations. I joined a fraternity to form a genuine bond with people. I attribute the strong bonds I have with the people in my fraternity to my new member education process. Any more restriction and people will surely move their fraternities off campus.

44 The Task Force completely failed to point out the fact that 15 of the current 30 hrs are mandatory study hall hours. We will absolutely not decrease the amount of study hours, so 20 hrs per week would leave 5 hrs per week to perform actual new member education activities, which is simply not feasible for most houses per national requirements. The fact that this Task Force spent TWO YEARS conducting this study and was still completely unaware that 15 hrs per week are dedicated to study hall, something that literally every member of an IFC affiliated fraternity knows, shows what a complete
failure this study was.

45 My main point here is that part of the "hours" counted are mandated study hours which are not hurting but actually helping students academically. // Also, we only have 6 weeks at Vanderbilt to form this individuals to the standards of our chapter, and effectively develop them. That's a lot to cram in six weeks, and placing further time constraints on it would significantly decrease the impact we can have on these young men early on.

46 Too much

47 It is certainly worthwhile to place a cap on NME hours, though a cap of 20 hours may be very low in that it is too prohibitive towards immersion in the fraternity experience, assuming that this recommendation does not include "study hours" as part of the total of 20 hours. If it does, then such a recommendation is extremely prohibitive towards the aforementioned goal. That being said, the general concept of a cap is absolutely the right course of action, as the standing policy of new members staying in fraternity houses no later than midnight (among other regulations) has serious potential for both abuse and consumption of excessive amounts of new members' time.

48 15 hours is the current amount required and is usually more than enough for most new members. If needed for tests or assignments, new members are granted extra time. Increasing the amount of required hours for each week would make it more difficult for the new members to do other things like participate in commons events and such.

49 This seems unnecessary. A large aspect of new member education is getting to know the brothers. This is done through spending a lot of time around the chapter.

50 In theory, capping the # of hours of NME each week is great. However, it doesn't solve the actual problem of the fact that the actual programming going on isn't always constructive towards building a more cohesive new member class and shaping future members of the brotherhood. Getting hazing and detrimental programming out of the NME process is more vital than capping the # of hours (because 20 hours of hazing is just as bad as 30 hours of hazing). There needs to be programmatic fixes first.

51 Insufficient amount of time to provide meaningful new member education. Only practical way to do this would be to reduce study hours which would hinder academic progress. Unlike to be effectively followed/enforced.

52 The primary concerns with this recommendation deal with the actual implementation of the recommendation. The idea behind new member education is to have intentional and purposeful member education activities, rather than simply limiting all activities to a hard numerical cutoff.

53 New member education is a time for classes to come together and become more cohesive. The more time they spend together, the closer they typically become. Rather than attempt to strictly limit the amount of time they may spend together, I believe it would be better to provide new member educators with more constructive activities in order to reduce ultimately reduce hazing incidences.

54 I think that IFC should loosen hazing standards in exchange for more open pledging processes from chapters.

55 The 30 hours that have been prescribed already include 15 hours devoted to study hours - shortening the maximum would only cut out on study hours. These hours are used for new members to collaborate and get to know each other better.

56 I don't think that 20 hours per week is enough time for new members to be able to connect/bond with the chapter before being initiated.

57 When I was a new-member, the additional time helped provide structure in my day, gave me an opportunity to get to better know my pledge brothers. Additionally, the interactions I had during this time were extremely helpful academically, as it gave a freshman such as myself people to study with and learn from.

58 I think the idea of limiting the number of hours spent "on task" is necessary. However, many situations do arise when new members will spend more than 20 hours in a week doing chapter activities because of various retreats, programming events, etc. I would also like to point out that in practice, new members spend 15 hours/week doing real activities. The other 15 hours of the current 30 hour
maximum are study hours. This recommendation would not necessarily change the practices in place. If we want to have more new member engagement in other parts of campus, I think we can do more than just changing an hour limit because the 20 hour maximum would not have an impact.

59 5 hours daily is sufficient during the week if this does not include study hours. However, weekends should be included as well. Community service events, educational activities and other elements of new member education are often time-intensive. New members should be available every day of the week, both to grow closer together and to allow for a balance between intensive education and leaving their academic coursework uncompromised.

60 How would less than 3 hours a day for a few weeks help bring the class together at all?

61 The hours spent as a new member were pivotal making my undergraduate experience as incredible as it has been. Largely because of the time commitment and the need to work as a team, we came together as a pledge class and formed bonds that I wouldn't trade for anything. My Greek experience has been by far the best part of my larger Vanderbilt experience and I wouldn't want to "trim down" any of it. Our new member education process is designed to bring each pledge class together and I wouldn't want to change it in any way.

62 Currently, IFC regulations state 30 hours maximum. When you consider that 15 of these hours are protected study hours, that only leaves 15 hours of activity for NME. This is under the cited 20 hours for NCAA athletes. In addition, the 20 hour rule for NCAA athletes does not incorporate study hours. Should the NME weekly max be cut to 20 hours, only 5 hours would then be left for true NME activities. Hardly enough to accomplish any meaningful bonding or education. The GLTF should look into GPAs of members during their new member semester. Anecdotally, my new member semester was my best semester GPA of college. The impact of these study hours should be taken into account when considering NME time maxes.

63 Personally, I don't see anything wrong with the 30-hour maximum for new member education, especially if 15 of those hours are dedicated to study hours. The biggest issue I have with the recommendation is that it gets rid of mandatory study hours. These hours play a major role in helping prevent hazing, and help ensure that new members still focus on academics while being newly involved in greek life. This also helps play a role in the academic success on greek life. If I understand the goal of this change is to allow new members more time to participate in other extracurriculars, but I believe it will actually have the opposite impact and actually increase the new members' "pledging" workload. As of now, only 15 hours can be spent on pledging activities and 15 on studying. Under this change, that workload would be changed to 20 hours on pledging activities and the new members would have to find studying time on their own, which would be more difficult.

64 That is not enough time for a pledge to be able to learn the traditions of the fraternity. They must know the bylaws and meet everyone during the pledge process and this time cap is not enough to cover that. Increase the cap.

65 Maximums on New Member Education Hours will interfere with new members' abilities to freely engage with the organizations they join. The process should be as flexible as possible to allow new members to create their own experience.

66 Freshmen need to spend more time getting acclimated to campus and working on their studies. I think Rush activities currently take away from that by requiring too much time.

67 New Members need to be given enough time to get their studies done, however, there is a fair amount of time that they have during the day in between classes and when they are not permitted to be at the houses where they could do their work as opposed to messing around.

68 I agree with this limit, however the reasoning is absolutely illogical and mathematically incorrect. To use the guise of adding in study time for each class (which in reality are GREATLY exaggerated) is simply not true. Study hours is not an ADDITIONAL amount of time, but the time they are saying should be added in order to keep up with class. It is not mutually exclusive. In fact, it directly overlaps and is instituted for that purpose exactly. When it comes to policy reality is more effective than theoretical. Look at Kissam emergency exits. Students on this campus do not study 3 hours a day. They simply do not. However, providing all New Members with 3 hours a day (which almost every fraternities do and follow up on) is providing them with more academic time management than they would ever have otherwise. Not knowing the students you govern in a realistic light is a concerning
aspect of this report.

69 Why limit this? What a person gets out of something is directly linked to the effort put in.

70 What NME hours are used for is more important than the number of hours. Most NME programs include both academic (study hall, typically) and non-academic hours (service, social integration, "pledge project" and fraternity education). Cutting the hours would likely come at the expense of study hall, in particular, undermining the value that all Fraternities place in academics. / Given that NME is only 6 weeks in the time of a 1st year, this seems like a blunt tool who's benefit to their larger university life comes at great expense to a values based Fraternity system. / Recommendation - focus on the activities during NME and accountability for them.

71 A minimum number of hours for pledge training are needed. As the hours per week go down number of weeks should go up. Most Nationals have thoughts on this. Pledge training is only 1 semester and very low on the list of what is wrong.

72 If passed it will likely force chapters to make pledge education program more efficient.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 2A: Hire Area Coordinator

1. Greek housing already has enough supervision. I have cops walk through my house twice daily and the facilities management staff always seems to be a notable presence.

2. This is unnecessary; only six students live in each house, are already acquainted with living on campus/ with their fellow members, and have resources already available to them.

3. Students old enough to live off campus or in greek housing would not use that as a resource. It is predominantly upperclassmen who are familiar with the available resources on campus. Additionally, greek house managers are undergoing more intensive training so that they can fill more of a resident advisor role in the house. Greek residents would more likely reach out to their friends for advise than to a stranger. It seems like a superfluous position when the house managers already exist within the residences.

4. I'm not entirely sure of the purpose of this proposal - I don't really see a point to it and therefore I think it would be unnecessary. I'm going to be honest, the majority of people don't care at all about programming, and people in greek houses and off campus wouldn't care. / / I know that some people think that people in greek houses are "being neglected," but I can assure you that is not the case - those who live off campus and in greek houses do not want or need to be babied by the university.

5. They are already regulated enough without adding anything more to the their plate.

6. I believe that college is a time for students to learn personal responsibility. I believe that students might feel as though the area coordinator is being assigned to Greeks as a babysitter. I believe this decision will be ineffective in properly monitoring the Greek community. What might work better is interviewing undergraduate students for positions (I'd recommend 6 spots for these students to fill total). If students monitor other students I think the Greek community would be much more accepting of their authority.

7. This just seems unnecessary. Vanderbilt already has too much administration. Shouldn't the Faculty Senate be worrying about why this school is already so expensive in lieu of fretting about how the school can better worm its way into the business of off-campus and Greek students, which can only lead to even more inflated tuition and housing costs?

8. Requiring a Vanderbilt employee to live with students who are off campus is an overreach into one's personal privacy.

9. My tuition is already high enough, I do not support the hiring of more administrators so that it can be increased even further.

10. I think this is a valid recommendation. Possibly, a coordinator in charge of students who live off campus is an overstep. I think that students who live off campus should be allowed to essentially go without university intervention in their living arrangements.

11. I do not see the added benefit from this because I believe our chapter advisers partially serve these roles. House managers also make sure that regulations are followed and go through RA training.

12. It has happened and it working very well

13. I don't really think this is necessary. I think that ideally, a residential member of each house should go through the same training as an RA (right now I believe they do a shorter version). I don't think an area coordinator is necessary, it seems like a solution without a problem.

14. I'm not sure I see what right the school has to impose regulations on students living off-campus. They have been granted permission from the university to live on their own. I do not believe it should be within the institution's power to monitor students who are not living in on-campus residential halls. I think the school only has the jurisdiction to regulate actions on campus.

15. I personally don't think this is necessary.

16. Where will the money come from to hire this Area Coordinator. The duties of this potential AC are/can
be done by the House Managers of each house.

17 This is simply unnecessary. We are adults and do not need to be monitored in this way. Doing so is an infringement on privacy and independence.

18 There is ample time for this area coordinator to do both. I think it would be a waste of money. Opportunity cost isn’t great here.

19 I think this could be a great addition to Greek life on campus, if it done correctly and the area coordinators take it seriously.

20 I think that this is a recommendation that goes both ways. Were the AC to be responsible, accountable, and transparent, I doubt I would oppose such a measure. As it stands currently, those in Greek Chapter Houses are more or less “left out to dry” in terms of their living arrangements. However, if hiring the AC is a way to condition how all chapters operate internally under the guise of coordinating activities/housing for Greek members, I would fully oppose the measure.

21 I feel it is unnecessary.

22 I don’t think that this is the worst idea. Greek houses are considered on campus housing, so it’s kind of fair. Off campus housing should not be regulated however. The point of living off campus is to have added freedom, which seniors should have.

23 There is no need for this. Those who live off campus are adults and do not need anyone watching over them. I believe it is a waste of money and manpower.

24 We already have a faculty advisor for our chapters and weekly checks on the state of the house. An Area Coordinator role would simply be redundant. To my knowledge, no other Vanderbilt organizations have an off campus housing Area Coordinator, so the creation of this role is nothing but a thinly veiled attempt to limit the freedom of members of Greek chapters.

25 There are way more than enough people keeping tabs on the everyday working of greek life. The area where an individual like this could be helpful is to help with issues in the houses such as leaks, rodent issues, etc. I know that we already have someone who is supposed to do this, but repairs and the like take weeks. Every time a toilet is clogged or something is broken I just have to get used to being without it. This is not acceptable especially with the amount of money greek house residents pay to live in the houses.

26 NA

27 In effect, we already have coordinators. Randy with housing, the graduate students who work with Greek life, and the greek office already act as our area coordinators. I see it more as just an additional person on Greek payroll which would INCREASE dues more so causing further financial burden.

28 I read the task force. The reason they said this would be beneficial is lack of programming without an area coordinator. As an already busy student (biology major) I likely wouldn’t participate in any extra programming. This position would be redundant and could cost greeks more money directly. We have house managers we do not need an AC

29 Ask any student in University Housing when the last time they interacted with their AC was. Ask Greek members if they feel they are missing out on anything by not having AC’s. In either case, you will find that an added AC for Greek residents would be a waste of University time and resources. The members living in Greek houses chose not to live in Vanderbilt Housing, and they believed that living in a Greek house would provide them with more than they lose by not living in Vanderbilt Housing.

30 A lack of an Area Coordinator for Greek Housing and Off Campus Housing is a duly noted discrepancy, and I think this would be a good addition

31 I don’t necessarily think it’s necessary, but if it would make the administration more comfortable then sure. I would, however, recommend that the cost of hiring these new employees does not come from Greek students, as Greek life affordability is already an issue and does not need to be added onto.

32 There is already an area coordinator for off campus residents, and an Area Coordinator would serve no new purpose outside of the work already regularly done by Randy and Catherine.
33 As an RA, I see the existence of an AC for the Greek community as very beneficial in general. While Randy Clark has been a huge asset as an AMS, he is not an AC-type individual. Among other things, having an AC for Greek houses would reiterate the basic fact that the houses are indeed part of Vanderbilt (i.e., owned and leased out by Vanderbilt to the organizations) and must thus abide by many of the same rules as in residence halls. If such an AC is appointed, then it would be highly favorable (though not absolutely necessary) for that person to have been in an IFC fraternity or NPC sorority, as there is a chance for a non-Greek AC to be met with antagonism in the community (or, at least, moreso than he or she already would be by virtue of being a supervising university administrator). Of course, a AC with prior experience working with Greeks (Carmichael Towers AC Michael Brown, for example, worked with Greeks while he worked at the University of West Georgia).

34 The Office of Greek Life in my experience already fulfills any need this Area Coordinator could serve. Maybe adding a new position within OGL would be the best solution.

35 Seems like a decent idea. However, how would the residential situation of this AC be determined? Will House managers act as the RAs? How will graduate assistants fit into this system (they function somewhat as RAs just by the nature of residing in the house). Seems like two conflicting ideas, and an over-allocation of resources to Greek Row.

36 The Greek Office appointed a head of Greek Housing (Catherine) who seems to fulfill the necessary duties of area coordinator effectively.

37 My main concern with this recommendation is that a Greek AC would be covering the smallest number of students (a large portion of which are off-campus) on campus, adding privilege to a group of people that is already considered to have the most resources on campus.

38 A lot of work is already put in by housing managers and the office of Greek life to ensure that everything is running as it should. Moreover, to instill this system would be incredibly reductive of greek leadership as it is introducing a third party to babysit them more or less.

39 It is unnecessary but the resources dedicated to fixing issues with the houses have to improve. I lived in a Greek house last semester that was filthy because we could not get it fumigated or properly maintained.

40 I am honestly not sure what the role of an AC actually is, but it seems fine to me.

41 I currently live off campus and still feel that there is more than enough programming available to me. Perhaps there could be events for those living in Greek Chapter Houses to better get to know their neighbors.

42 I think an Area Coordinator for the Greek Area would be nice. Currently, Kristin Torrey basically does that job herself. I would push back on the fact that Greek students are not being supported, however. In a survey filled out by hundreds of IFC men, the first people they would go to with a mental health or personal problem are brothers. This implies that the inherent community within Greek Life serves as the necessary support for students. More $$ spent on Greek students also pushes our privilege forward when I think other sectors of campus are in more dire need.

43 Off campus students certainly do not need an area coordinator, the entire point is that they are no longer within the Vanderbilt housing bureaucracy. As for greek housing, the number of students living there is minimal already.

44 Not applicable because Vanderbilt does not own the Phi Kappa Psi house. Future residents should apply to live off campus and be treated as such.

45 I like this recommendation, as many basic housing needs are not currently met in Greek houses. For example, we haven't working laundry machines for quite some time, we've put in many maintenance requests to fix the water pressure in our shower, and many other things that either don't get done or take weeks to get handled. When I lived in normal dorms, this type of thing would never happen. So hiring a staff member who could oversee the Greek residential experience is a great idea.

46 A little more oversight in houses would be nice. Moreover, an AC could implement programming to engage Greek House residents in a new way. Ultimately, I'd expect to see fewer divisions between Greek chapters because of the opportunity to easily engage multiple chapters at a time.
This is absolutely necessary. Greek houses (especially fraternities) get far much less maintenance attention than they require, and many maintenance requests get ignored or barely looked at. I have lived in a Greek house here, and personally, in my fraternity in recent years, we have submitted dozens of requests for the same issues without so much as a response. There are major problems with regards to the roof leaking, and we have had multiple people from maintenance come in for other issues (along with plenty of requests) and state that this was a major problem and needed fixing, only to have no follow-up response from these interactions. Having a graduate student in charge of housing has helped immensely, but having an Area Coordinator would put that much more importance on housing conditions. The students living in the house deserve the same attention to living conditions that students living in dorms get.

