

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE  
FUTURE OF THE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES

Robert K. Adair  
Sylvia Arrom  
Thomas Gariepy  
Donald Kagan, Chairman  
Timothy Naftali, '83  
Merton J. Peck  
Ellen Shemitz, '83  
Sofia Simmonds  
Karl Turekian  
Heinrich von Staden  
Robin Winks

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
The Residential Colleges at Yale	1
Expectations	1
The State of the Colleges Today	2
The Mastership	4
Expectations	4
History	5
Current Procedures	6
Appointment	6
Duties	7
Evaluation and Recommendations	8
Deanships	12
Expectations	12
History	13
Description	15
Appointment and Review	15
Resources	16
Duties	16
Assessment	17
Recommendations	17
College Administration	20
Undergraduates	21
Expectations	21
History and Current Practice	22
Recommendations	25
Fellowship	32
Expectations	32
History	32
Recommendations	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

	<u>Page</u>
Graduate and Professional Students	42
Expectations	42
History	42
The Graduate Affiliates Program	43
Evaluation	45
Recommendations	47
Alumni	49
Recommendation	49
Services	50
Expectations	50
Description and Evaluation	50
Recommendations	52
Summary of Recommendations	

## THE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES AT YALE

### Expectations

The system of residential colleges should play a central part in Yale College's plan of education. The goals of Yale College include the development of the student's intellect, civic responsibility, and character. Though the chief responsibility for academic instruction should be carried by the faculty through the several departments, the colleges should make an important contribution to the variety and quality of teaching and learning at Yale.

In the other aspects of a Yale education the colleges should play a major role. As individual communities within the larger scene at Yale the colleges offer a special opportunity for acquiring and practicing the qualities needed for life in a decent society, indeed they require those qualities for the achievement of their goals. Self-restraint, respect for the rights and well-being of others, appreciation of the personal rewards of taking part in activities for the common good, the ability to govern and be governed in turn, all these are benefits of a civic and ethical education available in the colleges. Students resident in the colleges should treat these educational opportunities with the same seriousness they owe to their academic work. Masters, Deans, and Fellows should all understand their responsibility to contribute to the life of their college and to the civic and ethical education that is a vital part of it. In discharging these responsibilities Masters, Deans and Fellows should ever be respectful of the students' values and rights, and of the diversity that so enriches the life of the colleges.

The residential colleges should provide comfortable and pleasant living quarters for their resident members, spacious enough to afford reasonable privacy and quiet enough to permit study, conversation, and sleep. Their dining halls should offer nourishing and savory food in a pleasant atmosphere. Their public spaces should be adequate for formal and informal educational activities and for social and cultural events. The colleges should serve as centers for athletic activities and for informal entertainment.

The colleges should be communities of manageable size, where students can come to know most of their colleagues and meet and enjoy the company of Fellows. The colleges should likewise provide an opportunity for its Fellows to meet and come to know scholars from different disciplines and people from different walks of life. They should encourage formal and informal association between students and Fellows for their mutual enjoyment and benefit.

In a larger university such as Yale, with a serious commitment to research, the colleges should provide a more cohesive and more comfortable environment where the students' unique and individual qualities are recognized, nurtured, and sustained.

#### The State of the Colleges Today

The rest of this report will examine in detail the way in which the colleges are functioning now, will attempt to evaluate their performance, and will recommend ways to strengthen them for the future. Here we wish only to make a general statement of how we see them today and what might be needed to sustain them.

In his charge to this committee President Giamatti spoke of Yale's system of residential colleges as "a mode... of bringing together how students learn and live that is unique, valuable and irreplaceable." Our inquiries lead us to agree with him. We believe that the colleges have been outstandingly successful in their first half-century, even beyond the original expectations of their founders. Partly because and partly in spite of the challenges it has met and the changes it has undergone, we think the system is functioning better now, in most respects, than ever in the past. More than ever the colleges seem to hold a central place in the lives of the students, to win their loyalty and to enhance the quality of their experience at Yale. The educational role of the colleges, both formal and informal, is greater than in former days; the social, athletic, and cultural programs are vigorous. We believe that the system deserves to be called excellent in the degree to which it meets its own expectations. When we look at it in comparison with the residential arrangements of other colleges and universities we are even more impressed by its quality, and we see no system that is its equal.

That is not to say that we gaze upon perfection or that Yale can afford to be complacent. The elements of the colleges that are working well require continued attention and support, and some others need improvement. Detailed descriptions of the problems and suggestions for their solution appear below. Here it is enough to point out that the buildings of most of the colleges are a half-century old and are showing their age. For many years the colleges have been crowded enough to interfere with the fullest achievement of their goals. The duties and problems of the Masters and the Deans have grown, while the support available to them and the compensation for their labors have not. Some Fellowships have not flourished in recent years, and their contributions to the lives of the students in the colleges and the contribution of the colleges to the lives of the Fellows have not achieved the level we would like. The processes of self-government in the colleges have not been as useful and important as they might be. The formal educational programs of the colleges can make a greater contribution to the variety and quality of a Yale education than they do at present.

The preservation of the excellence of the colleges and the solution of their problems will require effort, imagination, and expense from students, faculty, alumni, administrators, and friends of the university. Our study of the system's achievements and our belief in its possibilities make us think all this worthwhile.

## THE MASTERSHIP

### Expectations

The Master should be the educational leader of the college and the chief administrative officer. The Master has the ultimate responsibility for all aspects of the college, and is responsible directly to the President.

Each Master should define the particular ways of carrying out the general charge of developing the educational and social life of a residential college. Naturally, different Masters will emphasize different aspects of the residential college.

Along with the expectation of diversity, the Mastership entails certain common obligations. The Master must live in the college and should be accessible to all members of the college. The Master should enjoy contact with students individually and in groups. He or she should be available for counseling of students and should entertain them socially as may be appropriate. The Master should try to make all students feel welcome in the college and should help foster a respect for diversity and for the sensitivities of those from different backgrounds.

The Master must also be able to work effectively with other officials of the residential college: the Dean, appointed (in consultation with the Master) by and responsible to the Dean of Yale College; the Dining Hall Manager, appointed by and responsible to the Director of University Dining Halls; and the Custodial Supervisor, appointed by and responsible to the Manager of Custodial Services. The Master must supervise the work of the Administrative Assistant, Master's Aides and Graduate Affiliates.

The Master, as educational leader of the college, assisted and advised, where appropriate, by Fellows and students, should guide its educational program. The Master should be the leader of the Fellowship, and direct the talents of its members to contribute to the intellectual life of the college. He or she should play the chief role in recruiting members of the Fellowship, assisted as necessary by other Fellows and the Dean of the college. The Master is also an

advisor to the President and the Dean of Yale College on matters of undergraduate life, both individually and as a member of the Council of Masters. The Master is expected to take an appropriate role in alumni and public relations.

The Master should maintain his or her activity as teacher and scholar during the term in office. Teaching and research are the central concerns of the Yale community and involvement in such activities is vital to the Master's standing in that community. Masters usually return to full-time teaching after completing their terms, and unless they remain active in their departments they will find the transition difficult. Because many potential Masters are concerned with the interruption of their careers as faculty members by service in the Mastership, we believe the conditions of the Mastership should be so arranged as to diminish the disruptive impact of the change of duties. Normally Masters should carry a half-time teaching load as appropriate to rank and department.

#### History

The first Masters were drawn from the Yale faculty and faculty members elsewhere. There was also an effort to enlist distinguished individuals from outside the academic world, although none of the first group was in this category.

The early Masters were spared many of the obligations now associated with the Mastership. Discipline and counseling remained centralized in the Yale College Dean's Office. Extracurricular activities in the Residential College were few. The problems of the physical plant were managed centrally and much eased by ample budgets. Academic advising remained the responsibility of the Departments. Until World War II, fraternities provided much of Yale undergraduate social life. There were no residential college seminars.

The Master carried out the promotion of the intellectual and social life of the residential college by his own activities, a task made easier by the fact that a residential college had only about 200 students. The Master was also expected to rely on the help of the eleven Fellows who were associated with each college. The Master selected the Fellows, and the selection of Fellows was considered an important way in which a Master could influence the life of

the college. Finally, the first group of Masters had a generous fund which they could use for entertainment, to bring speakers to the college, and for any other purpose they thought valuable. Each Master was paid the same salary-- \$10,000, then the top salary for full professors.

Over the years the duties of the Master have expanded substantially. As maintenance budgets decreased, the Master became increasingly involved in the operation of college buildings. With decentralization of the Yale College Dean's Office and the assignment of freshmen to the colleges in 1963, the Masters became increasingly involved in advising and counseling. Residential colleges are now the focus of many extracurricular and social activities, many of which call on the Master for advice and counsel. The burden of entertaining in the Master's house has grown substantially, in part because of the loss of the Faculty Club and some guest suites. With the creation of the residential college seminars in 1968, the Master was given additional educational responsibilities. The Fellowship, originally designed to ease the Master's burdens, came in some colleges to require his increased attention to sustain even a minimal sense of community. The Master's fund declined substantially in value and has accumulated many obligations that limit its use as a discretionary fund.