This is not really that helpful I believe.

It's such a small portion of campus that it's not worth all of that time, trouble and money. Kristin Torrey and the OGL already do this job brilliantly. She understands the community and its members better than anyone, so I think a change here would be counter-productive.

AC's do such great work and would be able to check in with the residents of the Greek houses and help them. Especially with the increased number of off-campus students in the coming years, there's no reason for Vanderbilt to ignore the students that need its support.

The Greek office continually thinks adding more and more people to oversee things is the solution to every problem. The Greek office is one of the most inefficient uses of human capital I have ever witnessed first hand. Instead of adding people, adding bureaucratic paper work and organizational routes, as well as money to spend will only add to the ineffectiveness of this body. To be effective, the group needs to dole duties out efficiently and more effectively. The real issue I have is the mass negligence of funds that are given to the Greek housing fund. $300 per person per house is a huge amount of money to not have record of. This needs to be addressed. Handle this before you add more people.

We already have oversight of this. No need to hire anyone else. This would cause more dilution of responsibility on the part of the University and result in more bureaucratic compliance.

THIS RECOMMENDATION NEEDS TO BE SPLIT INTO TWO. / Agree - Area Coordinator for residents in Chapter houses. However, Disagree - Area Coordinator for UGs off-campus. The notion that this can be an effective and useful influence on those UGs in off-campus housing is optimist at best. In loco parentis only makes sense for on-campus students, the solution for off-campus students is to build more housing sooner or matching enrollment to housing.

Part of Greek life is going into adulthood. This means being responsible for your own house. The greatest lessons are through mistakes. The more services the University provides the less preparation for adulthood our members have as they feel responsible for less and less. There are a sufficient number of educational programs already provided for every member to find whatever he is interested in. If all the Chapters on campus had an active volunteer faculty advisor the same goals could be accomplished through advice and discussion with better understanding between Greeks and Faculty. These faculty advisors do not have to be Greek. Just willing to help. Strongly support faculty advisors. Oppose Area coordinator. In theory our house residents are some of our best members and our leaders. We have no need of an Area advisor.

I believe this would decrease the impact of chapter advisers and Greek Life staff.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 2B: Hire 1 to 3 Graduate Resident Assistants

Obs  C10

1  What would this accomplish? Ask yourself that.

2  The house managers serve as effective residential advisors. I room with one of them and he has taken
to heart all of the RA training. We manage ourselves well enough.

3  Not sure why this is a recommendation. This is already being implemented.

4  See above comments.

5  College students do not need resident assistances when they live in their own greek homes. Greek
houses already have janitors and house managers so no other assistance is necessary. House
managers are now being trained to direct students in need to on campus resources such as the PCC.
Most students are over 20 years of age and most houses cannot accommodate another person.
Personally, I would be very uncomfortable with a stranger living in my house.

6  I've already addressed this in other sections, so I'm not going to say the same thing twice. But basically,
the last thing that we want is to be babyed more by the university. I can assure you, almost everyone
I've talked to in the greek system does not care for this proposal.

7  Having an RA in greek houses would be a horrible situation. The entire idea that the house is a safe
place for brothers to express themselves would be completely reversed by putting an RA in the house.
It would definitely result in far less attendance at the house if brothers felt like they were constantly
being judged and watched.

8  Assuming these Graduate Resident Assistants would live in chapter houses, I strongly disagree with
this recommendation. Having non-members living in a fraternity house is not conducive to the ideals of
a fraternity and could easily lead to the compromise of ritual and other fraternity practices.

9  I believe that this decision would once again discourage the Greek community from learning personal
responsibility. I also believe that chapter houses should be places for brothers and sisters only.
Introducing a new element that is unaffiliated with that chapter will lower the sense of
brotherhood/sisterhood that a chapter house is meant to provide. I'd once again like to recommend my
idea for using undergraduates to help supervise Greek Row.

10 Greek life already has too many administrators, which has created a overly-complex system for getting
the necessary approval or support for any kind of house issues.

11 Please read my previous comments. One of the reasons why our Greek community looks so white and
privileged is because you keep hiring useless, unwanted administrative staff, thereby ratcheting up the
cost of attendance and ensuring that the only people who can come here are wealthy white kids.

12 My tuition is already high enough, I do not support the hiring of more administrators so that it can be
increased even further.

13 I think this would inhibit an organization to act as an independent entity. When an organization loses its
independence it ceases to have its own unique identity. Personally, I have acquaintances in the Delta
Tau Delta fraternity that have expressed extreme disdain for the OGL member that lives in their house,
explaining that it "cramped their style".

14 We have a live in Graduate Resident and it makes very little difference in reality, so from experience I
think it would not be helpful. It does however expose our ritual to others which I do not think is desired
by anyone.

15 I do not like this recommendation. A lot of fraternities on campus hold many ritual events in their
houses and it seems to deteriorate on the ritual when non-members could just be wandering around in
the house during it. My chapter has formal chapter when we bring a lot of the ritual elements into the
meeting which could be as often as once a week. It seems like a nuisance to have a graduate student
who can live in a house but cannot enter the house during certain hours. Once again, it also seems to
be a solution to something that is not a problem, I have read the task force report but I do not understand what exactly the Graduate RA would accomplish better than a member of the house who is trained as an RA.

16 I'm not sure I see the point of this regulation. Our house managers are being forced to go through the same RA training as everyone else. Having someone who is not a member of the chapter living in the Greek chapter house takes away from the feeling of solitude that the house provides. When I go to the house, I want to be greeted by my friends and brothers, not Area Coordinators.

17 To me, one of the beautiful and important things about being in a fraternity is that it is a safe space where I feel like I have the ability to be open and honest with my needs, wants, fears, and desires. I feel like the implementation of a Graduate Resident Advisor would prevent students from feeling the brotherhood aspect that is so important to a fraternity. I think a better solution is to integrate a resident advisor into each house by combining the RA position with the house manager position. That way, there will be someone who is a part of the brotherhood working to advance the goals of the AC and director of Greek Life. With this set up, I don't think there will be adverse affects to brotherhood and I think it will result in greater accountability and safety in Greek houses.

18 I would think of this as a big intrusion on the privacy of the people living in the house.

19 This recommendation places a burden on Graduate Assistants. Most fraternities already have RAs that are apart of their organization. This also moves potentially 3 people out of living spaces. I do not believe there will be any benefits that come from an in home babysitter.

20 what is the point of IFC if were going to have the administration run everything. Isnt there something to be said about students taking responsibility and working with their peers to better the greek system.

21 This would completely disrupt the cohesiveness and unity of a brotherhood. The house is the center of the chapter. If there is a non-brother living in that house then there is no dedicated space for brotherhood. This person could disrupt rituals and other important and secret brotherhood events.

22 Have graduate students advise, but it could create a large divide in members living in houses.

23 This would detract from the brotherhood and sisterhood.

24 I do not see any benefit to this proposal, and furthermore do not know where these Graduate RAs would live. "Greek Row" is extremely vague, and I feel confident in stating that nearly every chapter would voice strong concerns with having a live-in RA, especially as in concerns practices such as formal chapter meetings, initiations, and the like that are to be meant solely for initiated members and are subject to the utmost secrecy.

25 Introducing non-chapter member to chapter facilities serves to invalidate the purpose of a chapter facility. What was once a safe space for exchange of ideas would be turned into a public forum.

26 That would not be necessary.

27 I don't think that this would be much of a use, just a waste of money. I think that an Area Coordinator would be a fair compromise.

28 There are numerous graduate students who work in the Office of Greek Life and who we as leaders in the Greek community are often in contact with. Again, this would be a redundant position and would only muddle the proper chains of communication within the Greek community.

29 I don't think this is an effective way to implement change in the greek system. This just causes individuals to be even more discrete and pushes events and activities off campus where more harm can be done with less fear of punishment.

30 NA

31 The fraternity housing is perfect as is. Adding Graduate resident assistants would disrupt the enjoyment and fraternal atmosphere of the houses. They are already on campus and under the supervision of Vanderbilt in many respects. Additionally, accommodating an additional person in the houses is quite impossible for many houses and would require additional renovation which would be a financial burden.
Like I said we have house managers we are ok.

Here again the idea arises of "wasting University resources". I don't know what "work" these Graduate RA's would be supporting. It is not specified. Until this is made clear I cannot really agree or disagree, but I do not agree that the residents in Greek housing require the same supervision that Vanderbilt Housing residents have.

Having three live in Graduate RAs would not be a good use of the University's resources. Currently having one in the Delta Tau Delta house is more than enough in my opinion. I think a better solution to this is to provide RA training to all of the residents of the chapter houses (in the next question). This training will allow Greek presidents to be able to police themselves, so having an more than a dozen RAs in those couple blocks along with the Area Coordinator will enough.

Living in Greek Houses provides students with a certain amount of independence that is not available in other residential housing and allows for students to more easily become accustomed to the style of living that they will have after graduation. Allowing these students this freedom I believe better prepares them for a life after graduation when University resources are no longer available.

I don't understand how the Office of Greek Life needs more people regulating the fraternities. Also it is ludicrous to expect people to tolerate living with Resident Assistants in fraternity houses.

In all honesty, I question how effective they would be and whether or not they would have any impact at all.

I think the one Graduate assistant has worked well. Catherine has been extremely helpful to our chapter, especially with the past inadequacies of the Greek Housing Office. Catherine has been a major improvement from our past experiences. I don't think more would be needed, though.

Catherine, the grad student who lives in the DTD house, already basically serves the function of this position. Beyond that, I don't see any tangible benefit to this proposal.

Stay out of our lives.

My comments on this carry the same general sentiment as my comments for the last question. Very good idea and reinforces the notion that the fraternities and sororities are actual parts of the Vanderbilt community and are thus under supervision. Additionally, with these live-in GRAs, it may expose Greeks to the field of Higher Education Administration, where their officer experiences would likely be useful in the many careers available in HEA. In my own experience at Vanderbilt, it is typically only RAs who go out of Vanderbilt pursuing degrees and careers in HEA due to interest generated via many associations with those in the field.

I don't think this is necessary.

Prefer this system to the AC mentioned above. Three grad assistants on greek row would be much more effective than one AC.

Where are these RAs going to live? Placing RAs in Greek houses would be mutually detrimental to fraternity/sorority members and the RAs placed there.

Steps have already been made in hiring Graduate students to live in the Greek community.

This doesn't make any sense, graduate assistants do not live in 6 person Kissam suites with students - This seems a little invasive/unordinary.

I think it's a good idea.

I think this is a great idea.

Greek Life should not place people into the houses. If non-undergraduate advisors are necessary let the alumni network and chapters screen applicants and choose.

The AC idea is great, but there is no other AC on Vanderbilt's campus that has more than one graduate assistant. This just feels like an attempt to insert graduate students into the Greek residential system. If this were to happen, Chapter Presidents and governing councils would need to have a strong hand in selection. Throwing someone into the house who is not a member of the chapter.
drastically changes chapter dynamic and placing someone there without this consideration could lead
to a miserable situation for the chapter and the graduate assistant. I would also like to see how these
assistants will engage off-campus residents because little attention has been paid to them at all in the
report.

51 I think this has been an effective program so far, but it does provide a major inconvenience to the
fraternities that house the assistance. These fraternities are given no compensation even though it
significantly affects the housing situations for the members living in the house. I think improvements
need to be made to the houses before the assistants can reside in the houses.

52 This sounds like something that will just be tacked on to Vanderbill's bill to people in Greek life, further
alienating people away from it who can not afford to pay dues, which is completely contrary to our
goals.

53 See above. No need

54 They need to make their roles very clear and need to help support the chapters by helping to create
programming for the chapters that align with Vanderbill's mission

55 Same issue as previous component. The greek office continually thinks adding more and more people
to oversee things is the solution to every problem. They have more than enough people working there
adding more is only going to render them more ineffective.

56 See my answer to the previous question.

57 Several years ago, our House Corporation voluntarily remodeled our house to accommodate and then
engaged a Resident "Advisor". This person, gender immaterial, has been a very positive presence in
the life of our Chapter, serving only our Chapter. We highly recommend our model to others. / However, the suggested new Graduate Resident Assistant(s) accountability, authority, and reporting
relationships for/of this new position plus a maximum of 3 persons for all the Chapters may be too
complicated to be anything other than a policeman. I would strongly agree if the objective was to place
such a person in every house or serve no more than 2 houses per person. With smaller groupings,
more personal, trusting relationships develop and the "assistant" can become more of an "advisor". Advisors can stop things before they happen. Assistants, more commonly, report on things after they
happen.

58 I already disagreed with the idea of an area advisor. As for RA's, This is an old Greek custom to have a
house mother or other responsible person live in the house and see as an advisor and adult presence.
This is the most important single item to aide the current chapters. The more you have the better. Each
house would like to think of the RA living in the house as their own and is not thrilled with having to
share them. Strongly support. Let these RA's work for Greek Life. The problems on Greek row and off
campus differ. //

59 I think having someone close to chapter members' age might be helpful but would like to see more
details about proposal before making a decision.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 2C: Require Greek Chapter Presidents RA Training

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = No Opinion, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

Obs  C12

1  I think a 2-3 hour course could be beneficial... not a 2-day affair.

2  The RA training allows chapter presidents to better understand the issues facing students, especially the ones living in their chapter's house. I truly believe that the house managers and presidents have enough training to effectively control greek residential life.

3  This makes no sense

4  While this is a good recommendation in theory, the additional training required for what is already a demanding position puts more strain on each chapter president; this training would subsequently be accompanied by the additional responsibilities of a Resident Assistant. The position of RA is a paid position, so to impose additional workload on each chapter president without the monetary compensation for what is, in very real terms, a job, would be unfairly taking advantage of these people.

5  I believe that this is perhaps the best of all the Greek Life Task Force recommendations.

6  It is completely unreasonable to ask chapter presidents to add further training to their already full schedules.

7  As a house manager, I undergo similar training. It is helpful training, however, our president does not live in our house.

8  I'm neutral on this one - however, I would think this would be beneficial in cases of emergencies.

9  Presidents are elected on their ability to lead the fraternity and handle all the responsibilities that come with it. Training them to be RAs would be redundant and a waste of time.

10  Much of the RA's job seems to be building a sense of community in dorms and on floors. This does not need to be done by fraternity presidents because there is already a sense of community within houses.

11  While I think training can be effective, I feel that I receive enough training as a chapter president that more training wouldn't help me that much. I also believe that chapter presidents are overbooked as it is and more training is not going to help with that. I think the training should be available, but not required.

12  The training is barely applicable.

13  It couldn't hurt, though it's just another training session to heap onto the pile that is already burdening the shoulders of Greek officers.

14  This is a good recommendation, and training presidents in the same way that RAs are trained could only help people in need.

15  While I do not disagree with this recommendation in principal, I think it is superfluous.

16  We already participate in numerous programs that are about taking care of others, and then the rest of RA training is not directly applicable. Also House managers participate in the other RA programs so it is not necessary for both to do so.

17  They are extremely busy as is and it is unfair to subject them to a week of training. A couple hour session might be beneficial, but anything more will result in diminishing marginal returns, given that they are living with their fraternity brothers and not an VU student like RA's in the dorms.

18  I think this is reasonable; the only change I would make is that have the house manager or "risk chair" be the one to participate in it instead of the president.

19  This seems like a good idea to me.
20 Far too much work
21 the RA role and the chapter presidents are very different roles /
22 I think that the house manager should undergo this training. The president already has too many other responsibilities.
23 I'm not sure what this would achieve, but I don't think it could hurt anyone. It can only do good; I'm just not sure how crucial it is.
24 Don't dissuade the best candidates from running for president because they don't want to be an RA.
25 Greek Chapter presidents already undergo a significant amount of programming, and to burden them with RA training is—in my opinion—a poor use of their time. Given that their co-residents are their brothers/sisters, they possess a more intimate knowledge than that of your standard Vanderbilt RA. In short, I do not think the program yields enough benefit to justify the time commitment.
26 As a greek house manager, I participated in RA training. Little to none of the information presented was relevant to the house management position, nor could be, in my opinion, relevant to a house president.
27 It wouldn't hurt to have a trained person in each house.
28 Greek Chapter presidents are not resident assistants. We already go through numerous leadership and mental health education modules in addition to the fact that we already have strong relationships with our members by virtue of our new member educations processes. To me, this is a needless recommendation.
29 NA
30 Although I am opposed to additional meetings for presidents who already do so much this may be beneficial. However, I feel it is unnecessary and the marginal benefit is minimal as we already go through so many programs that teach us what is needed to identify issues, both physical and mental, of our peers in the house.
31 Not an awful idea but redundant because house managers do this
32 Some chapter presidents do not even live in their houses. This has been the case for my fraternity for the last two years, in one case because he was already an RA. For a student to rise to the position of Chapter President, they must already possess excellent conflict negotiation, decision making, and leadership skills. To have them attend additional training programs seems excessive.
33 There is no downside to this measure. As residents, there should be a RA, and the President (or some other chapter officer) should take on that responsibility. I say other officer because the president is already the most demanding position for a chapter executive; giving this RA responsibility to an officer with relatively less responsibility may work better. And as stated in my previous answer, if there is an RA in every house, and an AC, there really is no need to have 3 graduate RAs (who you have to pay).
34 Not sure if there is a lot of overlap between President and RA responsibilities so I don't know how helpful this would be.
35 Our house managers participate in this training already. In our chapter the house manager also serves as the brotherhood chair which I think correlated well with keeping tabs on mental health and those sort of issues
36 We do not need to complete the intense and rigorous training provided to RA's because we aren't overseeing so many kids. Those who live within the Greek facilities are all more than qualified officers of their fraternity who need no further assistance from a President trained as an RA. This would be overkill, especially considering RA's in upperclassmen housing already have a very limited role with each of the students to whom they are assigned.
37 They aren't ras
38 As an RA and an officer serving on my chapter's executive board, I say that a decent portion of RA training would not be useful in the execution of their responsibilities. A lot of the training sessions
convey information that would only be useful to those are involved with OHARE. Of course, this is not
to say that none of the sessions would be useful to chapter presidents- the sessions about identifying
illegal drugs, crisis management, and "carefrontation" come to mind, among others.