The increase in the size of the residential college has also added to the burdens of the Master. At the outset, the Corporation voted that residential colleges were to be no larger than 250 students, the greatest number it was considered a Master could expect to know well. Colleges now range from 375 to 460 students.

#### Current Procedures

A. The Appointment of Masters. The selection of Masters is the responsibility of the President. Masters are usually appointed for a five-year term by the Yale Corporation upon nomination by the President. To advise him in his selection, the President appoints a search committee. The committee's role is purely advisory to the President in carrying out his responsibility for the nomination to the Corporation.

The search committee's chairman is a Fellow of the residential college, selected by the President. The committee, also appointed by the President, is usually composed of twelve to sixteen members, including both Fellows and undergraduate members of the college. At the outset, the President meets with the committee to discuss their task. The President asks the committee to submit to him a list of ten to fifteen names of individuals who, in their judgment, have the capacity to be successful Masters. He customarily asks that the search be focused on tenured members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences who have been successful teachers of undergraduates, but the committee may include on their list senior faculty members of Yale professional schools and one or two individuals outside the Yale community, if they believe such individuals could make an exceptional contribution. The President asks that the committee not concern itself with the questions of availability of candidates and that it not rank the individuals on their list. The President further stipulates that while the committee's list will be given serious consideration, he considers himself free to appoint an individual who is not on that list.

The search committees have adopted widely varying procedures in developing their lists of candidates. Once the list is completed the full committee meets with the President to discuss their nominees. Some committees have used this occasion to indicate preferences among individuals listed.

President Giamatti has made 21 appointments or reappointments; 6 were senior faculty members of professional schools; 15 were senior members in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences; none was from outside Yale.

As the initial term of a Mastership comes to a close, the President may ask the Master if he or she is willing to serve further. If the Master is willing, the President may extend the term or reappoint him or her. In the case of re-appointment, the President usually convenes a Review Committee to advise him.

B. The Duties of the Master. The primary duties of the Master have been described in the opening section. Here, we place particular emphasis on the Master as an administrator, because such functions can divert the Master

from the role as leader of the residential college community and "presiding academic presence." The problems relating to physical plant seem particularly troublesome. Masters are said to average one or two hours a day on physical plant problems. This is too much of a Master's time, is a source of great frustration, and leads to a distortion of the Master's role in the eyes of the students. There should be a better way of using a Master's time than having him or her serve as a building foreman or hotel manager. There are also considerable administrative burdens with respect to appointments to college posts and review of college seminars. In addition, in some colleges, the Fellowship consumes much of the Master's time, without providing an equivalent of enrichment of the life of a residential college. Another chore for Masters, at present, may be fund raising. For example, Masters are expected to play a supportive role in solicitations for the Parents' Fund. The Development Office also expects the Masters to entertain prospective donors, a task that is a further drain on the time and funds of Masters and a burden on their families.

#### Evaluation and Recommendations

The success of the residential colleges rests to a considerable extent with the Master. Hence the selection of the right person for this role becomes crucial. We think it is appropriate for the Master to be selected by the President, and for the President to have a wide latitude as to whom to appoint. We also agree that Masters should be chosen primarily from Senior members of the Faculty. In our view, single individuals should be considered as candidates for a Mastership. The Mastership should be so arranged that help by a spouse is not required to perform the functions of a Master. Consideration should be given to finding some appropriate ways to recognize the major contributions of Master's spouses to the life of the colleges. We think the present use of a Fellow-student search committee is desirable. In some cases the search committee's procedures are unsystematic, but this problem is mitigated by the major role taken by the President in the final selection of the Master.

The problem, as we see it, is to make the position of Master sufficiently attractive to produce an adequate number of highly qualified candidates for each Mastership. Yale has been well served by the many exceptional individuals who have ably performed the Master's duties in the past and at present. This tradition of excellence must be continued. Once good Masters are appointed, it is important that their energies and time be focused on promoting the intellectual and social life of the residential college.

Our recommendations are devoted to making the position of Master more attractive in order to increase the numbers willing to serve as Masters and to free the position of duties that are unwarranted drains on the Master's time. They are also intended to make it easier for a Master to continue as an active scholar and teacher while serving as Master. Our most general recommendation is to call for recognition by the administration, faculty, and students that the time and energies of a Master are among the most valuable assets of the residential college system. The system must limit its expectations of a Master sufficiently to allow him or her wide discretion in choosing the aspects of the Mastership to be emphasized, and to leave a Master time to continue the research and the teaching that were part of the basis for the appointment. Our specific recommendations, not in order of priority, follow.

1. Increase the Discretionary Funds available to the Master. The use of discretionary funds is one way a Master can influence the activities of the college. Inflation has eroded these funds, and various obligations have been accumulated that limit their use as true discretionary funds. We would like the discretionary funds to be large enough to allow each Master to initiate new activities, and recommend the present allowance be doubled.

2. Make a special effort to increase the funds available to the less affluent colleges. There are now differences in the funds available to the various colleges. We do not think it necessary to have complete equality, but the Masters and students in the less well-off colleges are often at a disadvantage. For the long run we urge fund raising priority be given to the needs of the less well-off colleges. In the short run we urge special attention be given to increasing the funds for these colleges.

3. Increase the "housekeeping" funds available to Masters. The Mastership imposes a major burden on the spouse and family of a Master. We think there should be adequate funds to allow various forms of flexible domestic assistance to help ease the burden imposed on the Master and his or her family and, perhaps, to permit single individuals to serve as Masters. Again we recommend the present funds be doubled.

4. Assistance should be given to the Master to enable continued teaching and research. Masters are usually chosen from individuals dedicated to teaching and research. In order to make the position attractive to such individuals, the Mastership must be compatible with active teaching and research. Exactly how this should be accomplished will vary with the individual and his or her discipline. Among the possibilities are:

- a. Allowing Masters to "bank" leaves during or before their terms and be allowed even a double triennial leave, where two have been accumulated at term's end. This measure would enable a Master to carry out additional research and ease the transition back to full-time teaching and research.
- b. Providing summer stipends for Masters, typically one ninth of regular salary. Such payments would recognize that a Master's duties spill over into the summer, and that, as compared to other faculty, the Master has less free time during the academic year for research. Some Masters already have summer research funds, so that the arrangements would vary among Masters. The Masters should, in our view, discuss their summer research plans with the President, and he should authorize the appropriate stipend.
- c. Establishing a special fund for the research expenses of Masters. Masters may be at a disadvantage in seeking research funds since their duties tend to preclude extensive efforts to obtain grants. The availability of research funds for use by the Masters, both during the academic year and during summer, would offset this drawback and affirm that Masters are expected to be active in research.

5. Make Physical Plant operations more responsive to the needs of the Residential College System. A major difficulty is that Masters spend excessive time on problems of the physical plant of their colleges, including the assigned portion of the old campus. Both larger maintenance budgets and an administrative system that is more responsive to the colleges are required. There is a variety of ways to improve the administrative system, and we urge the Administration to explore the possibilities. We lack the expertise to determine which will be most effective, but we think that problems connected with physical plant are an excessive drain on the time and energy of the Master. We strongly urge that the Council of Masters, working with the Vice President for Administration, state the possible solutions and make specific proposals to the President in the academic year 1984-85.

6. Brief New Masters. So that Masters may be more fully aware of the University's administrative structure, including physical plant and the Campus Police, newly designated Masters should undertake the sequence of briefings that have been approved by the President and the Chairman of the Council of Masters.

RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE DEANSHIPS

Expectations

The twelve Residential College Deans are the representatives of the Dean of Yale College in the colleges. They are also colleagues and members of the Yale faculty. Their chief responsibility is to maintain the integrity of the academic and disciplinary processes determined by the Yale College faculty and the Dean of Yale College by ensuring that undergraduates comply with academic requirements and regulations.

Each College Dean is expected to be an untenured member of the Yale College faculty (or to be fully eligible for such an appointment in one of the academic departments of Yale College). The Dean should hold a doctoral degree or its equivalent and should be expected to teach one or two term courses each year. The Dean should be a person of sensitivity, maturity, and discretion, who has had either academic or administrative experience in dealing with undergraduates. The College Dean is appointed by the Dean of Yale College after consultation with the Master and a committee of Fellows and students, and the College Dean therefore is accountable in the first place to the Dean of Yale College.

The College Dean should live in the Residential College and should be generously accessible to students. He or she is expected to know the students in the college and to attend as many events in the college as possible. Like the Master, the Dean must be prepared to accept responsibility in time of crisis, day or night.

Academic counseling is a major responsibility of the College Dean. The Dean shares this responsibility with the departmental Directors of Undergraduate Studies, the Master, the Faculty Fellows of the college, and other faculty members. Personal counseling of students is the shared responsibility of the College Dean and other faculty who reside in the college (the Master and Resident Fellows), the Yale Religious Ministries, the Division of Mental Hygiene, freshman counselors, resident graduate affiliates (if any), and, in appropriate cases, individual faculty members.

The College Dean is expected to perform such other duties for the office of the Dean of Yale College as the latter might specify.

The College Dean is expected to assist the Master in all nonacademic disciplinary matters, in maintaining security, fire safety, the general upkeep of physical facilities, and in all other such responsibilities (e.g. housing arrangements) in the college as, by explicit mutual agreement, the Master and Dean decide. The Dean is expected to cooperate fully with the Master, who is the chief officer of the college, in all matters affecting the college.