RA training is almost completely inapplicable to the role that a President serves. The only benefit I see
form RA training would the emphasis of campus resources. A smaller program that just introduces
campus resources like the PCC would suffice.

This could be beneficial.

As an RA, I think this idea is good in theory, but not entirely in practice. 50-60% of the training that RAs
go through would be almost entirely inapplicable to Chapter presidents. Having presidents attend
certain components of RA training would be beneficial, but would still require them to show up 1.5
weeks early -- a big change for some people who may otherwise not have that expectation.

The RA training is excessive and many parts are not applicable to life as a Greek chapter president.
Possibly have chapter presidents sit in on some portions of training.

A large portion of the RA training could not be used or applied by a chapter President. I agree that
some of the training is useful, but there are only certain aspects that should be focused on. I think that
a training designed specifically for the Presidents with aspects of RA training would be more beneficial
for all.

The House Managers (who are required to live in the houses) already undergo RA training - this is
redundant but can't hurt I guess.

They aren't RA's. If they wanted RA responsibilities, they would've applied to be RA's

I don't think this would end up helping much at all, but it can't hurt so it may be worth trying.

The thinking behind this recommendation was to have someone in the chapter houses who would go
through formal training. Currently, IFC House Managers already participate in many aspects of RA
training. This just highlights the lack of research and understanding from the Task Force about the
ongoing Greek practices.

This is not the responsibility of the president. If anything, it should be mandated that every chapter
select an undergraduate house manager in order to coordinate with the University and act as a
resident advisor for the house.

I agree with this recommendation if the Greek Chapter presidents can essentially serve as RA's for
their chapter facility, without a graduate RA living in our houses.

I'm an RA. RA training has strong crisis management components as well as social justice and
diversity awareness trainings. Some elements of RA training will be excessive, but once those have
been filtered out, this will be a valuable tool.

This might be slightly redundant, since I believe that greek organizations already provide the support
for members that RA's do, but at the same time maybe it wouldn't hurt.

These programs are typically tailored to larger residence halls, and I don't think that a lack of RAs has
been an issue in Greek housing.

Not a bad idea. The presidents see a wide variety of weird things. The more trained that they are for the
unexpected, the better

While I agree that chapter presidents should have the skills to help members with personal problems
and to deal with issues related to behavior, I do not know enough about RA training to say if it is
appropriate.

Behind closed doors is the wrong training program for them to participate in. The different programs
like suicide prevention and other issues would be the best for them to participate in. BCD is only really
applicable for RAs, and even then has its own problems

The go-to change for Greek Organizations is to pile on more programming. programming programming
programming. At a certain point it has to end. It's getting to the point where every officer in Greek Life
has so much programming they aren't even given enough time to be a member of their chapter. are
them some aspects that may be useful? Yes. All of it? Clearly not. It will be ineffective and make being
president more resented in the eyes of members. Slapping training as a way out of blame is not the
way around it. knowing what the actual problems a president faces and how to handle them is what
needs to happen not blind distribution of training.

57 Seems like a good idea, especially if the president is an underclassman.

58 The only negative to this recommendation is that I'm not sure how much time is required for the
training. If the time requirement is significant, it might discourage upperclassmen from serving as
President.

59 With 6 responsible members in the house this should not be needed. Presidents have all the
responsibility they need. If this is considered necessary (which I do not think it is) designate another
member living in the house for this training and responsibility.

60 Time demands on chapter presidents are already stretched quite then. This would cut further into
academic time. Also, if RAs are paid, then chapter presidents who are RA-trained should be paid, and I
am not sure where that money comes from. I would rather see some RA training added to Presidents
Retreat before the start of school year in August.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 3: Include Faculty Fellows in Greek Life Community

Obs C14

1 If this includes a live in faculty member I think that it is a terrible idea and an invasion of privacy. Honestly, all of these ideas are anti-greek. I don't believe the person who authored this report has ever set foot in a Vanderbilt fraternity house. It doesn't make much sense to elect a random professor to author a report about the status of Vanderbilt greek life when in fact he has 0 knowledge base.

2 I have grown hugely in my academics through my involvement with greek life already. My chapter includes 80 men with a wide variety of majors and intellectual interests. The intellectual environment currently present seems casual, social, and self motivated. I do not believe that we need more forced intellectual engagement within greek life. I would rather have more time to engage intellectually with my own interests. I hope that makes sense. I really love living and I love learning--I just want them separate. Rather than having to spend my time attending greek programming and greek faculty engagement things that aim to broadly enlighten me, I would rather have more free time to engage in my academic interests individually.

3 We all know that having faculty members living in Greek houses would be an absolute train wreck. That would essentially mean no more parties or tailgates. I don't think admissions would be pleased when high school kids hear about this and decide not to apply to Vandy

4 I appreciate what faculty fellows do for certain students, but do not think this recommendation would really provide any value for those in the Greek system; it would be a waste of time for the faculty member.

5 I build my relationships with faculty members during classes and office hours. I would prefer not to have teachers involved in my social outlets.

6 I strongly disagree with this one. Having a chapter and a house that is yours, with only your fraternity brothers is a vital aspect for the greek life experience. Having a faculty advisor would make it feel as if it was a commons house, and not your fraternity or sorority house. In all honesty, the faculty fellow would most likely not receive a warm welcome from the house that he or she is assigned.

7 More regulation and restriction is not what Greek Life needs.

8 This is a vague recommendation, so I would tentatively agree but I would need to hear more about proposed programs and how this would be put into action.

9 I would need more information on Faculty Fellows before forming an opinion.

10 At this point, it becomes obvious that the Faculty Senate's interest is not in reforming Vanderbilt Greek life but in completely demolishing it.

11 Faculty engagement is critical, and this program could only help.

12 I'm not sure what a faculty fellow is.

13 I think this idea could be decent, and it would help with faculty involvement in Greek life and improve our perception among the faculty. I do not see extensive involvement though.

14 Sit in during chapter once a month?

15 I don't think this should be a necessity for Greek houses to accomplish. I think it really depends on the personality of the Greek house. Some houses are involved in more student organizations than others and some may want to bring in Faculty Fellows. I know that in my house we are very involved on campus but a lot of the organizations are student run. We are involved on campus but we do not stem that involvement from a Faculty Fellow. Some houses may use that approach but I do not think it is a necessity for involvement and therefore should not be a necessity for Greek members.

16 I don't fully understand this recommendation, but I am completely open to building closer relationships...
with faculty members.

17 I honestly just don’t see how this would work. I think greater faculty involvement in the Greek community is important, but this probably isn’t the way to do it. My chapter is starting to implement Lunch and Learns and lectures from various faculty members. I feel like something like this is a far superior way to interact with faculty.

18 Also seems productive.

19 Greek life should be strictly for undergraduate students.

20 Faculty has generally exhibited animosity towards Greek Life, and I believe it would create an hostile environment.

21 Greek life and school should be separate entities. What makes Vanderbilt so appealing to many prospective students is the unique balance between academic prestige and a vivid social life, and the reality is that Greek life makes up a great deal of the social life on campus. I truly cannot comprehend why anyone thinks it is a good idea to interfere with this system, as it works so well for Vanderbilt. The attempts to change and minimize Greek life will eradicate the balance for which Vanderbilt is currently known and loved.

22 Like the area coordinators, this role could be really helpful for some chapters if they’re being implemented well and willing to help us out.

23 Greek Life should have a relationship with Faculty. Facilitating such a relationship is worthwhile.

24 This recommendation is vague. Does it propose live-in Faculty Fellows, or just a higher level of faculty involvement?

25 Completely unnecessary

26 Not sure what they would do to help. Also, houses are too small for this.

27 I am not entirely sure what this recommendation means. However, we currently have faculty advisors, so I imagine having a faculty fellow could be integrated into the faculty advisor role.

28 NA

29 I believe this is actually a plus. Connecting faculty more so with the Greek community can help increase inclusivity with other parts of campus and help dispel some tension between faculty and the Greek community.

30 Only if they actually have experience in greek life, neither the dean of students or anyone on the panel was Greek. They wouldnt be qualified for something like this so please make sure anyone you put in this position is

31 What does the role of “Faculty Fellow” include? If they are live-in residents of the houses, I strongly discourage this; not only because the faculty members would likely not even want to live in the fraternity houses, but also because their relations with the chapter residents would be strained. If this is more of an advisory or supervisory role, I could see this as positive; although my chapter in particular already has a Faculty Advisor, I fail to see what we could gain from a “Faculty Fellow”.

32 I have had some very meaningful interactions with faculty in my commons house, and I believe introducing this to Greek Life would be a unique experience that everyone could benefit from. I know members in my chapter are always looking to learn from new perspectives and experiences, and this would be a good opportunity.

33 Perhaps this would be good to have a second opinion, but I could see it getting out of hand become some faculty don’t understand the greek system

34 This is another recommendation that makes no logical sense. It is incredibly difficult to find a faculty advisor for most clubs on campus, much less an entire fraternity. I also highly doubt they would be effective. My fraternity is composed of 87 diverse men with different backgrounds, different majors, and different career aspirations. The odds of finding a faculty member both willing to take on this role and knowledgeable enough to help even a quarter of the members of my house are slim to none. This is
yet another unrealistic recommendation by a completely disconnected Task Force.

35 I think faculty advisors could be a better approach, the Greek program doesn’t need more funding for this sort of help. If we were to get funding from the university it would be best served for scholarships.

36 To allow Greek members even more easy access to faculty relationships by virtue of having houses would increase the stigma surrounding the privilege of Greek Life on this campus. Not to mention, we already have advisors with whom we regularly meet, and encouraging more faculty to get involved wouldn’t yield a fruitful relationship in my opinion.

37 I don’t see any benefit from this.

38 Should be on chapters to have faculty advisors – finding 15 faculty members who WANT to actively engage with the Greek community and contribute to the success of a chapter will be nearly impossible. Chapters do and should continue seeking out advice from faculty, whether that be for brotherhood development or through the new member education process. A blanket “faculty fellows” program would be wildly ineffective, if 15 could even be found.

39 The Greek community already has put in place measures to work with faculty. For those chapters that have the desire to engage with faculty, the process works. For those who do not, the process does not work. In my opinion, this recommendation simply privileges Greek Life and adds additional financial burdens to the Office. I am primarily concerned with the role of this Faculty Fellow.

40 Many faculty members were not Greek, and therefore I don’t think they should have a say in Greek affairs due to lack of understanding.

41 I see no need for this. Members of Greek life have exposure to faculty through other channels. Having a place such as the chapter faculty can be a useful stress-reliever for getting away from faculty, homework, etc. if necessary.

42 The spirit of this recommendation is to improve Greek relationships with Faculty members. Greek chapters already have advisors in the Office of Greek Life, Boards of Trust made up of alumni, consultants and officers from National Organizations, as well as various other advisors and faculty advisors. We do not need another person with oversight. Furthermore, having over 30 faculty members that would need to be educated on the practices of Greek Life would create another much more work for Kristin than it would have a real meaningful impact. If the Task Force didn’t pick up on big practices and aspects of Greek Life while researching it for over 2 years, it is going to take a less involved Faculty Fellow much much longer to fully understand the Greek culture.

43 Greek houses severely lack for friends in the administration. In addition, they could provide some valuable advice.

44 This is a good idea as long as the Faculty Fellows are agreed upon by the Greek houses and not simply members of the faculty who self-select themselves members of the committee.

45 I’m not particularly familiar with the role of Faculty Fellows, but some additional faculty support is always welcome.

46 More opportunities to engage faculty? Sounds like a good one to me. It’d be nice if each chapter had a designated faculty fellow as a go-to. That being said, every chapter already has many points of outside contact, namely OGL and alumni advisors. Would this addition be excessive? Good idea, but mechanics need to be fleshed out.

47 Having a strong relationship between Greek life and the faculty is important for the success of greek life moving forward.

48 If they were not in Greek life, like everyone on this faculty senate task force, then no.

49 I’m not sure what this would exactly entail, but it is my strong belief that if faculty were more engaged with the Greek community, they would see what an overwhelmingly positive force it would be.

50 This is not the approach that we need in order to engage Greek members with faculty. We already have dozens of chapter advisors, and Faculty Engagement requirements for our Greek members. The change needs to come from somewhere else, and somewhere authentic and meaningful to our
members. I'm sorry, I wish I had a specific recommendation, but I do not.

51 There needs to be a give and take from both sides. As of now, it doesn't appear like the faculty wants to get involved, especially if the report is calling for them to get paid for this. They need to show a genuine interest in Greek Life and getting to know the members, but if paying them is the only way they will do it, I feel like it will be fake and not really worth it.

52 what is a faculty fellow? advisors want less to do with chapter than the chapters want from them. organizations are being treated like children. There is no room to grow. a weekly update should be more than enough. advisors are already ineffective, why would adding more make it better? it's recommendations like these that make me think the task force did no research into the actual system and instead based recommendations on images in their heads without any effect of reality on them.

53 I have been a VU Greek for over almost 50 years. In my experience, for the last 25 years the VU faculty, in general and with notable exceptions, has not been interested in participating in Greek Life. I strongly agree that Faculty Fellows in Greek Life would benefit us all.

54 Faculty and Greeks are in 2 different worlds. Faculty Fellows or Faculty advisors will go a long way in riding this gap. The Greeks are not perfect but they do offer a lot to the University. See area advisor answer.

55 Not sure what Faculty Fellows are, but am not opposed to more faculty interaction with Greek Life members.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 4: Develop and Endorse Inclusivity Agreement

Obs  C16

1  This is a meaningless agreement ... there are no statutes or goals.

2  The greek inclusivity agreement is a great step towards improving and broadening the reach of greek life. I still think that the financial aspects of greek life were not addressed enough in the task force report. The university must give more scholarships in an effort to improve racial/socioeconomic diversity in greek life. I also would like to see stats of the % on financial aid vs ethnic breakdown of the school.

3  I have no opinion on this issue, although I do believe that certainly the Panhellenic council is already in the process of implementing a similar agreement or plan.

4  Further inclusivity agreements that extend to the other councils are a good idea and will promote a positive image for Greek life as a whole.

5  Inclusivity is paramount in Greek Life. As a member of a very diverse pledge class, I can say that I truly appreciate having diversity in my life. As a whole, greek life needs more diversity but there are underlying factors that reduce diversity in greek life which are out of the university's sphere of influence.

6  I'm in an IFC fraternity, so this doesn't really apply to me, but I think this one is a no-brainer. Strongly agree.

7  I believe every greek organization on campus should have this type of agreement. It has done nothing but enhance the IFC experience and help chapters be more well rounded.

8  I absolutely believe the other councils should adopt the Inclusivity Agreement. Quite frankly I'm surprised that they haven't adopted it yet.

9  It's easy to forget that virtually all Greek organizations are predicated on exclusivity. These are organizations of likeminded, similarly situated and accomplished men and women. The more you force the doors open, the more you erode their values and image. Of course, any Greek organization that clearly discriminates on any arbitrary basis, including race or sexual orientation, should be ashamed of itself and held accountable. But at the same time, you cannot blame these organizations for the discrimination that they must exercise in order to be an exclusive organization at all.

10  Public declarations of this kind are usually superficial and empty. Thus, they rarely change anything and are meaningless.

11  I agree that other greek councils should be held to the same standards for diversity and inclusion as IFC.

12  I think that the inclusivity agreement has been effective and a positive influence on our community. I see no reason why an analogous agreement wouldn't be successful.

13  IFC accepting this was a great thing, and I think it would be great if other organizations would follow suit. It is something we should strive for without the agreement so ensuring that it is sought is great for our community.

14  NPHC is already all about diversity. They shouldn't have to reaffirm this sentiment since it is a major principle they adhere to.

15  I am a part of IFC so this point does not really apply. Interestingly enough, (I'm pretty sure) the founding of NPHC was actually on inclusivity because of their exclusion from other Greek organizations so it seems ironic to require them to do so.

16  As a member of IFC, I think the inclusivity agreement has done great things. I would be happy if the other Greek organizations on campus adopted the same initiative.

17  Obvious one here.
18 I think was a great addition by the IFC and I think Panhell and NPHC should follow the lead.

19 As a Greek Ally myself, I fully support this measure. Work should be done, however, to ensure proper implementation.

20 It is the prerogative of these councils to develop their own policies; if these policies are to be developed, they should be organic.

21 Greek houses have been doing a very poor job with inclusivity. The foundation of Greek life rests on excluding everyone from "joining the brotherhood," so I don't see a realistic fix to this (sadly).

22 The IFC Inclusivity Agreement was an excellent bit of work that represents the will of the entire IFC. This sort of collaboration for something as important as inclusivity should be work toward my ALL organizations on campus.

23 NA

24 It is more of a publicity stunt, but cannot hurt, and can help mend current and create future relationships.

25 yeah good idea

26 Although all Greek communities on campus are already inclusive of race, gender, sexual orientation, etc., it would be wise for the Greek community as a whole at Vanderbilt to show this with an official document across the Greek spectrum. IFC led the way in this regard with their Inclusivity Agreement; it is rather surprising that the Panhellenic Council and NPHC have not already followed suit.