The Dean is expected to serve a three-year term. If the regular review process (see Description) conducted by the Dean of Yale College is favorable, this term may be renewed. The expectation is that a Dean serve no more than two terms. The Dean is also expected to teach one course per year in an academic department of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

#### History

The present system of Residential College Deanships in Yale College came into being in 1963.\* The development of this system is best understood by noting the arrangement which preceded it. Counseling and administrative functions of deans for undergraduates were provided on the Old Campus (one Dean, one Associate Dean, one Assistant Dean), in the office of the Dean of Yale College (one Dean, one Associate Dean, three Assistant Deans), and in the office of the Dean of the School of Engineering (one Dean, one Associate Dean).

Two events occurring in 1961-62 resulted in changes in this arrangement. First, the School of Engineering was converted to the Department of Engineering and Applied Science, with the result that undergraduates in engineering became members of Yale College, and the office of the Dean of the School of Engineering was no longer necessary. The second and more far-reaching change resulted from a study of the Freshman Year by a committee appointed by President A. Whitney Griswold and chaired by Professor Leonard W. Doob.

\*This account is an excerpt from the Walker Report on Residential College Deanships of December 1974.

The Committee on the Freshman Year concluded that there remained no significant reason other than geography for the then-existing separation of Yale Freshmen from the rest of Yale College. They recommended the affiliation of each entering Freshman with a Residential College and an increase in the number of Residential Colleges sufficient to provide living accommodations in the Residential Colleges for all undergraduates. Recognizing that new Colleges could not be built immediately, the Committee recommended that each Freshman be affiliated with a Residential College from the beginning of his career at Yale and that Freshmen be encouraged to participate in Residential College activities even though they continued to live on the Old Campus and to have most of their meals in a common dining hall. The Faculty quickly adopted these recommendations, and Freshmen arriving at Yale in the fall of 1962 were members of Colleges on the day of their arrival.

The report of the Committee on Freshman Year contained also a recommendation that the interests of both Freshmen and upperclassmen might be better served by appointing to each Residential College a suitable person to counsel students and to administer their academic programs. This recommendation was studied in 1962-63 by a group consisting of the Dean of Yale College, the Associate Dean, and six members of the Council of Masters, and a plan for implementation was presented to President Griswold in early 1963. With his enthusiastic support the plan was examined and approved by the Faculty and the Corporation and on July 1, 1963, a dean was appointed to serve in each of the Residential Colleges. For a variety of reasons the Residential Colleges owe more than can easily be described to the generosity of Mr. Paul Mellon and of the Old Dominion Foundation. It should be noted here that the College Deanship system has been completely supported from its beginning by an endowment for that purpose from the Old Dominion Foundation.

In 1974 a committee on the Residential College Deanships under the chairmanship of Professor Charles A. Walker made the following assessment:

"We find the Residential College Deanship system to be living up to the expectations which were expressed for it at its founding in 1963. The counseling of students and the administration of their academic programs are being provided by deans who are positive about their positions. These functions are being carried out at the Residential College level in an atmosphere which is conducive to close personal relationships between students and deans.

"We note, however, that the Residential College Deans have demands placed on them by the Dean of Yale College, the Residential College Masters, the departments, and by various other groups at Yale. We feel that it is important that the essentially academic nature of the Residential College Deans should be protected from excessive demands for handling routine nonacademic matters.

"We stress again our opinion that the College Deans perform their functions energetically and well and that they contribute significantly to many facets of life in the Yale community. In particular, we believe that one of the greatest assets that Yale has to offer students is the Residential College system and that the success of this system has been enhanced by, and now is to an important degree dependent on, the contributions of the College Deans."

Our own investigation suggests that the concerns of the Walker Committee were justified. The problems they identified were real and continuing, and we have addressed some of them below.

#### Description

##### A. Appointment and Review

After nationally advertising a vacancy in the residential college deanships, the Dean of Yale College, in consultation with the Master, appoints an advisory committee, normally consisting of three Fellows of the college, three students from the college and the Master as Chairman. The committee typically screens applications, interviews a number of candidates, and recommends three or four unranked names to the Dean of Yale College. The latter, while not bound by these recommendations, normally tries to appoint one of the nominees.

The ordinary length of service of a Residential College Dean is for two terms of three years each. During the College Dean's second year of employment, the Master of the College, the Dean of Yale College, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies carry out a progress review of the College Dean's performance, in order that the Dean of Yale College can discuss ways with the College Dean in which the execution of his or her duties might be improved. In the conduct of this progress review, the Dean of Yale College, the Master, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies consult members of the Residential College community who they believe will contribute relevant and useful information concerning the College Dean's performance. An appointment to a College Deanship beyond two terms of office is possible, but it is an exception to the normal practice, and may occur only after a thorough and formal review of the College Dean's work. Such a review would be held during the College Dean's fifth year in the position, and would take place in accordance with established procedures.