27 The IFC Inclusivity Agreement was a powerful declaration, and the other two Greek councils would be remiss not to do the same. Greek Life should be inclusive to all.

28 I believe the Inclusivity Agreement was an important step in furthering the accessibility of Greek Life to all students, and to reduce the negative stereotype that Greek Life has regarding diversity. Encouraging declarations like this throughout Greek Life will be a positive factor.

29 Does the Task Force know what NPHC is?

30 For Panhellenic, an agreement like so would be a positive step forward. NPHC organizations celebrate black history, and will always accept anyone willing to join them because their personal beliefs align with those of the organizations. Forcing them to publicly acknowledge they're inclusive and diverse doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to me, and I feel that you're all overlooking them completely throughout this report, with this recommendation being an example.

31 The fact that the IFC did not have such an agreement until 2015, let alone that the Panhellenic Council and NPHC do not yet have such an agreement, is at least mildly troublesome. In the particular case of the NPHC, however, such an agreement would easily convey that their organizations are open to those who do not identify as African-American.

32 This is a great move that should have already been done. Making an outward statement about pledging to be inclusive in my opinion is the most positive greek life has done recently.

33 Yeah why not. That being said I don't think there was a problem with inclusivity in the first place. People want to surround themselves with people that they like-- an inclusivity agree didn't necessary change anything nor did it need to.

34 Yes. However, I wish the Task Force had provided IFC with feedback on our Inclusivity Agreement. As faculty members, the Task Force deals with inclusivity issues on a regular basis, and thus would be well-positioned to give feedback on steps IFC could take to improve our agreement and develop action items for it's continued adherence and growth of the ideals within.

35 I completely agree with this initiative, but think it should be rephrased to ask all councils to make action-oriented plans and initiatives, not just public statements.

36 I do not think Greek life is as exclusive as the report made it out to be. There are niches for everyone. Furthermore, I think that apparent inclusivity problems are more attributable to the groups who end up rushing certain houses rather than the houses selection processes themselves.
37 There's no reason not to

38 I think that this would be a good thing, but that it is very important for these types of agreements to be born out of a desire for inclusion by the aforementioned groups. So while I hope they adopt inclusivity agreements, I do not think that they should be required to.

39 This recommendation needs to include some call to action. It also blatantly ignores many diversity declarations by National Organizations - again another example of a lack of research by the Task Force.

40 Why would anyone oppose this? If anything the Inclusivity Agreement is too weak. We should be setting the tone with new members about Greek Life's stance on inclusivity. Discussions in IFC were had about diversity training. This should be used in all three councils.

41 No one should be opposed to this. Done.

42 Don't know how pan-hel or nphc work in depth, don't feel comfortable commenting

43 Why not? Granted signing a piece of paper isn't going to change the culture (and lets be real, it hasn't for most of the chapters as much as we want to pat ourselves on the backs for how good it looks...) but finding ways to decrease dues across the board, and truly work with the campus community to develop ways to get people involved in GL would be best. That said, if people don't want to join, we can't force them and we do have an image problem working against us.

44 of course they should. they should also follow up farther than IFC had. the greek allies system is on paper only, they have done a horrible job making that a relevant part of rush and the greek experience.

45 Unnecessary.

46 My understanding is the Greeks already followed these suggestions. Just because you force someone to sigh a statement so they can continue to exist does not mean anything will change. Everyone already knows which houses are inclusive and which are not. Todays students are much more accepting of differences than students of the past and I suspect they will be more so in the future. Signing a paper will not change things. I suspect all Chapters will sign this as the cost of not doing so will be too high, Change will be minimal to none after formally adopting this policy. Why impose something that will result in no changes?

47 Chapter supports inclusiveness throughout Vanderbilt community.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 5: 2019-20 Third Year and Higher Only Live in Chapter Houses

Obs C18

1. Students going abroad will not be able to ever live in a Greek house.

2. What's the point of this, anyway? Give younger students some freedom, if they want it. I think sophomore officers play a large role in many chapters and they should be allowed to live in the house if they choose.

3. I feel like most people living in Greek houses are juniors or seniors. All the sophomores I know living in Greek housing have a good reason to do so given their chapter leadership position.

4. This is an unnecessary constriction on the housing options of second-year students, particularly because residing in the house waives a maintenance fee that is a significant financial burden for whomever is paying the bills. Vanderbilt, while generous in financial aid, is still a very costly institution to attend, and the mandate that this fee be paid for all second-year students is unfair.

5. I really don't see any argument for this proposition.

6. By not allowing sophomores to live in Greek housing, they are given an extra year to adjust to life at Vanderbilt.

7. Sophomore year is the best year for living in Greek Houses because you are finally a member for the entire year. As a junior or senior, there are more appealing housing options that are more conducive for studying and completing harder course loads.

8. I disagree with this one. People in my chapter want to live in the house, and the older people (juniors and seniors) usually want to live off campus. I see nothing wrong with having some sophomores that live in the house. Maybe as an alternative, there must be, for example, at least one senior that lives in the house so that sophomores are supervised by an older member of the chapter.

9. Presidents are often sophomores. Having them not be able to live in the house is frankly absurd. Your year in school has nothing to do with the maturity required to live in the house.

10. This is already the practice in my house, so I see no problem with this becoming a school-wide rule.

11. As a second year student living in our chapter house I must strongly disagree with this suggestion. Our International chapter bylaws require the chapter president to live in the house and I don’t believe my being a sophomore has in any way hindered my ability to lead my chapter. Since I took office our chapter has been one of the few chapters to not face any disciplinary charges. A lot of this is due to my living in the house. As an officer in my chapter I believe living in the house has made doing my job much easier to handle. I don’t believe class year should have any impact on who can live in the house.

12. I can’t think of any reason why sophomores shouldn’t be allowed to live in Greek housing.

13. I think that the maturity difference between a sophomore and junior is minute. In my chapter, we had a sophomore move in for the second semester of this year and the results of that have been hugely beneficial for our chapter.

14. I think that those in authority positions should live in the house, whether it be sophomores or juniors or seniors. It does not matter ones age but the authority they possess in the chapter.

15. In certain houses this is not feasible for a number of reasons.

16. My chapter does this already - so it would not require any change in my house, but that is because I am used to the executive structure of my chapter. I do not understand how the executive structures work in other houses and it may be logical to have some second years living in the house. I think ideally that it would not all be sophomores in the house and we could try to limit that number to 2 or 3 (as opposed to 5 or 6), but I do not understand how other chapters on campus run and which positions live in the house because it really does vary chapter to chapter.
17 I do think this will change much. It is already very uncommon for sophomores or freshman to live in the Greek Chapter Houses.

18 I think this discourages sophomores from getting involved in chapter positions that would require living in the house.

19 Most officers are second year

20 Second year students are perfectly capable of living in a greek house

21 There are some necessary situations where a sophomore should be allowed to live in the house. For example, those who live in the house get a dues reduction in my chapter. This is one of our ways of promoting possible socio-economic diversity. Living in the house automatically qualifies you for a dues scholarship. Taking this away would prevent some of our brothers from being able to pay dues.

22 Most fraternity chapter houses are undesirable living locations, and it would be unfair to force upperclassmen to reside there in years where they are more likely to receive preferred housing assignments. Additionally, chapters should be allowed to determine who lives in their residences individually, because the culture of every chapter is different and would require different things out of their house residents.

23 Most involved Greek students are sophomores in my experience

24 This would discourage younger guys from taking on leadership roles in the fraternity or sorority.

25 I lived in the fraternity house as a Sophomore and feel I benefitted from it. Why make these objective rules instead of taking every situation case-by-case?

26 This appears to me an arbitrary and meaningless distinction, especially since some second-year students hold chapter positions that fully merit them living in the house (e.g. President, House Manager, etc. etc.).

27 A member’s merit as a leader has little to do with age or class standing. If administrators are worried about second-years not being inserted enough in university culture, they may rest assured that it would be highly unlikely for a sophomore to continue living in a greek house for the duration of their university career.

28 There’s no point in doing this. If a sophomore is an officer, then that person should be able to live in the house. In order to be elected as an officer, the underclassmen must be a responsible individual anyway.

29 This is not very applicable since usually executive board consists of older students anyway. No strong opinion. People should be able to live where they want to live.

30 Currently, most of the time it is just third year or higher students who live in the house, at least for my chapter. However, I do not see any problem with a younger person being voted into an executive position by his or her peers and living in the house. If an individual merits a leadership position then his/her age should not preclude him/her from taking on the role in its full form, including living in the house.

31 This does not makes sense. If an individual is responsible enough to be elected to an officer position. That individual should be responsible enough to reside in a greek house. In addition if they are supposed to live in a house there is a reason for that and that reason is the same whether they are a sophomore or junior.

32 NA

33 Sometimes living in the chapter house is not a positive or a desired place to live. Usually the younger kids live in the house unless someone with more seniority wants to, which does not happen often, if at all.

34 Some executive members are younger than third year. It is more important to have the appropriate and deserving officers in the house as opposed to age. Really provides no benefit and can only hurt.

35 not the worst idea but important sophomore officers should have the option
36 This is already the case for most chapter residents; this seems redundant in a sense. The only Sophomores who would live in Chapter Houses are those in leadership positions, in which case, their drive and personal leadership qualities should be enough to ensure them residence in the Houses. I don't see what fears the GLTF has about Sophomores living in Greek Houses, as opposed to a traditional dorm or a residential college. The Sophomores who would live in a Chapter House have proven sufficiently their maturity and merit to live in an alternative form of housing at Vanderbilt.

37 As stated in the final report, for many chapters, chapter officers are required to live in their respective chapter houses. To then allow only juniors and seniors to live in house would be to ignore the reality about education at Vanderbilt. Seniors much more often than not, do not become officers. Seniors have a form of apathy of what we all know to be "senioritis," and for many that I personally know, taking on a leadership position such as chapter executive as a senior is one of the last things they would want to do. Juniors suffer from this aforementioned apathy as well, although to a slightly lesser degree. One more important point about this is that junior year is the primary year that students go abroad, preventing them from taking on a yearlong leadership position. So by elimination sophomores from living in the house, and thereby becoming chapter officers, you severely limit yourself with options of apathetic seniors and juniors wanting to leave the country. Additionally, sophomore year is a great time to take on a leadership position such as chapter executive, and in order to do this, they must be allowed to live in the house.

38 I am pretty sure most fraternities only have 3rd and 4th year students living in the houses, but I don't understand why 2nd years should be prohibited for living there. If Vanderbilt keeps over regulating fraternities they are going to kill the system off entirely. For me, I chose Vanderbilt over other top ranked universities because I thought it had one of the best balances between academics and fun. However, I am now being forced to reevaluate if I would still make this decision. I truly love Vanderbilt, but I also love my fraternity and feel like you are trying to take that away from me. Look, I understand that fraternities can bring bad publicity to the school and they can get into trouble, but I think eradicating them from school is just a terrible move.

39 You can make this recommendation, but then you have to allow non-officers to live in the house. Very few seniors want to live in the house and with so many juniors going abroad, it is difficult to find people that want to live in the house from the remaining pool of junior officers. That being said, I don't think this is an issue. The current rule that you must be a member of a house for a full semester before living in the house is sufficient.

40 Currently, many members that live in the house move abroad after the first semester, and the newly elected officers are at the time still sophomores. Our bylaws require officers to live in the house but they would still be second semester sophomores.

41 I suppose that's fine for most IFC chapters, even though there will still always be a few sophomores in leadership positions who deserve the right to live in a Greek house. And again, this is blatantly dismissing NPHC organizational structure, based on their membership demographics and which officers must reside in their houses. I can't imagine how this report was completed with such little awareness of the NPHC community.

42 Messes with our chapter stuff

43 Living outside of the Ingram Commons for at least one year lends itself to an understanding of campus residential life and sets expectations for an on-campus residential experience while an upperclassman. If a student were to move into a Greek house for his or her second year, then his or her understanding of upperclassman residential policies, housing applications, etc. may be inhibited going into his or her third or fourth year after having only lived on the Commons or in Greek houses.

44 This is already the case for most houses. The people who live in them are usually officers and most often are juniors when they are given their roles as officers.

45 A sophomore living in the house is no different from a junior living in the house.

46 Great idea in theory -- only juniors should live in houses. On board with the premise. However, many fraternities have brothers who go abroad as a group in their junior year, leaving spaces in the house for that semester (technically the year) that would be filled with sophomores. Don't see how these juniors can be prevented from going abroad, and if not, the only other option is really to have sophomores in the house. Need to solve that problem before mandating this.
47 This isn't a bad idea but the reality is, sophomores often live in houses after juniors go abroad, end their term as an officer and move out of the house, etc.

48 This concept poses various problems dealing with sufficient officer turnover and NPHC intake.

49 Unless the houses are improved and more resources are provided, it is going to be hard to do this. Not fair to penalize chapters thousands of dollars for open rooms in greek houses when they are not furnished/maintained or equal in quality to the rest of the school's housing options.

50 Not entirely sure why sophomores should be prohibited, but I don't think it's a huge deal.

51 Good idea.

52 I don't see a problem with this recommendation. In my chapter, we only have third year and higher students live in greek housing.

53 There will be many exceptions to this recommendation. Many NPHC organizations might only have sophomores in the organization and thus they would not be able to fulfill having members live in the apartment. I also think it's ridiculous for Professor Weintraub to imply that with this recommendation, it might be best to re-assign the NPHC apartments to other uses. One major point of this recommendation - certain officers are required to live in Greek Houses. WE are currently trying to engage general members in more circles of campus and ensure they have a more well-rounded Vanderbilt experience. If they are forced to not go abroad or seek other experiences just so they can hold an executive position in a Greek organization, we are inherently giving Greek experiences more control of someone's Vanderbilt life, which is the complete opposite of what we want to do. This is a perfect example of unintended consequences coming from a recommendation and displays the further lack of understanding the Task Force had for the process.

54 Sophomores are usually the most involved brothers.

55 Officers and high ranking officials should live in chapter houses. If underclassmen are elected then they should not be barred from living in the house.

56 Upperclassmen are much more prepared than underclassmen to lead their chapters.

57 Only third year and higher chapter/governing council officers should like in Greek Houses

58 If a student decides that he or she wants to live in a greek house sophomore year and has already shown leadership qualifications and earned a leadership position in his or her organization, then that should be allowed. Students should be able to make their own choices on how they want to spend their Vanderbilt experience.

59 This is absolutely ridiculous. This should not be implemented, we already have tiny greek houses compared to other universities. Plus, most upperclassmen do not want to live in the house, it should be the most involved people, which is usually sophomores and juniors.

60 Officers should be allowed to live in chapter houses regardless of year.

61 By extension, this suggests that only Juniors and Seniors can hold exec positions. If I am reading into this correctly, then yes I agree for that reason

62 It is incredibly difficult to balance living in the house and getting work done, so only those who know they can do it should be able to live there.

63 makes sense, but in reality that's really hard to do. there could very well be situations where people simply do not want to live in the house. some constitutions make certain positions live in the house, this would render them unavailable to sophomores. it is a good rule to follow but there should certainly be exceptions. i would recommend no more than 2 being second years. also this textbook has the limit at 180,000 characters... unprofessional as hell.

64 As long as Houses are crummy, poor competition with upperclass dorms and off-campus options are available, this will be difficult to implement. I agree in principal, but the mandatory time schedule needs to reflect a realistic consideration of the competing quality of the housing options.

65 You want your leaders to live in the house. The more mature the better.
I fail to see a reason to propose this. Chapters should have the independence to determine who lives in their house as long as the member meets academic and chapter eligibility requirements.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 5: Greek Chapter Houses Become Non-Residential Completely

Obs C20

1 Then what's the point of a fraternity house anyway? If you're planning on eliminating Greek Life at least be forward about it.

2 I am very against the college hall system, I understand that it is fundamentally incompatible with residential greek life. I really enjoy the fluid housing situation that Vanderbilt currently offers and I truly desire to have my living/social space be totally independent of university-sponsored intellectual engagement. That's just the way I operate. I get enough engagement on my own.

3 Another way to just absolutely destroy admissions, and there are substantial benefits to allowing Greeks to live in houses.

4 This is fundamentally opposed to one of the most tangible aspects of Greek life. In addition to the costs concerns which I have stated above, this limitation of housing options severely takes away from the Greek experience. The culture that surrounds a chapter house on campus will suffer greatly if all students are barred from living in it. Vanderbilt has already significantly limited options with regard to Greek housing by restricting residence to only six officers, and this move will greatly damage the opportunities that students have to make the most of their Greek experience.

5 This is perhaps the most egregious of all the Greek Life Task Force recommendations. Part of the point of being part of the Greek system is having a place of refuge from the Vanderbilt community. If there were ever a way to "kill" Greek life here, this would be it. If you're view of a quality College Hall community is Kissam, then you are grotesquely wrong. The vast majority of people who live in Kissam, only live there because of the amenities and spacious rooms. The College Halls system (that we know you are copying off of Yale) is really not popular with the student body. We need to stop pretending to be some other school, and embrace what we already have. Greek life (and residential Greek life as well) is a fundamental part of the Vanderbilt experience, and there is absolutely no reason to change it.

6 The Greek housing system has an integral place on Vanderbilt's campus. When the college hall system is finished being constructed, officers of Greek organizations should continue to be allowed to live in their respective houses so that they may be more responsible for the actions that occur there.

7 Dorm life is detrimental to my mental health and physical health. It is also more conducive to sickness and the spread of disease. It is less private and the security protocols dominate the lifestyle. It was not until I moved out of the Vanderbilt residence halls that I became happy to live on Vanderbilt campus.

8 I cannot stress how strongly I disagree with this proposal. It regards to the college halls system, people in general do not want to be forced to live in a certain hall or area of campus. Many people want to live off campus, or at the minimum, be able to choose where they live on campus. It in my opinion, making greek houses non-residential would effectively kill Greek life. It would no longer be your fraternity house, it would effectively become a building where you have two registered parties per semester. I understand the purpose of this proposal is to limit partying at fraternity houses, but this will only result in more off campus activity and people going to bars, which is undoubtedly riskier and more dangerous. I'm not endorsing partying at fraternity houses, but I do think this proposal would only exacerbate the problem it's trying to address.

9 Living off campus is something that should be an option to all students. It is an important learning experience and Vanderbilt should not be able to decide whether students are able to live off campus or not. It should be an unrepeatable option.

10 There is something inherent about having your greek house be a residential facility. For those who put the most into the organization, living in the house is a reward for all the hard work they do. The reason our house is so vibrant and always full of laughter and discussion is because of the guys who live in it. By making Chapter houses non-residential, we are losing an inherent part of the greek experience.

11 If the chapter houses are no longer residential, then I believe chapters might not take as good care of them as they should. Officers living in the house means that someone is almost always in the house to
make sure that everything at the house is under control. If you take the officers out of the house then there isn’t a good monitoring system in place where the chapter can look out for itself. Given that the Greek Houses are all on campus, I don’t believe that my viewpoint goes against the original vision for Vanderbilt (a community on campus strengthened by all of its students living on campus). My living in the chapter house has in no way hindered my ability to become friends with non-Greek students, and I don’t believe I would be any more connected with the Vanderbilt community if I lived in a place like Kissam or the College Halls.

12 Having residents in the house is crucial to fostering a fraternity environment within the house. If no one lived in chapter houses, the houses would become a strange meeting ground with no identity. Also, with no house residents, other main meeting areas nearer where members live would arise, such as large, consistent flockings to dorm rooms.

13 The College Halls system is a joke. Not only does it ironically erode any sense of community that is fostered elsewhere in living arrangements (Kissam has more in common with minimum security prisons than it does with regular dorms), it feels like the university is trying to force us all into a space in which they can exert unabated control over its student body. If it’s the university’s goal to reduce Greek organizations to little more than glorified community service clubs, then go ahead, take away our housing.

14 Chapter houses are the lifeblood of many fraternities and sororities. The ability to walk in to your house and know that people will be there hanging out cannot be undervalued. It creates a strong sense of brotherhood and accountability. With actual members living in the house, it makes it easier to curb destructive and reckless behavior, as it is actually someone’s living space.

15 Having people live in a chapter house together provides more bonding opportunities for members of a chapter.

16 This is an interim step to the elimination of single-use Greek houses, without which the mission and emphasis of the organizations will be radically changed.

17 I think that have responsible members of your chapter living in the house from a risk management perspective is very beneficial. In addition living in a Greek house provides a unique experience impossible to replicate at a later point in your life.

18 Non residential housing would remove a large part of our experience.

19 Greek houses will be completely disrespected. There will be little sense of pride. More broken rules will result at fraternity houses.

20 Two reasons I disagree with this. / 1) People who live in the house have their housing money go towards the maintenance of the house. If we force these people to move out of the house this will increase the cost of Greek life exponentially and make it less affordable which contradicts another part of this task force report. / 2) People will lose respect for the house, there is less of an incentive to keep the inside clean and nice because nobody has to live there at night. I think it will deteriorate on the appearance of the houses due to lack of funds to maintain the house and lack of respect for the house itself.

21 This recommendation is appalling. The people who live in the house are members of our executive board. They are able to contribute more to the chapter by living in house because they get to see all of our brothers on a daily basis. Even if the administration does force all of us into College Halls, I am still going to spend time with the people I have built relationships with, many of whom are not Greek. Placing people in closer proximity will not foster any closer sense of community. What harm has come from having Greek members live in their chapter houses?

22 I think having students live in Greek Houses is really important and is a really unique opportunity that can add to a student’s educational experience.

23 This just takes away from the experience of fraternities and sororities.

24 It adds a new perspective and gives incentive to get more people to come to the house and hang with their friends that live there.

25 If this recommendation happens, fraternity houses become just party houses. No pride will be taken
into the maintenance, and upkeep of the facilities, and no logical Greek member will agree to pay a $370 maintenance fee for the house, when they could use this money and lease an off-campus house.

26 Having people live in the house encourages brothers to spend more time at the house, which further helps foster friendships and learning.

27 This is absolutely ridiculous and a bad idea. The houses are the center of each chapter and each brotherhood. That is where life-long memories are formed and maintained. The brothers that live in the house keep the house running and thriving. Without residents, the houses would basically fall to pieces. The residential aspect also allows our important officers to always be present. The rush chair is available and at the house during rush just as the president lives there so that he can readily be available. This is one of the most important aspects of Greek Life and removing it would essentially kill the entire program.

28 This is the most outrageous of all the recommendations of the GLTS. Without the residential component of Greek Houses their would be little incentive to maintain house accommodations. Alumni would be less inclined to donate money towards house improvements. It would pose a security risk to the chapter house, because there would be no members available to oversee it.

29 The single reason that these houses are somewhat respected and not completely physically trashed during parties is that they are residential. People understand that other people live there, and are therefore respectful of the building.

30 Takes away from possible housing opportunities.

31 This would obviously be an extreme and drastic change, but I think with the Title IX investigation that is going on and the issues with sexual assault in fraternity houses specifically, this could perhaps be exactly what needs to be done.

32 Don't take away the thing that makes greek life unique.

33 Since only six members live in each house, this appears to be a nominal gain to the College Halls system at the expense of fully redefining the Greek experience for many. That is, it is not worth including approximately 120 more students in the College Halls system if doing so turns fraternity and sorority houses into glorified meeting spaces. I strongly oppose this measure.

34 The College Halls are Vanderbilt’s thinly-veiled drive toward an Ivy League-style living situation. I came to Vanderbilt because its culture was distinctly different from the Ivy League. Is this change worth the destruction of a longstanding culture at Vanderbilt? I myself am not sure, but those in charge should tread lightly.

35 Officers should live in the houses to be in tune with chapter matters and foster brotherhood.

36 When all of this happens, then yes, this would be a good idea. I think that it would decrease the separation between greeks/non-greeks.

37 One of the reasons the Greek houses are maintained well and stay relatively clean is because people live in them. It also fosters a sense of community within the chapter and puts all of the executive officers together to make decisions and collaborate together. Without residents, I fear that the chapter houses would just turn into venues for events and parties and become run down and neglected.

38 I have found that my Greek chapter is an excellent living and learning community, which is centered around our house. Eliminating this model would be opposing the very similar model of the College Halls system.

39 If the houses are not lived in they will be treated like shit. I hate to use language like that, but that is the only way to describe it effectivley. No one cares about a place that is just used for parties. No one will care if people throw up on the ground and pee in the corners. It will just turn into a cess pool whether a fraternity likes to party hard or just uses the house to play board games. There is no reason to pick up after yourself without people living in the house.

40 NA

41 The Greek Chapter Houses and those who live in them are integral to the function of the fraternity.
Allowing officers to live in the house is a privilege and an exceptionally beneficial experience. It promotes brothers to “swing through” the house and provides a place for relaxation where there is always someone to talk to. Making them non-residential would hurt the functionality and brotherhood aspect of the chapter.

42 This is an absolutely awful idea. NO ONE on the panel was greek. The dean was not Greek. I don't understand how they think they are qualified to make decisions so important about something they don't really understand. I live in a house. It is my home. Why would you deprive someone of this experience. Having a true home vs just some building to meet in is huge.

43 The Greek experience has honestly been diluted far enough at Vanderbilt. I have visited chapters of my Fraternity at other schools; these have 40+ residents in their house. The quality of life and fraternal experience for these students far superior to the 6 who live in most Chapter Houses at Vanderbilt. Their brotherhood and Fraternity as a whole is strengthened by living together. I wish I could have that experience. The idea of making Fraternity houses non-residential boggles my mind. So much is gained by having officers living in the house- they are more accessible to the members at large and spend plenty of time bonding together outside of official fraternity activities. They can live in a Towers or Kissam suite together, why should they be barred from living together in the Chapter House?!

44 Living in house is a big part of what makes greek life work. Having chapter member live in chapter houses means much more than giving them somewhere to sleep. Being in the house means being a part of the activities that bring the chapter together. Living in a fraternity or sorority house is a privilege awarded to chapter members across the country. Our chapter houses may be different because they are much smaller than a lot of schools with greek life, but despite our size, our greek system is still strong.

45 This is ludicrous. Vanderbilt needs to develop/retain its own culture. Stop trying to copy Yale and other Ivy league schools. I would have chosen to go to a school like that if I wanted that style of housing, but I did not want that so I came here. Someone acknowledge that Vanderbilt attracts a unique student: a student wanting top-notch academics as well as a vibrant social life. Take away or limit the social life and then you're going to destroy the draw of Vanderbilt to so many kids.

46 The completion of the College Halls won't happen for at least 15 yrs. Making this decision know makes absolutely no sense. We do not know what the climate will be like at Vanderbilt in 15 yrs, or in Greek Life in general. I cannot come up with a good reason why this suggestion was in the report other than for purely quantitative rather than qualitative purposes.

47 Our chapter struggles with moving houses away from being a home because then people tend to treat them like structures for parties. So they cause damage and have no regard for the facility. Having a brother live there keeps it as relatable to a home as possible. // There are also other reasons but I figured this was a unique perspective.

48 The houses would become places solely designated for debauchery, and would be a constant mess. Dues would need to be increased to cover the loss of house members paying an additional fee to the OGL. There seems to be no good reason for this recommendation to ever be adopted.

49 Enjoy Greek row burning down. There will be zero respect for these buildings if there aren't people who have to live in them.

50 Are you kidding me? Greek organizations have history and strength. You are ruining this school.

51 There is a high degree of utility to be gained with chapter officers (and only chapter officers) residing in the chapter houses in terms of organizational benefit, management, etc. The restrictions on who can live in these houses, however, should be tightened (i.e., only executive board officers, not general officers necessarily).

52 There are ways that Vanderbilt can make the "College Halls System" better for students. Instead of emphasizing programing, which nobody really attends, a system based on less formal participation would be more effective. A ceremony/party where nicknames are given out and yearly events that each hall puts on that are in the vain of Fraternity parties would make the system more applicable to young adults. Participation should not have to be motivated by the school but rather the culture of the school should make everyone invested. Having programs that are just a discussion will not make a positive impact a student like a memorable event could. Until changes like those are made, I don't feel
that college halls system can replace the positive experience that living in a greek house brings.

Are there negative consequence associated with students living in the houses?

This is an incredibly long timeline. I can't agree with a premise that is based on a 20 to 30 year timeline, especially because I have no clue what this campus or greek life will look like when that time comes. / / In addition, and probably more important: removing the residential component from greek houses decreases significantly the desire from brothers to keep the house in a decent and livable shape. Making the houses non-residential essentially turns them into a party space, and the current regard for cleaning up and maintaining a generally respectable house (respectable has broad connotations here... houses look different on a saturday morning than on a tuesday afternoon) would go away completely if there weren't brothers who had to use that space as a living space as well. This would be a massive issue in regards to respect for shelter space.

Making Greek houses non-residential will result in houses being treated very poorly. Currently, Greek Row residents have a stake in keeping their house clean or, at the very least, habitable. Removing permanent residents from the houses will remove this idea. I also have no idea how this idea could be implemented without serious financial implications.

Making Greek Houses non-residential poses many problems. Those who live in the houses watch over the house and protect it. Taking that away will undoubtedly lead to more disrespectful use of the house. Houses are also used for relationship building, and making the houses "buildings" will take away from that experience. It will also pose a huge financial burden on the community as no rent will be paid for the use of the houses.

The current College halls at Kissam (I live there) are not any better at facilitating interaction than Hank Ingram or any other nice dorms. The students still self-segregate and hang out with their friends exclusively. In fact, the huge turnover rates at Kissam make it impossible to stay there multiple years in a row. Plus, having kids live in the houses makes people respect the facilities infinitely more, because that is someone's home.

Having people live in the houses is a crucial aspect of Greek life and allows the "house" to be perceived as a home, which facilitates group bonding.

Diversity of housing options on-campus has been a very beneficial experience for me. It forces you to visit friends in other parts of campus.

This is absolutely ridiculous. From an experience stand point, this greatly dilutes the Greek experience on campus and would detract from potential interest. From a logistical side, without residents, the houses would become party centers and people would not respect the properties. Currently, chapters pay around $60k/year to live in those houses because the residents pay their housing fees to the University to pay for rent and loans. Without that money, we are now putting that monetary obligation on the chapter, something that is too great to offset in other ways. Furthermore, Professor Weintraub suggested using these houses for things other than Greek organizations to reduce the monetary responsibility of Greek members so we are more inclusive to socio-economic backgrounds. Whichever organization has a responsibility to the house will have to increase dues on a magnitude scale and cause the same socio-economic hardship. This is utterly ridiculous.

I absolutely disagree. Commons is essential for the integration of new students into the community, but even by the end of their first year, students seek connections outside their housing community. The university cannot cleanly administer the bonds that students form. In addition, it should be easier for students to live off campus, not harder. Please do not try to be Hogwarts.

Officers and high ranking officials should live in chapter houses. If no one lives in the house then no one will take ownership of the houses and the houses will have lots of damage inflicted on them.

My residential experience in my Greek house has been arguably my single favorite part of my Vanderbilt experience. I love constantly having friends around the house and my room. I also like that only the officers live in the house, as it ensures that we are all still involved on campus and get to know other people as well. Students choose to live in Greek houses and run for positions because they want to, and depriving future students of that opportunity would be truly regrettable. Also, the houses (especially IFC houses) would be treated with a lack of respect if no one lived in them, as no one would really care if the houses were dirty, things were broken, etc.
64 As a member of a chapter who started unhoused upon joining, becoming housed has had the greatest impact on our brotherhood. We are tighter and our brotherhood is more fulfilling than ever. Not to say we NEED the house, but having a designated space to spend time together has undoubtedly made our chapter dynamic more cohesive. Simply having members living in the house changes how a chapter facility is approached and makes chapter tighter. / / I also think this recommendation runs contradictory to AC recommendations. Why have an AC for an area that has no residents?

65 Having residents live in the greek houses is one of the main reasons there is any reason for members to maintain and clean the house. It also guarantees some form of leadership at the house at all times. Having members live in the house also provides a sense that the house is truly a home for the members and is considered a "safe space" for them to hang out.

66 Why should we pay for houses with bedrooms and not be able to use them at all? This is in complete disregard for the Greek Community. The 6 people from each chapter who live in the house is not that big a deal, this seems like the precursor to getting rid of Greek houses to replace with college halls.

67 I think it is helpful to have presiding officers in the house at all times, and it contributes to a sense of community on Greek Row.

68 I don’t know the rationale behind this idea, but I believe that there would be no accountability for taking care of the houses. Additionally, the president, house manager and risk manager should always live in the house to be around the action in case something goes wrong.

69 I understand this won’t be actionable until at least two more reports... but my gosh is this unrealistic. NOT ONLY WILL IT UP COST, THE HOUSES WOULD TURN TO TRASH. If anything there should be MORE people living in the houses in order to add accountability for the care of the home. Also,... there are not many people on this campus who live in houses... less than 150. That’s approximately 2% of the population of vanderbilt. is this really important? there are maybe 60% who couldn’t care less about college halls... focus on making the program effective not on having a marginal amount of people get added to its presence. know what kids want don’t just force them into the system they already have wholly rejected.

70 This would lead to more problems than are encountered today. No one living in a Greek Chapter House? Bad idea.

71 This recommendation does not consider the attendant material financial consequences. Facility (Chapter House or College Halls) operations and maintenance are funded by resident fee or University subsidy. Removing the Chapter residents removes the primary income stream that keeps the House open. The economics of this recommendation need more study before establishing this recommendation as a firm. / / Unless there is a reasonable University construction schedule with financial plan to achieve 100% housing in the next 5 - 10 years, this is an unnecessarily contentious recommendation. Contrary to earlier assurances that the College Halls were compatible with the Greek system, this recommendation is viewed as an attack by the Faculty on the Greek system. I do not believe that this is a helpful or positive contribution to a discussion of Greek Life at VU at this time.

72 Living in the house provides 6 members their first opportunity of entering the world. They keep their own rooms clean. Learn to cope with the distraction of other of an outside world by brothers regular presence and noise. Gives them a convenient place to have meetings (the officers attend way more than an average member). The diversity of majors in a fraternity is much more stimulating than a College Hall of engineers (I was one) will ever be. The bonding due to mutual selection will always be stronger than the bonding of a mutual major (on average). You have a system where the average student has higher grades and is happier. Why make a major change in it? The finances of the Greek houses is based on 6 members living in the house. How do we replace the lost income? Completely oppose this recommendation.

73 Logistically a complete waste if living space is not used in each house. If only officers are allowed to live in the house, then they are able to develop great communication and cohesiveness, which they most certainly would not have scattered throughout dorms.

74 Greek members would be much less likely to take good care of their facilities if fellow members are not living there. Getting rid of the residential aspect of a Greek Chapter House would perpetuate the perception that our facilities are merely social gathering places. It would also be a risk management nightmare, because the (often high-ranking) chapter officers who currently reside in the facility would
no longer be present by default.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 6A: Address Socio-Economic-Status Problem

Obs C22

1 This is so key. I think the university needs to take a big step in fixing it, rather than constantly release new reports that simply claim it's an issue and do not offer any solutions. / / My chapter ensures that all of our members can receive IN-CHAPTER off-the-books scholarships. We make this clear to every kid who rushes us. The university does not offer enough support on this front, so we do it ourselves.