B. Resources

The College Dean has a full-time Administrative Assistant and a modest budget for entertainment and office expenses.

C. Duties

In addition to the duties implied by the description of 'Expectations' (I. supra), the College Dean's routine administrative duties include registering students and scrutinizing each student's course schedule to ensure that all general academic requirements are being met. The College Dean helps students determine when to accelerate, to withdraw for academic reasons, etc. The College Dean also coordinates the freshman faculty advising program and supervises the work of the freshman counselors affiliated with each college. In most colleges the Master has delegated the supervision of student housing to the Dean. In recent years the Residential College Deans also have been assigned a variety of duties previously performed by the Yale College Dean's Office and by others.

These include service on committees concerned with Sophomore Advising, Special Divisional Majors, Athletic Eligibility, Readmission, Teaching in the Residential Colleges, Services for the Handicapped, etc. Several such committees are chaired by College Deans. (This is a change that has taken place as part of a deliberate attempt of the present Dean of Yale College to bring the College Deans more into the activities of the Yale College Dean's Office in order to emphasize their role as members of that office and at the same time to use the entire decanal apparatus in the most effective way possible.) Residential College Deans normally reside in their colleges until June 15 and again from August 15.

#### Assessment

The program of Residential College Deanships function well. Since its introduction it has become a very important characteristic of the Residential College system. The Deans provide valuable service as academic and personal advisors, as administrators of the freshman advising system, as colleagues of the Masters, as members of important committees, as assistants to the Dean of Yale College, and in countless other ways. Precisely because of the many functions they perform there has been some confusions in the community's understanding of their central function as academic officers of Yale College and colleagues and members of the faculty. Some of our recommendations aim to emphasize more fully the primacy of the Deans' academic status and functions.

Our recommendations attempt chiefly to clarify the College Deans' role in some of the functions they perform.

#### Recommendations

1. Since the College Deans are chiefly academic officers, members and colleagues of the Yale College faculty, they should have the same qualifications as those full-time junior faculty members holding regular appointments in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.
2. We recommend that College Deanships be advertised as leading to careers in academic administration as well as conventional academic careers.

3. To make it possible for College Deans to continue their scholarly work while serving as Deans, thus enhancing their academic status and the chances for a successful academic career, we recommend that they be granted one semester's leave with pay in the second term of appointment.

4. For the same purposes we recommend that the university establish a fund to which College Deans can apply for the support of their research during summers.

5. The duties currently performed by the College Deans are very demanding. We recommend that these duties not be increased.

6. The College Deans' responsibilities as representatives of the Dean of Yale College charged with maintaining the integrity of the academic and disciplinary process, and those they carry as advisors to students in the colleges, have led to some confusion as to their proper function in disciplinary cases. We recommend that the Dean of Yale College continue to find ways to make it clear that the College Dean's primary duty is to maintain the integrity of the academic and disciplinary process. Their role as advisors and counselors is performed by advising students fully of the rules governing the matter at issue, and of their rights and obligations.

7. The coordination of the Freshman Faculty Advising Program is an important part of the Deans' work. We recommend that they continue to make every effort to educate faculty advisors in all aspects of advising freshmen. With the assistance of the Faculty Fellows Advisory Council, (described in the section on the Fellowships) they should continue to make every effort to match freshmen with appropriate advisors.

8. The Deans play an important role in the tutoring system. At present, provision of tutorial help requires certification by an instructor that a student is doing poorly. Since many instructors cannot provide such certification until mid-term, students who need it must wait until then to seek help. We recommend that ways be found to allow College Deans to take a more active hand in making tutors available to students earlier in the semester.

9. The counseling and advising of students is a heavy burden that College Deans should not be expected to bear unaided. We recommend that the Deans continue to encourage students to make use of the many sources of advice available to them. The Dean should remain the person directly responsible for enforcing all nonmajor requirements, but students in the process of planning a specific major should be referred for advice to the relevant Director of Undergraduate Studies or to the departmental faculty representative in the Residential College. The College Dean should make it clear to students that the task of advising and counseling is a responsibility which he or she, the Master and the Fellows share with other faculty members, the Division of Mental Hygiene and the Religious Ministries. In matters requiring personal counseling they should all be sensitive to the boundaries of personal privacy.