2 I believe this is a major issue in Greek life at Vanderbilt, but that initiative is meaningless. There needs to be concrete initiatives taken that go beyond inclusivity agreements.

3 This recommendation is very good, I would simply like to know how this would happen. As a student who is not exactly as well off as some of my peers may be, I would take issue with the money I am paying to attend this institution might go to paying the dues and other costs of someone else. I do realize that this may be necessary, and would support this change if it did indeed occur.

4 I agree with this on principal, but in practice this is very challenging. A large portion of Greek dues go straight to to our national offices, insurance, and other necessary expenses. Our chapter already has a very large brotherhood-assistance program, which allows many brothers coming from a low SES to afford their dues. If you had any advice as to how make Greek Life more affordable, that would be great. However, I question whether this is realistic.

5 If it can be done so in a manner than does not affect the people who do not need financial aid then I agree. In other words, do not diminish the greek life experience in order to make it more accessible to more people.

6 The people who join Greek Life are usually part of a higher socio-economic status than the general population, but how can you possibly try to change this? You can't force people to join or not join Greek Life. The people who want to join will join, no matter what. You can't try to mold the people who join.

7 This is great in theory, but "meaningfully address" doesn't really mean anything without an action plan behind it.

8 Hint: the problem doesn't begin with fraternities and sororities themselves.

9 National funds are not the answer to this problem. Vanderbilt is ahead of the times compared to national fraternities, and there should be accommodations for the high cost. One way to do this would be to allow financial aid to cover the housing fee that is charged every semester. Moreover, experience vanderbilt funds could be made available.

10 A lot of students feel that Greek life is in accessible to them due to financial reasons, some of which are imposed by Vanderbilt and can be changed. I disagree that the mark should be by 2025 and it should come ASAP.

11 It is duplicitous for the administration to claim that they see a place for Greek Life in 2025 at Vanderbilt University while simultaneously doing nothing to make the organizations more affordable with Experience Vanderbilt. We face structural barriers that make our membership socioeconomically stratified in the same way that Club Hockey or Wilderness Skills do, but the administration has deemed those and similar organizations worthy of Experience Vanderbilt funding. It is absurd for the administration to claim that they support Greek Life while they withhold Experience Vanderbilt funding from those same organizations because (presumably) Greek organizations do not comport with their values.

12 I think that a solution more comprehensive than the "raise you dues to fund more scholarships" that was offered at the officer round up needs to be identified and executed. It's no easy matter to fix but one that definitely needs to be.

13 It should be addressed, but the options provided by the report did not seem feasible. It actually wants to reduce options for this which then strains us more.
14 Greek life is expensive. I think we can do more to make it affordable but the task force report points out all the issues with no meaningful recommendations. I think there are ways to make it cheaper but I do not know the ways to make it less expensive. I think the issue of the socio-economic-status problem is because of the affordability of Greek life and we can hopefully find ways to make it less expensive in the next 9 years.

15 Every dollar I have spent on dues has been money well spent. I have friends who have taken on second jobs here at school in order to pay for fraternity dues. The majority of the money we spend on dues goes towards social events, philanthropy events, and brotherhood events. The system of dues was not created to discriminate in any way based on socio-economic status. Our chapter also offers payment plans to students who may have a harder time affording the member payments.

16 I think this is needed.

17 If we can not pay the school so much, dues will go down a lot and more people can participate.

18 The socio-economic-status problem has been addressed, it is on Vanderbilt and IFC to come up with the funds to make it more accessible.

19 This is very vague. The school has complained that our dues are so high. We are an organization and like any organization we need money to be able to run. A large portion of our dues goes towards paying the amount that the school charges us just to exist on campus. If Vanderbilt cut those costs then we could cut the cost of our memberships significantly.

20 I agree that this is a problem that should be addressed, however the GLTF provides absolutely no remedies for the problem. In fact, the few off-handed recommendations I have heard from faculty would actually increase the cost of dues. Lastly, many of the new policies of The Office of Greek Life have been the root cause of increased chapter dues.

21 This is not a Greek Life problem, this is a Vanderbilt program. There's little socio-economic diversity in Greek Life because there's little socio-economic diversity at this school. Many scholarship programs exist to help students in difficult financial situations.

22 Give more scholarships for low socio-economic classes to increase diversity in chapters.

23 There should be no barriers to taking part in Greek life here on campus. This should include race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, and not just socio-economic status, however.

24 This must be addressed immediately if we truly want Greek Life to be inclusive. There needs to be an immediate increase in funding for IFC and Panhell scholarships, and I believe this can come from University funding. Students simply cannot afford funding other member dues, so a significant increase in scholarship funding is necessary.

25 This is so far away and so vague I can't believe it was included as a recommendation. What determines an "addressed"?

26 I have no issue with this—Greek Life should be accessible for all. This recommendation, however, is currently overly vague. I would suggest that such a measure does not remove a chapter's right to set its dues for members.

27 This point is not quite fleshed-out. I'm not sure what the methodology would be to address this item other than by tangibly discriminating against members based upon their family's socioeconomic status, which seems a little odd.

28 "Poor people" cannot join chapters right now because getting "free" dues is near impossible and many do not want to work a job just to pay greek dues. I don't see a fix to this unless more money for scholarships is given by the university.

29 This recommendation lacks content and does not acknowledge the strides the Greek community is making in helping all people, regardless of socio-economic status, to join Greek life if they choose. I also play club lacrosse, which has dues very similar in cost to my Greek chapter. There has not been a task force addressing the socio-economic problems associated with club lacrosse, but there has been for Greek life despite Greek life's concerted efforts to help ease the financial strains of joining. I have numerous friends in my chapter who do feel the everyday strains of depleted finances, but we ensure
that they are included as much as possible.

30 I think OGL and Vanderbilt can do a lot more to help out Greek students. Placing the blame on greek houses for not recruiting certain people is completely wrong. Most houses have assistance programs and so do their national organizations. The way to address this problem is for Vanderbilt to help out more.

31 NA

32 I do agree, and it does pain me that some members of the greater Vanderbilt community cannot enter the Greek community due to financial issues. However, as my chapter does, promoting internal scholarships is a start. I will say though, measures to increase socio-economic equality in Greek life is an issue that must be tackled in INTIMATE lock-step with leaders in the Greek community. Some suggestions may reduce financial burden but also could have effects that are not worth it.

33 The dean was ridiculous and insulting at round up. He accused us of having high dues to exclude people then said we should raise dues on ourselves to pay for others. If you actually care then maybe Vanderbilt could give us money or stop charging the hidden fee that many new members don't know about.

34 What problem? I don't believe that one exists. My fraternity has some of the most socio-economic diversity that I've seen from any group at Vanderbilt. Members who want to make dues absolutely can I and many of my Brothers work over the summer and use this money to pay our dues, because being a part of our Fraternity is quite worth it to us. Greek life isn't free, but no one is precluded from joining because of their concerns. My Chapter and many others offer scholarships to members who need it, and IFC as a whole has many scholarships up for grabs.

35 I do believe there is a SES divide between students who join greek life and those who do not. There are already scholarship funds in place through the IFC and such for disadvantaged students.

36 This survey question does not make sense with the answers given. I think that fraternities have a reputation for only attracting kids of certain socio-economic backgrounds. However, we have never ever ever discriminated in the rush process or considered socio-economic status. If kids cannot afford dues in our fraternity there is a payment plan.

37 I commend the Task Force for pointing out our most apparent flaw but providing absolutely no suggestions for how to address it. Two thumbs up.

38 Will need help. Can't do this on our own. Need to school to not put a negative image or hurt fundraising for scholarships.

39 I'd love to find a solution to that problem.

40 I am for positive change like this, not unnecessary things to destroy Greek life.

41 Allow dues to be included within tuition so financial aid and scholarships can cover some of the cost. Or make more scholarships that cover dues available. Those are really the only 2 things that can be done to solve this problem.

42 I don't see the problem. Clubs are clubs. People let in who they want. Socio-economic status doesn't play a large role in who ends up pledgeing a fraternity aside from issues associated with costs. That being said, chapters can work with people financially if they really like them. //

43 This sounds super nice, but I need action items or recommendations to make this happen. Will Experience Vanderbilt (assuming it gets off the ground before 2025) include Greek Life as one of it's areas that it financially assists in? (I don't see why it wouldn't). If that's the case, EV would significantly mitigate costs associated with joining Greek Life. // This cost mitigation would in turn help our current issue with lack of diversity/inclusion. A huge filter to joining greek life is financial situation and perceived SES status, as horrible as that seems. Removing a large chunk of the financial obligation for those students who need assistance would help to nullify that stereotyping. // It's hard to lower dues currently, as a significant portion of those go to national organizations, OGL, etc. What's left over is intended for meaningful programming, dues assistance, and other obligations to keep the chapter running.
44 This isn't a bad idea but how, exactly, are we going to “meaningfully address” this problem? This recommendation needs structuring.

45 While I think this problem exists, various initiatives are underway to tackle it.

46 Speaking only for my chapter, our selection process is blind to socio-economic influence. Our rush is completely free of charge and we work with new members to ensure they can afford the house given their personal situation.

47 There needs to be some sort of a plan for this. Possibly the school covering national/facility fees through the need-based financial aid plans.

48 Wouldn't be an issue if Vandy didn't keep increasing the amount of money they charge our organizations.

49 I agree with the principal but am not sure I see how this would be done.

50 This is something we are already working on. I do not agree with the guidelines that the Task Force lies out as it greatly reduces potential action from Greek members. The phrase that alumni contributions can serve a greater interest to the University only implies that the Task Force did not have the long term success of Greek Life in mind.

51 There should be scholarships available to low income students seeking greek affiliation. A condition of extracurricular involvement or simply grade point average could be a powerful incentive to remain focused on higher priorities as students.

52 While we address this matter internally very well, I think it'd be a great idea for this to be a Greek-wide initiative.

53 This is as much a Vanderbilt problem as it is a problem with national organizations. I have heard of national organizations who will not allow their chapters to set aside a scholarship fund with member dues. When national organizations handcuff their chapters, there is little Vanderbilt can do. // Each governing council should have scholarships set aside to pay for a significant portion of membership dues. This will be valuable to further diversify the Greek population. // It should be noted that reducing chapter dues by some small amount (say $25) will have little effect on who can join. While financial accountability is important, reducing $800 dues to $775 will not truly change demographics. A student unable to pay $800 will likely be unable to pay $800. This problem should be addressed with large scholarships that will reduce dues by half or more. My chapter sets aside $5000 each semester and members needing assistance apply and we allocate money based on need.

54 I agree with the overall purpose of the recommendation, but disagree strongly with the methods outlined in the body of the recommendation. The recommendation states that greek leaders must provide solutions for this solely on their own. If greek orgs are truly considered Vandy orgs, then it's disingenuous that Vandy wouldn't help provide resources to help people join. Greek orgs can only provide so much financial assistance (we can't control nationals), so there's a maximum level of assistance we can provide without it negatively impacting the programming that helped us rank so favorably in the findings from the task force. Recommending that Vanderbilt Experience $$ should not be used to help pay for dues is overstepping the task force’s bounds, since this is a VSG program. Also, the fact that the task force recommends this $$ should be used for some orgs but not others makes me worry that the goal of this recommendation is to strong-arm $$-challenged students into joining other orgs.

55 Maybe we should start with the $400 dollar increase in tuition per semester from Vanderbilt, which increases our dues by 40%.

56 We've been doing this for a while now, but continuing it is always a good idea.

57 See above regarding inclusivity agreement

58 Great recommendation. How you gonna do it? I got an answer-- figure out how to cut the absurd housing fees we pay. Our dues are 500$. Adding another 300 for the greek renewal is almost double. If you're gonna do that have some record-keeping. Clearly this is an addressable portion. At least have an argument. Nonetheless, you need a plan to account for this. Did you know my chapter gives out 10,000$ of scholarships a year from our dues? Probably not, since this report did little to no research.
on that front, you need some actionable realistic items or this is moot.

59 There are plenty of alternatives for students who cannot "afford" membership in a Greek organization. The Admin has no business "addressing" this. For over 100 years it has worked just fine.

60 This recommendation requires subsidy of some by others and requires such a subsidy for continued existence. If this is a University goal for Greek Life, the subsidy should come from the University. Our Chapter agrees with the value and has some members who are of lower socio-economic status. Those guys work hard to pay their dues and receive some support. Short of paying for all Greek Life or banning Greek Life, I'm not sure how the University "solves this problem" for the Faculty.

61 In my era we had students washing the dishes every day to help pay their bills (Most never did). There is always a cost to membership. If someone pays nothing they will get nothing out of joining. Money is a fact of life. If someone wants to be a fraternity member they can get a part time job to pay for it. The social budget is one of a chapter's biggest expenses and is self imposed. The only way I see to help this situations for Vanderbilt to assist in paying for Greek membership or for Vanderbilt to provide loans to Greek members to pay bills. Most other methods of fixing this will destroy the Greek system. What is the socio economic status of those who go through rush vs the Greek system. Unless they go through rush this will not change.

62 I agree this is an issue, but would have to see some more specific proposals before commenting.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 6B: Create Affording Greek Life

Obs  C24

1 Pamphlets will be published discouraging parents from allowing their students to waste money on frat dues. No other club on campus requires this appraisal.

2 Many kids do not know about the actual costs associated with being a brother until pledging/after pledging. For example, I did not know about the costs associated with spring formal until I became a brother. That was a shock.

3 This is the wrong approach. This would only serve to discourage membership. Instead, focus on educating chapters on how they can make Greek Life more affordable.

4 I think this would be a valuable resource, but hope that it will be an accurate representation of the relative expenses of different chapters; some are more affordable than others.

5 The costs of Greek Life vary greatly by chapter. It would be very hard to make an average estimate for every chapter.

6 Those with financial concerns don't have a concrete plan available to them before arriving at Vanderbilt.

7 The people who need financial help to pay for the costs associated with Greek life will seek out information from the brothers in the houses.

8 I agree with this, I've never had much trouble paying for fraternity dues, but I didn't realize how expensive the dues actually were until I had already joined the chapter.

9 I believe that most kids understand the financial burden of joining a greek house, but a formal process appraisal would not be a bad idea.

10 I like the "before-you-start" part of this recommendation.

11 I don't even know what this is. I need more information before I can give an appraisal.

12 I struggle with finances, and the many hidden costs of Greek life really upset me when I first joined. Helping first year students plan for this would be intelligent.

13 Dues figures do not explain the true cost of Greek Life.

14 I think a program like this would be proactive towards helping the social-economic issue addressed beforehand. More information could only help individuals who were uncertain about joining greek life.

15 I mean the costs are more or less there so I do not think that this makes a huge difference. I think the only thing this would change is including the cost of formals.

16 I don't agree with this because no other clubs have something like this.

17 I think we could be more up front with how much Greek life costs. My chapter does a need based payment system. If you can afford the dues then you pay them; if you cannot, then you pay as much as you can comfortably pay and the house will cover the rest. Once again, this really depends on the house, certain houses have more events and pay more (sometimes double) of other houses. I think this is more of a personal discussion with a treasurer of the house you are interested in, not a generic pamphlet handed out to prospective new members because of the variability of costs and payment structures between different houses. Some people may argue it is intimidating for freshmen to approach an upperclassmen in the house about this issue - but it shows initiative on the part of the individual, and it starts to cultivate friendships across different classes. These both are things that are assets in a fraternity.

18 Also good idea.

19 This appraisal should not be used as a scare-tactic, and should show that Greek Life is affordable.
People know what Greek Life costs. Money is necessary to running the organization and anyone serious about joining knows that.

This would really help a lot of people out and perhaps remove the accurate stigma that traditional Greek life is very privileged

If this is desired, so be it. I do not think it will really add much information to the "going Greek" process, but would probably be welcomed by a few people.

This seems like a reasonable recommendation. Many chapters already require new members to evaluate financial responsibility to the chapter, but it would be nice to have a pervasive policy.

Anything to increase inclusivity would be great. We need to figure out this socio-economic divide between greeks/non greeks.

The costs of joining each chapter are readily available before joining the chapter.

I feel the real costs are well articulated to potential new members already.

This isn't really realistic. What is the real cost of Vanderbilt? Do you include the cost of a rain jacket or new shoes in the cost of attending Vanderbilt? Would you include the cost of a new jacket in greek life? this doesn't make any sense,

Making people aware of the actual amount dues cost before joining would be wise; however, this information MUST be kept up to date. It would need to be reviewed every year with the Chapter Treasurers and each Chapter would have to confirm that these figures were correct.

Such a program would be beneficial to those who rush and would later find out finances would prevent them from joining a chapter.

Different houses have different payment plans, would have to be on a case by case basis.

Sure, that sounds like a good idea.

The monetary costs of participating in Greek Life are made direct in the sense that each chapter's membership fees are published in some handbook publication, but that is not sufficiently explicit.

Greek Life has been the best experience I've had at Vanderbilt. Having any program that would present the message to discourage people would be doing them a disservice. This would be good but it should emphasize the possibilities of overcoming the costs like mentioning campus jobs to pay for dues.

It wouldn't be a bad idea to do this, although the cost of going greek varies from chapter to chapter

Pretty simple: // Dues (~$900 per semester) / Formal / Date Parties (~$250-300 a year) / "Going Out" costs (food, alcohol, clothes) (varies depending on the person, and is NOT Greek-Life specific) / Other costs / // Think this would help with transparency. Part of this "Affording Greek Life" would absolutely need to include information about dues assistance programs set up by each chapter. For example, my chapter allocated over $8,000 of our budget to assisting brothers pay for dues. That is incredibly significant to consider when someone is appraising Greek Life as an option for their involvement.

Limiting this recommendation is the part that I strongly disagree with. Experience Vanderbilt was created with the intent to let students choose the way they experience our school, with Greek Life being one way to do so.

Good idea.

Seems like it could be beneficial to both chapters and new-members.

Each organization is different. Greek Life cannot create its own Opportunity Greek Life program. Depending on the socio-economic backgrounds of each member of the organization, scholarships and
aid changes. We cannot give a full appraisal before people start because it's a circular formula. All we can do is be honest about what dues of each chapter. Which we already do.

42 Students do not need written discouragement from going greek. If this was to be an unbiased appraisal, testimonial positives must be included.

43 This sounds like it could be a useful tool but also could be used by the university to taint opinions of Greek Life in people before they even step foot on this campus.

44 I like this, but it would have to be carefully constructed, as each chapter handles finances differently.

45 There are so many hidden costs, not just dues. This would go a long way toward creating financial transparency.

46 Very smart and transparent.

47 We already list out our dues costs on a pamphlet. Isn't this the same thing. Also, we tell all our rushes our dues and associated costs.

48 Kids should know exactly how much they are paying and what they are paying for before they sign up.

49 It will scare people, but may actually lead to reforms. One problem is the costs of throwing events continues to increase and with no way for chapters to get private security/bartending, we're forced to shell out a seemingly ridiculous amount of money just for a registered event.

50 Hidden fees are on greek office end. We tell everyone our dues up front and offer scholarships to whoever applies. Greek office neglects to add their costs of greek renewal, this is Vanderbilt's duty not the students to clean up.

51 An average member's costs for the prior 2 years by chapter would be sufficient for the freshman to see what was coming.

52 This strikes me as another attempt to handcuff Greek recruitment if handled by the University. I can easily see a "Run the Other Way Before You Waste Thousands of Dollars on a Fraternity" tone to it. I also have a big problem with opening our chapter's financial records to accurately determine this information.
IFC Feedback on Recommendation 7: Student Life Monitoring of Progress

Obs C26

1. These are useless recommendations.

2. The report overall needs more student engagement and reflection from within the system.

3. Do not have the most corrupt student organization on campus have anything to do with Greek life

4. From what every single person I have spoken to has said, we, as a collective, disagree with a majority of that committee's intentions. We should not be coerced into a partnership. We should be able to vote on it as a greek community because we are a real community with common interests.

5. I think that the greek community should be as involved as possible with these proposals, because the greek community will be the ones most affected by these actions and therefore should have a voice in these decisions.

6. As long as this partnership is truly a two way street and the two sides are really working together, I see no problem with this. As long as the greek voice is heard, this should not be an issue.

7. I absolutely believe the Greek community needs to be heavily involved in reviewing these recommendations. These recommendations stand to have the largest impact on the Greek community, and I believe the Greek community should be consulted heavily on these recommendations.

8. I do not understand why faculty must be involved in Greek life decisions. They work in the academic section of this school and no experience or merit to be making decisions for a section of this school that has little connection to their employed positions.

9. Where was the Faculty Senate when they were dividing these recommendations? This whole process needs to be 110% more transparent and more inclusive of not just students but Greek community members as well.

10. We would like our voices to be heard. The fact that there was little if any communication with Greeks about this task force and their thoughts has left many people upset.

11. If the committee is too detached from Greek life they have a worse chance of knowing the full implications of their recommendations. In addition, with a negative reputation swirling around Greek life, their opinions could become biased without taking the time to figure out what Greek life is really about.

12. Given the minimal extent to which Greek organizations were consulted on the Task Force Report, it is counterproductive for Greek organizations to be involved in the assessment process.

13. I believe there needs to be a constant dialogue in order for recommendations to be received and successful. Unfortunately this is often not the case, perhaps causing many of the issues discussed in this survey. I believe that the Faculty Senate Student Life Committee has an obligation to listen to students and not attempt to impose rules that the students do not agree with without opening up channels of dialogue to attempt to mediate a solution for both parties. Ultimately, compromise might not always be possible, but without at least an attempt at something, students will be very dissatisfied.

14. I believe that any changes should be monitored by IFC since they all have experiences in these groups. Other groups are not aware of why we joined and will not be aware of how to implement these changes realistically.

15. The Greek community can regulate itself. After visiting AFLV (a national Greek leadership meeting) I realized how progressive Vanderbilt Greek life is. Many of these meetings were discussing how other schools hoped that their school would use Green Dot and be more inclusive in the future (stuff Vanderbilt already does). There are a lot of issues pressuring the Greek community and Vanderbilt Greek life is always far ahead of many schools in this aspect. For this reason I think Vanderbilt Greek Leadership is capable to monitor the implementation of these recommendations. I do think it may be helpful to have the Faculty Senate Student to help implement these changes, however what worries
me is that Greek leadership completely changes every year. I am worried that we will lose control of the direction our community is headed in when we accept help from the Faculty Senate. The incumbent Faculty Senate will be largely making decisions after the first round of Greek executives graduate.

16 Don't think it's necessary.

17 Let the greek community find its own solutions

18 Students deserve more input into these decisions. I don't believe that this task force researched the issues at hand very well. They based their recommendations on stereotypes and isolated cases rather than actually researching Greek Life as a whole.

19 If this partnership is a meaningful two-way dialogue, there ought not be any problem with it. However, if it becomes nothing more than a trusteeship over Greek Life—a partnership in name only—I would not support it.

20 Our voice should be heard. For as many problems as greek life seems to have, it does serve a purpose. It helps people find their best friends—people to play sports with, hang out, do service with, etc. It also serves to motivate students to push each other to become the best versions of themselves: both socially and in the classroom.

21 Our input is important. I feel that there is a massive disconnect between the study body and the administration at Vanderbilt, especially Greek students. I, along with many others believe the school pushes the student body around and ultimately works for its own benefit without taking students' opinions into consideration. If Vanderbilt wants to dramatically change Greek life, Greek students' voices must be heard.

22 The Faculty Senate Student Life Committee should have more thoroughly consulted the Greek community before making these recommendations, but a step in rectifying that mistake is to meet to review these recommendations with the Greek community.

23 NA

24 In no business or organization, ever, can a third party speak better to addressing issues than those within. They may be able to identify the issues, as has happened, but working with the Greek community will aid in creating real change that is acceptable to the Greek community, and ultimately better for the community overall.

25 The task force has absolutely no greek affiliation, I have discussed this with alumni advisors. We think this is a biased panel that is not qualified to evaluate an experince the do not understand. The dean is also not greek. Actually talking to students they claim to represent wouldnt be the worst idea ever. Might even be somewhat productive

26 I believe an ongoing conversation between the Faculty Senate and the students is essential in improving the welfare of the Greek Community. As the climate for greek life continues to change, it is important to maintain contact and review these recommendations and their effectiveness as necessary. It will be important to get feedback from students as these recommendations begin being implemented.

27 Listen to the students for once please. If you make all these changes without our input we are just going to resent the administration.

28 Faculty don't understand Greek life.

29 Oversight is generally a good thing, though it must happen at an optimal level (as opposed to maximal) such that the Greek community does not respond with excessive antagonism.

30 I would like some input as to how these recommendations are evaluated and rolled out, and I can speak for many other students in the community in saying that we would all like to have input and to give our perspective as well. These recommendations affect our community directly, and I feel that it's in the best interests of both parties (students and faculty) to have an honest conversation and consider all perspectives before moving forward. Frankly, if the FSSLC wants to see a successful implementation of parts of this Report, student involvement in that decision-making process is an
I do not think that any further oversight is needed with these recommendations. The University pays a full staff to work with Greek Life on this school, and they are the most informed of all.

The Greek community should definitely have a say in these matters

Honestly speaking, I do not see the value in continuing engagement with the Faculty Senate after the very negative experience of this Task Force.

Greeks do not have much of any say in this process. They need advocates at higher levels in addition to inclusion in the decision-making process.

While I mean no disrespect, the Faculty Senate has very limited exposure to the true ins and outs of Greek life. No amount of research can substitute for being involved on a daily basis, and those who know most about Greek Life (OGL, IFC, etc.) are those who should monitor and review these recommendations.

Governing councils should be heavily involved

Yes, the faculty senate needs much more student input regarding this report, and the recommendations definitely need to be reviewed.

Clearly there should be more input from the people it will affect most.

Judging by the rhetoric that has been circulating, it seems that the Faculty Senate Student Life Committee has been more interested in attacking the Greek community than partnering with it. I'm sure that the Greek community would welcome any genuine attempts at productive collaboration going forward.

One thing that was made clear was how little the FSTF actually learned about Greek life. They appear to have gotten their information in a bubble and didn't really learn anything. Then when accused of this, they get very defensive. They need to actually intrain themselves in the community before they start making recommendations that will affect the community in such ways that they have.

The Faculty Senate has made it clear in this report they do not understand the Greek community. They should be talking to each president, conducting research, coming to chapter meetings. ANYTHING, this report showed no tether to reality and simply stated solutions that fit any group. the greek office understands the people they oversee, the senate doesn't. I think they should work on a report that genuinely gauges what is wrong with the system with appropriate responses that can address the problem realistically. Truly upsetting it took them two years to come out with this.

The more voices the better.

I'm not sure what this means in practice.

Greeks and Faculty need to talk to one another. It is good for both sides.
IFC Feedback on Hypothetical Recommendation: Sophomore Rush

Obs C28

1. It's an integral part of the freshman experience. Boom. Mind-blowing.

2. Greek life builds meaningful friendships on top of those that you make in your first semester on commons. Moving to sophomore rush could have a larger effect in tearing freshmen friendships apart. I also learned so much freshmen year from older brothers in the chapter. Sophomore rush would take away from some of that mentoring.

3. Another way to ruin admissions, and this would have substantially hurt my experience at Vanderbilt.

4. I think that taking away an entire year of membership will devalue the Greek experience and lead to less investment and subsequently involvement in Greek life.

5. Joining a values-based Greek organization during my freshman year has been a very formative experience for myself. Freshman year was very tough for me, but having brothers to help me along the way was something that I will be forever grateful for. Also, if this were ever to be put in place, then the entirety of freshman year would just serve as a "dirty-rush" period. As a result, chapters will likely know exactly who will be in their next pledge class before sophomore year. This literally makes no sense whatsoever.

6. The deferred recruitment already in place at Vanderbilt offers first year students the opportunity to explore all opportunities available here. It is important to keep this in place to allow freshmen to see how the Commons and Greek life can build off of each other, not take away from each other.

7. I think second semester freshman year is perfect. Commons gets old after first semester anyways. Sophomore recruitment would increase the amount of dues flowing into the house which would make it harder for my fraternity to accommodate financial needs of brothers which we currently do.

8. I think this would be a very bad idea. I completely agree with spring rush; I believe it is the perfect amount of time to rush and meet brothers of fraternities and it is a much better system than in State schools that have fall rush. However, the defining characteristic of my freshman year was rushing and joining a fraternity, and having people wait until sophomore year would be way too long of a time period to wait to join a fraternity / sorority.

9. There is no reason to try to incubate freshmen on commons, which is what not allowing them to rush would be. It is important to meet a wide variety of people during college, including those of many ages. Not allowing them to rush would mean that freshmen would likely only be friends with other freshmen.

10. I believe second semester recruitment is the best option for a school like Vanderbilt. I really like the fact that you get a semester to choose the house you are in instead of being forced to make a decision after a few weeks. However, deferring to sophomore year would be a bad choice. There is nothing gained by an extra semester of rush except for more burden on fraternity houses. I believe houses would still pick the people they wanted at the same time as before, if not earlier, but only pledging would be pushed back. This would not do much to foster inclusivity, it would do the opposite.

11. I believe my personal story might be a good way to weigh in on this issue. Greek life is what saved my Vanderbilt experience. My first semester I could barely talk to girls, I didn't hang out with my friends very often, I mainly sat in my room and played video games during my free time. But joining Greek Life gave me the brotherhood I needed to get me to come out of my shell. I had joined multiple clubs my first semester, but without that sense of brotherhood nobody in those clubs seemed very interested in helping me grow as a person. My chapter helped me turn into the best version of myself, and I am so grateful that I got to go through recruitment as a freshman because I believe I wouldn't have grown socially and as a person if I hadn't joined Greek Life, leaving me with an extra semester of being a loner. Greek Life made Vanderbilt wonderful for me, and I know there are hundreds of others who feel the same way. The brotherhood/sisterhood that Greek Life provides is unrivaled.

12. What advantage would that provide? Freshmen want to rush and join fraternities without having to wait a year.
13 This wouldn't really solve your problem, nor would it create any other than giving students less opportunity to leave their mark on their organization.

14 I like the system we have now. First years have a good amount of time to find the house that they like, and are still given plenty of time to make a difference. First years are able to spend most of their second semester adjusting to Greek life in one facet of another, while waiting another semester would severely limit their leader hip opportunities and campus involvement.

15 The way it is done now is perfect. Students have a semester to make friends and figure out how to succeed academically. Adding one more semester to this would be unnecessary and would infringe on students' opportunity to participate in and receive the benefits of Greek life.

16 I disagree with sophomore intake because it reduces the size and therefore strength of Greek organizations and decreases the incentive to rush, as first years form more solid communities during their first year and a half.

17 I would not recommend this idea. This idea would discourage people from joining Greek organizations because it would limit the amount of time you could be an undergrad in the organization. Additionally, it would be of great expense to recruitment chairs in fraternities who would need to have events over the course of an entire year rather than just one semester. Ultimately, this recommendation seeks to remedy the idea that the commons experience is over second semester when students join a Greek organization. However, I believe that the commons experience prevents first year students from interacting with the upperclassmen. This results in a campus structure that is divisive between classes. Greek recruitment in the latter half of the first year breaks that open and even if an individual does not join a Greek organization they still will interact with older students as a consequence of their friends interacting with older students.

18 It would make sustainability much more difficult for our organizations, and lower the experience that others could get from these organizations. Being a part helps get leadership experience that would be lost, and there would then be higher costs since there would be fewer members.

19 I think the system of delayed rush and pledging by one semester is perfect. I don't think this change will improve anything to be honest. I am worried this will hurt the chances of a transfer student of being accepted into a house, however. The transfer student's exposure will be significantly less than a normal student if we decided to do rush and new member education all in the fall of second year. A lot of members will be evaluated based upon their entire freshman year (which can be beneficial) but the transfers will only have a small amount of time before bid day comes. The way the process works now, both the freshmen and the transfer sophomores get an entire semester of exposure before bid day in the spring. I also think this is a solution without a problem, there does not seem to be an issue with the way the process currently works.

20 Just because the administration wants more attendance at Commons events does not mean recruitment should be moved. I can honestly say that I would not have attended any more Commons events even if I had not joined a chapter.

21 There's just something special to being able to spend 4 years on campus with your brothers. I honestly feel like I have become a better man and a better citizen of this campus because of the experiences I have had in my fraternity. Additionally, I feel like moving towards sophomore recruitment is going to cause a plethora of problems. First, I think that recruitment will turn into a year long process that will be really stressful for freshmen. Moreover, it makes it really hard for transfers to get bids because there are so many freshmen they are competing with for spots in pledge classes. Finally, I think this will make it really hard for people who don't get a bid their first go around to ever join a fraternity. Overall, I think the system we currently have in place is the best form of recruitment possible.

22 It ends up being one fewer semester of a phenomenal experience. No reason to do this.

23 That is just less time for people to be in a fraternity. It allows freshman to join a new group of friends. If we move to sophomore year, the new guys will predetermine their pledge class and that will decrease the mental diversity we have now

24 This recommendation defeats the purpose of IFC's goals of growth and development of young men. Personally, joining a fraternity has set me on a path of success, with so many opportunities to fail at this school, and so many issues of liability, this recommendation is not feasible. This also isolates
Commons from main campus. Freshman men will be too focused on trying to rush a fraternity for a year, that they will not take the opportunity to join clubs, and enjoy time with those not in Greek life. At the end of the day, those who continue to rush will group with people like them until there is no more rush.

25 Second semester freshman year gives students plenty of time to adjust to school. Also if students are given a full year to make friendships before rushing they will all rush the same fraternities as groups and fraternities will be forced to give bids to groups of people rather than individuals.

26 Absolutely disagree 100%, Joining my fraternity has helped me forge relationships that will last forever. Pushing recruitment back only delays the formation of these relationships and gives us less time to enjoy them during our undergraduate careers. This would be a huge mistake is it passed.

27 This would severely disrupt the benefits of Greek Life. Every single one of my best friends at Vanderbilt have been the result of joining my fraternity. It is an extraordinarily diverse group of individuals who I would have never gotten to know otherwise, and it would be a disgrace for the University to take away a full year from students intending to go Greek from forming the bonds and friendships promoted by Greek Life.

28 Sophomore recruitment makes first year students miss out on an entire semester of all of the benefits of Greek life. This is entirely pointless. Deferred recruitment in the second semester, as we do it now, is ideal because it allows first year students to get adjusted before deciding whether or not to go Greek and creates a renewed sense of excitement about meeting new people during the second semester freshman year. This is especially beneficial as many first year students have difficult transitions and do not make many friends on their own first semester, and find that Greek life is an excellent way to make new friends.

29 I hate that rushing and pledging takes away from first-year's Commons experience, but I know there would be a lot of backlash about this.

30 The current system of deferred recruitment is fine as is---creating recruitment for Sophomores onwards is completely out of step with how almost every other Greek community around the country operates.