10. Since most Freshmen are housed on the Old Campus, we recommend that the Dean of Yale College, in consultation with the Council of Masters, appoint a resident nonstudent representative on the Old Campus. Such a representative should be charged with enforcing Undergraduate Regulations on the Old Campus in cooperation with the freshman counselors, the Residential College Deans, and the Masters. He or she should serve as a liaison between Old Campus residents and Custodial Services and Physical Plant.<sup>1</sup>

1. One member of the committee does not agree with this recommendation.

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

The smooth operation of the Residential Colleges require coordination of the work of its two administrative offices, the Master's and the Dean's, and ready accessibility to them by students. To that end we make the following recommendations.

1. Efforts should be made to keep at least one of the offices open between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.
2. In the event that the Residential College Coordinator or the Dean's Administrative Assistant is absent on a given day during the term, every effort should be made to keep both offices open.
3. Masters' and Deans' offices should be equipped with telephone answering equipment so that they may receive messages when the offices are closed.
4. In vacations during the term, either the Master or the Dean, or the Master's designated representative, should be resident in the college and responsible for dealing with emergencies.
5. Wherever possible the appointment of new Masters and College Deans should be coordinated so that a college does not get a new Master and a new Dean at the same time.
6. Masters and Deans should inform each other, in writing, of impending overnight absences from the college, so that both will not be absent simultaneously during term time. Should both unavoidably be absent, a resident Fellow or other appropriate officer of the college should be placed in charge and the Campus Police so informed.
7. The Master and Dean should not be on leave of absence at the same time.
8. The Executive Office of the Council of Masters should be restored to its original strength of two full-time employees with bursary aid.
9. We recommend that the University examine and audit the Administrative Assistants working in the Colleges with the view of recognizing their managerial duties as they now stand and in view of the responsibilities outlined in this Report.

## UNDERGRADUATES

### Expectations

The Residential Colleges should provide their resident undergraduate members with a place in which they can live and study in reasonable comfort, and provide all their undergraduate members with a place in which they can take full advantage of extracurricular activities and can enjoy the privileges of self-government. This presupposes commitment by students as well as faculty members to the belief that college life can flourish only in an atmosphere of mutual respect and tolerance, with each member of the college communities being at all times sensitive to the feelings of other members. It also implies that each undergraduate will exercise the rights of self-government, participating in the election of his or her Residential College Student Council whose members will represent and foster the interests of their constituents. Nor can undergraduates be unmindful of their obligations as members of the New Haven community to comply with standards of behavior expected of New Haven residents and as part of their education as future leaders to engage in volunteer service helpful to that community.

The Residential Colleges, through the action of their Masters, Deans, and Fellows, should also provide their undergraduate members with help on personal problems, with advice on academic programs, and with an opportunity not only to study but to undertake some academic work within the colleges themselves. In addition, the colleges should provide a congenial atmosphere for student-faculty discussions of subjects of mutual interest, no matter how diverse. These aspects of Residential College life presuppose active participation of Fellows as well as of Masters and Deans in college activities, and demand especially careful selection of Student Counselors and Faculty Program Advisors upon whom entering Freshmen rely for counsel and advice.

While achievement of these aims imposes responsibilities on all members of the Residential College communities, they also impose on Yale College the responsibility for alleviating the present crowded conditions that have led some undergraduates to seek living quarters more conducive to study and living outside their college and have hampered extracurricular and educational activities within them.

#### History and Current Practice

One of the major goals of the establishment of the Residential College system was the development of a milieu that fosters the intellectual growth of the undergraduates. The original ten colleges provided very comfortable, even luxurious, living quarters for their undergraduate members, then restricted to those in the Sophomore Senior classes. The space allotted for libraries, classrooms, special activity rooms, common rooms, and dining halls was fully adequate to meet the needs of the college communities, as were the accommodations for resident Fellows and the space designed for use as faculty offices and Fellows lounges. Some of the amenities were, of necessity, lost during World War II, and many others disappeared after the War when the greatly increased enrollment in Yale College required finding beds for more and more students in each college. The dining halls and other rooms were filled to overflowing in order to accommodate not only those living in the colleges but the many others lodged in a variety of other University buildings including temporary housing (barracks and quonset huts) erected for this purpose. Subsequent reduction in enrollment in the 1960s and the opening of Morse and Ezra Stiles Colleges in the Fall of 1962 gave only temporary relief from overcrowding: even before the admission of women in the Fall of 1969, the "capacity" of the colleges would have been insufficient to house all upperclassmen had not about five percent of them continued to live off campus; since then, and despite the almost yearly addition of beds, the colleges have lacked the capacity to house in what may be described as reasonable comfort, all those students wishing to live on campus. Indeed the need for space to put

additional beds, which first led to the loss of Fellows suites and offices and later to the introduction of "annexes." Recent reductions in the size of the undergraduate population have been welcome and helpful, especially in providing more comfortable housing, but problems persist. The lack of public space hinders extracurricular activities and restricts space available for studying and teaching within each college, the excessive overcrowding in the dining halls has caused considerable discomfort for undergraduates and Fellows. For the latter, this has meant the loss of Fellows tables at lunch, and many Fellows no longer care to partake of regular college meals or attend Fellows dinner meetings; in at least one college, Fellows have sacrificed their lounge to permit its use as an auxiliary dining room.