31 As a member who joined sophomore year, I find it unnecessary to have delayed my own recruitment.

32 I think part of what makes Vanderbilt Greek Life so meaningful and bonding is the fact that it has freshmen recruitment

33 There's no point in this. Most schools let 1st semester freshmen join. I don't think that this would help anything.

34 I believe that joining the Greek community is an integral part of the social development of many Vanderbilt students, myself included. Delaying that social development until sophomore year would benefit no one, except for those who seek to decrease the Greek community's role on Vanderbilt's campus.

35 NA

36 One of the greatest ways to get friends on campus as a freshmen is through Greek life, whether a person joins one or not, a lot of connections are made during the rush process. Getting friends is extremely important freshmen year, especially if a kid comes here and has no acquaintances on campus. I assume that person would be very lonely and unhappy during their first year.

37 This issue has been addressed for years, and continually has been shot down for good reason. Others can articulate better but overall, this would only hurt than help greater Vanderbilt.

38 No this is another bad idea. Freshmen have a semester to adjust then they WANT to become involved. Isolating freshmen for a year on commons is a bad move. I would not have liked it and I doubt many people are are actually greeks would like it

39 Deferred recruitment and a semester-long rush process is already enough of a strain on both Chapters and the First-years. To exclude First-year Students from an entire segment of campus life under the assumption that they are somehow not "mature" enough to handle it is insulting to them and seems like a direct attack on the membership numbers of Greek Organizations, as the size of each of them
would dwindle to 75% of what would normally be expected. This hypothetical recommendation would be disastrous and meet plenty of outcry if implemented, and for good reason. First-year students use Greek life as a way to adjust and integrate into campus as a whole; it eases them into the bigger world of the entire Vanderbilt Campus from their Commons experience, and acts as their "home away from home" during their first year. Greek life is a great way to meet upperclassmen as a First-year student, and restricting this further would deteriorate the First-year experience.

40 I disagree with this hypothetical recommendation. If this recommendation follows the same logic behind the current deferment of freshmen recruitment to the spring semester of their first year—the logic being giving them time to adjust, make friends, join other groups, etc.—then an additional deferment to sophomore year is an unnecessary redundancy. Joining a fraternity or sorority allows freshmen an incredible opportunity to create relationships, take on leadership positions, and grow individually. I think deferring recruitment to the spring to allow for a fall adjustment period is a good idea (especially considering the logistics involving fall recruitment for freshmen in the summer). We should allow students the chance to join these organization as soon as they are able to, given the benefits of membership begin as soon as they join.

41 What does this even mean.

42 Rushing for the entirety of freshman year would lead to a lot more student accountability issues along with completely tanking first year GPAs. If recruitment is delayed also, what would freshmen year social life realistically look like?

43 It hasn't been adopted in the past for good reason. Kids deserve to experience Greek Life in its fullest if they so choose, and limiting it to sophomore rush would limit the amount of meaningful experience Greek Life could provide to students. I know the administration prefers to focus on the negative effects of Greek Life on the lives of its individual members, and even blow them way out of proportion in some cases, but Greek Life does provide an immense amount of good for its members, and we deserve to experience that for all 4 years.

44 Freshmen want to find a home, let it be Greek life if they want it to be.

45 This could be a positive move. From my experience, the fall class of sophomores are usually more connected with other campus involvement than the freshmen classes.

46 As someone who joined greek life as a sophomore I think this is completely unnecessary. You can build more lasting relationships over 4 years.

47 The benefits of this switch are outweighed by the issues it would create. // Benefits -- allow FYS to adjust more to campus before making the decision to join. Frankly, waiting a year wouldn't change the amount or makeup of the students joining the recruitment process. Many students have preconceptions about Greek Life and join based on those, and keeping them out of the system for a year wouldn't do anything to change those preconceptions, since the visible side of GL that most FYS interact with (parties, date functions, large philanthropy events) for the most part just serve to reinforce those preconceptions. // Issues -- Completely prevent development of men in chapters to serve as future leaders. We lose a year of the development process, and thus our future executive boards would be less capable of handling the position as compared to someone who has spent 2 full years in the community before stepping into a leadership role. // -- Removes a major identify-formation (cont'd below) /

48 Moving towards sophomore recruitment would make the duration of recruitment unnecessarily long. Currently, recruitment spans across several months, explicitly for male students and, in underground circles, for female students as well. This length of time is sufficiently, if not excessively, long as is. Lengthening recruitment would cause Greek organizations to focus more on rush and less on member development and brotherhood/sisterhood.

49 Kids rush to find friends and meet people, two things that will happen regardless of when the official dates are.

50 This wouldn't actually solve any problems, and would more than likely lead freshmen to endanger themselves, trying to find replacement recreational activities.

51 I like the premise, but believe it would cause a lot of issues where freshman come to fraternity houses
but do not feel responsible for their actions at these houses. Additionally, I think it would be impossible to effectively ensure that no recruitment activities took place outside of the parameters that this type of a recommendation would likely entail.

52 This was NEVER discussed between the students and the Task Force. This is a strong arm from Professor Weintraub to push his own agenda. This has been recommended twice before and not implemented for a reason. It's ridiculous to let one member of the Task Force push his own thoughts forward without the support of the other members. Again, utterly ridiculous.

53 Greek life is valuable for young directionless students seeking a home. Sophomores are more comfortable in their non-greek identity, which can be good but also discourages chapter involvement. A first and second year balance is important.

54 I believe that this move would inhibit friendships being made between freshman and seniors as there are few other places where they two groups would meet in such an intimate setting. Personally, the senior class when I was a new member offered multiple mentor figures who helped me get the most out of my college experience and prepare me for life as an alumni.

55 Taking sophomores / transfers is something that each house should focus on.

56 Ultimately, this would entail a longer recruitment period for IFC (1 year instead of 1 semester), a severely prolonged moratorium on contact with freshmen women for Pan-hel, and a drastically different intake system for NPHC. Even with rules to maintain current amounts of time spent in recruitment for all three councils, it is hard for me to believe that some amount of dirty recruiting would occur. Ultimately, with prolonged starts to recruitment, I believe that students with deep understanding of recruitment/intake coming into college would be successful while unknowledgeable students would be relatively clueless.

57 Freshmen already have an entire semester to spend adjusting to campus and joining other orgs. By pushing back recruitment until Sophomore year, the school would only be preventing students from having more more leadership opportunities within their greek orgs, since they would have to wait longer to run for execchair positions and have less chances to do so. This hampers one of the most important aspects of greek life. Also, greek orgs provide some of the closest relationships available on campus, and this recommendation would reduce a freshman's ability to become friends with older members, and also prevents networking which would also benefit the new members professionally. This also prevents freshmen from having an easy channel to talk with and get help from older students with the same major, preventing them from getting help academically. Overall, this recommendation would severely diminish the greek experience both academically and personally (in terms of happiness on campus)

58 This will just increase the time of rush, which will make it so that more of Freshman year is spent at Greek Row.

59 Our recruitment process is already delayed long enough. Further delay would only undermine the camaraderie of these organizations.

60 This would simply encourage dirty rush for an entire year. The rush process is too long as is, and the length encourages members to drink with the freshman. By the time you're a senior, you are inherently less involved. So this would give kids 4 real semesters to experience fraternity life. It should be 6, but we choose to make it 5

61 This could help combat hazing and other issues that arise when giving upperclassmen power over freshmen. It would also remove amount of stress freshmen experience trying to get into Greek Houses. That said, "dirty rushing" would most likely still occur, but it could be mitigated.

62 you're giving up a year of fraternity life, as a sophomore this is your most important time to be in one. you develop friendships, career advice, academic knowledge, all of this is facilities through greg orgs well. giving this up removes a huge contribution of what a greek org should be. the fact this is in there is alone gate same token as making people go to events they have shown they do not want to. the commons is great. however greek organizations are not what is removing freshmen from that area... its that the events are not relevant to them and do not draw crowds. having captive audience does not make an event more successful. in fact it directly contradicts.
This would cause rush to last an entire Year!!! and/or impose rules on interpersonal contact that are destructive to community. The rush calendar needs reform to better coordinate with College Hall interests (and vice versa) but this is not reform.

After a semester on campus most students know where they want to go. The semester delay will just leave freshman in limbo about what the future will be. As it is now some freshman miss their first choice in the Spring and pledge with a second choice in the fall. The smaller size Chapters can approach those who did not pledge in the spring about being part of a fall class. If you are concerned about cost of membership this is one way to increase it.

I believe a student's academic and social adjustment to college is significantly helped by fraternity membership. So, the sooner the better. Also, likely puts a burden on chapters to rush throughout the summer.
IFC Additional or Alternative Recommendations to address the goals of GLTF Report: Inclusion, Accountability, Alignment, Programming

Obs C29

1. Don't accept any of the statutes.

2. I do not agree with the university's stance on purposive programming or residential life. I do wholeheartedly agree with the stance on inclusion and accountability, but believe that the students involved in greek life should be trusted with more responsibility rather than accountability via continuous university intervention.

3. I think more involvement with intersectional identities such as identities of Queer, nationality, ethnicity, mental health, and many others.

4. Scrap the entire report. It's a travesty that Greek life outsiders can swoop in and arbitrary make a bunch of recommendations that don't make sense.

5. No.

6. I feel like I don't have any living rights because I have police officers search my fraternity house every night without warning. They come in when I'm in my underwear. They come in when I'm watching a movie with a girl in the den on a date. I hope the University's mission could be more oriented towards treating students like we are human beings who deserve privacy and respect. I understand that accountability is important but it should not be used as an excuse for the university to disrespect me and my privacy. If I had the option, I would live off campus because there aren't cameras every 12 meters or unnecessary security guards walking down the halls in the middle of the night.

7. I believe that these matters need to be left in the hands of the student body. I believe that the students have the best perspectives on what would benefit the Vanderbilt student body as a whole. The viewpoints from students, both Greek and non-Greek, are views that only students can have because they truly understand how the Vanderbilt experience works.

8. No. Please read my comments above. Thank you.

9. Address hazing in a smart way. Plenty of great guys get scared by Greek life due to perceptions, so eliminating those stereotypes would be an excellent start. Give alternative behavior to the destructive methods that Greeks have seen as tradition in recent years. Many Greek men realize the costs of this behavior, but don't know how else to operate.

10. If the ultimate goal is the elimination (or at least wholesale change) of Greek Life on this campus, the administration ought to be honest and forthright about its goals, rather than obfuscate them.

11. None

12. Not at this time. I think that the most important issue to address is inclusivity (and probably affordability because that would increase inclusivity).

13. While I completely agree with the goals of fostering inclusivity and ending Sexual Assault, I do not see why the Task Force wishes to may such radical changes. Greek Life has played a large role in making Vanderbilt a top-20 school. One of the main reasons I decided to come to school here was the appeal of joining a fraternity. Vanderbilt claims to champion a "balanced" environment, but I think these changes will tip the scale.


15. Find the percentage of minorities who rush fully to the amount that receive bids. I believe that the percentage will be extremely high. Let fraternities and sororities operate. Let people have fun and make friends. Also focus on non greek life people too.

16. Consult with actual members of Greek Life more thoroughly. This report demonstrated a severe lack of understanding of the goals, functioning, and causes of problems within Greek Life.
The most important thing for strengthening Greek Life is making it economically inclusive to mirror the efforts made by Vanderbilt as a whole. Thus, scholarship opportunities through IFC need to be greatly expanded with University funding in order to allow all students to afford being in a fraternity. Chapters do not have the capability to fund the financial need on their own, so the only effective way to address economic inclusivity is with University help. If the University is not willing to financial help scholarships, then they are effectively not allowing the Greek community to become economically diverse.

I believe my positions on these recommendations are clear. I would advise, additionally, that this dialogue/process of implementation/etc. be undertaken with the utmost respect for the autonomy of individuals and Greek chapters. Personally, I think that the prevailing sentiment amongst the administration is that Greek Life is a blight on the Vanderbilt community. This view is (again in my opinion) wholly mistaken. To effectively change Greek Life at this school into nothing more than glorified social clubs would reduce the breadth of students that Vanderbilt attracts, its diversity of options for involvement, and the like. People ought to be respected, and placing Greek Life under what appears to be a much more focused microscope while neglecting other issues turns what could be a fruitful partnership into a witch hunt. Please consider that not everyone may share the view of the administration.

Inclusion is the most noble goal proposed here, and it should be pressed for tirelessly. The points directed at "accountability" do little to make chapters accountable a much to degrade the fabric which makes them entirely unique in the realm of campus organizations.

I think that Greek life needs to improve with inclusivity, but it's just so hard unless the university helped with scholarships.

N/A

No

I'm not aware how much money factors into people's decisions to not join a frat, but it may be a big factor so maybe that's one thing that should be looked into.

Work with Greek Community to realistically talk about addressing issues that cause harm. An issue is the administration is operating in a world where they are disconnected from the reality of Greek life and cannot address real issues.

Like I have said before, I don't think this task force is qualified because none of the have Greek experience. You all talk about diversity but this doesn't seem very diverse to me. If I was evaluating this as a research study I would say that it is has many types of bias. As a researcher practicing good science I would classify this as a very flawed paper. If I was reviewing the paper I would tell them to go back and fix the bias. Look at the population the data comes. The results may have been desired before the study was even started. As a scientist and researcher my boss would be very unhappy with such results.

Remove all members of the Faculty Senate Task Force on Greek Life who were not a part of a Fraternity or Sorority themselves. It is frankly hard to appreciate the value of Greek Life when one has not ever been a part of it. / Barring this first option

In line with the goal of accountability, I believe students involved in Greek life should continue to receive Green Dots training

Some of these recommendations are ridiculous and I hope that you will listen to students.

This report should be scrapped and redone. The Task Force showed such a complete lack of interest in their job that it is almost insulting to every member of Greek Life on this campus.

No

It is so clear you guys are trying to get rid of Greek life. It kills me to know how much you ignore all the positive that goes on in our organizations. Let's have open convo not you guys forcing decisions down our throats please.

In order to make Greek Life more compatible with your mission for "purposive programming" you will need to offer what students want. Right now Greek Life is filing that hole and just making a program
that most students do not want to participate in will not integrate Greek Life but rather drive it further from the future goals of the University.

-Removes a major identity-formation component from the FY experience. A significant portion of FYS join GL, and this in turn forms a big part of their identity as a student here. Many students feel included on this campus during their first year through G

I think the report did a poor job overall of assessing Greek life's function within Vanderbilt's social scene and its overall value to Vanderbilt.

Talking to the students more would be helpful, and trying to create a dialogue, not a us vs them mentality that stems from misinformation and a lack of communication.

Yes. I'm fully aware that most of the faculty task force is non-Greek, and I therefore believe them to not be entirely qualified to handle issues concerning Greek life. Also, you talk about lack of diversity as if we're intentionally turning away minorities. Recruitment is a two way street and not every minority WANTS to go Greek, especially when there are other organizations emphasizing certain cultures. Greek life is not an eyesore and neither are our tailgates. I GUARANTEE you wouldn't think of saying this to the hundreds of donating Greek alumni who were here when much more raucous activities took place on campus.

I've had a great experience at Vanderbilt and greek life has been integral to that experience. Furthermore, my experience with Greek Life was vital to improving my mental/emotional health at Vanderbilt and also opened my eyes to many diverse perspectives and people. It has also given me a better platform to address issues of inclusion within the school.

Students should be involved in the next Task Force. 6 meetings over the course of 2 and a half years is not sufficient to understand Greek Life. Especially because officers transition each year, there is no coherent communication chain. Professor Weintraub explicitly said he did not seek the input of individual chapter presidents because council officers are responsible for expressing their opinions. Clearly that is not true and ridiculous to even imply. The Task Force did not do its research and it clearly shows through with this set of recommendations.

Just include Greeks in the conversation rather than handing down opinions.

I think the task force did a good job of addressing these goals.

The GLTF clearly didn't communicate nearly enough with the leadership of IFC/Panhell/NPHC and believe they know what is best for the community without actively getting involved. They should lead the charge in getting involved with the houses, not just dictating from above.

Know your students. Do some research. Be realistic. Disappointed after two years this is the minor impact that this report had.

If the goals, as stated above, are in order of importance from the point of view of the GLTF I think the order is wrong. First must be accountability, then alignment then inclusion. Inclusion is not a Greek problem. All Greek and campus entities want good people and most, if not all, work towards this end. This is how it should be.

If this is really about the University community: seek out 1) Greek Faculty members to participate 2) Greek and non-Greek Alumni, 3) Greek and non-Greek students and 4) Greek and non-Greek staff and administrators.

I can't speak for NPHC or Panhellenic organizations. For IFC chapters, increasing the residential capacity of the chapter facilities would promote a more well-rounded, wholesome environment for chapter members. If, say, 12-15 members lived in a facility, you would actually see robust communities develop amongst Greek members, rather than merely mass migrations to Greek houses on Friday and Saturday nights. // By making the facilities true "houses", you would foster proper growth for the chapters and their members. I understand the desire to fully integrate Greek men and women with the greater Vanderbilt community, but the limited residential capacity is having an adverse effect on the Greek organizations and in turn on the Vanderbilt community as a whole. Again, I can only speak for IFC, but because they live all over campus many Greek men spend time at their facility almost
exclusively for social events. This creates and reinforces the unfortunate stereotype that Greek organizations are merely social clubs, or a place to drink. What if we made a commitment to make the Greek community a living, learning residential hub like we are with communities elsewhere on campus? By enabling (and in some senses, forcing) more IFC men to live together you would allow them to forge stronger bonds, and ones that aren’t born from a party on a Saturday night. IFC men who grow in this more wholesome environment would make a more positive impact on our campus and our surrounding community.