Help in easing the strains of overcrowding has come from the Office of the Dean of Yale College in the form of carefully prepared Undergraduate Regulations that serve as a guide to conduct on (and off) campus. The Undergraduate Regulations alert students to the standards of behavior expected in dormitories and dining halls as part of the responsibilities associated with membership in Yale's academic community and remind them of the need to recognize, and to conform with, the conventions of the larger community of New Haven. With respect to Yale-New Haven relationships, it is not unimportant that increasing numbers of undergraduates are participating in various volunteer services in New Haven under the aegis of Dwight Hall which, most recently, has also promoted the establishment of some specifically Residential College-sponsored projects.

That the Residential Colleges have continued to play such a vital role in Undergraduate life reflects the heroic efforts of their Masters and Deans and Students to overcome the difficulties imposed by overcrowding. Their efforts have not been eased by the lack of adequate facilities within the University to entertain and house guests and to accommodate meetings of alumni and New Haven-community groups. This lack, arising in part from the conversion of guest suites

on the Old Campus to other uses and the closing of the Yale Faculty Club, has resulted in ever increasing requests for the use of Residential College guest suites and has imposed extra obligations on Masters to make their houses available for such purposes.

From the start, the Residential Colleges were expected to contribute importantly to the educational functions of Yale College. Until after World War II, the educational role of the colleges was essentially limited to the academic advising of upperclassmen by members of the Fellowships which then were small groups (17-20) composed mainly of tenured Yale College faculty. Beginning in the 1950s, this role was expanded to include various types of teaching, and, at one time or another, the colleges have offered small-group discussions for Sophomores (Sophomore Seminars), discussion sections of large courses, Residential College Seminar Programs, Early Concentration Courses, and Writing Tutorial Programs.

At present, each Residential College has Writing Tutors available to help its Undergraduates and offers a selection of Residential College Seminars open to all qualified Yale College students and usually carrying course credit. A few colleges now also sponsor an Early Concentration Program, each Program being so organized as to allow a selected group of talented Freshmen to take special intensive courses in a specific field (usually in one of the humanities or mathematics), with those incoming Freshmen accepted into the program being assigned to membership in the sponsoring college.

After abolition of the Freshman Year program in June of 1962, each Residential College Dean became responsible for the academic progress of all Undergraduates affiliated with her or his college. While Sophomores still may be "advised" by Residential College Fellows, members of the Sophomore Class, like Juniors and Seniors, seek advice and approval of their course schedules from the Director of Undergraduate Studies or other faculty members in their major department. The advising of Freshmen, however, is primarily located in the colleges, and now involves, under the direction of the Residential

College Deans, the participation of Faculty Program Advisors and Freshman Counselors. The former group, composed of Fellows who volunteer to act as Advisors, often included individuals other than members of the Yale College faculty, and the latter (Counselors) group may include not only Yale College Seniors but Graduate or Professional School students, some of whom may not have attended Yale College. Not all Advisors and Counselors are equally well informed to advise incoming Freshmen concerning the choice of courses best suited to prepare for specific major programs, especially in the sciences. Some science departments, therefore, have recently instituted special meetings during the Freshman orientation period to try to compensate for these deficiencies.

Student self-government, an important if informal form of education, also has been located largely in the Residential Colleges, each college ideally having its own Student Council while also electing members of the Yale College Council. Each college also has a Social Committee that functions to some degree independently of the Student Council, with a Joint Council of Social Committee Chairmen serving to coordinate schedules and plan Yale College-wide activities. The Procedures currently followed in the election of members of the Residential College Councils and Social Committees vary from college to college, as do their activities, and not all of them can be said to be truly representative bodies. Such a failing opens to question the effectiveness of the Student Councils in helping their respective Masters to set Residential College policy and in representing the opinions of their colleges to the Yale College Dean's Office. A similar question may be raised concerning the Yale College Council; many believe that it does not represent the members of Yale College at large nor is fully cognizant of the opinions and work of the individual Residential College Student Councils.

#### Recommendations

##### Responsibilities of Undergraduates

Conduct in the Residential Colleges. By freely associating themselves with Yale College, students have made a commitment to be familiar with and abide

by the Undergraduate Regulations. As they relate to Residential College life, these regulations were designed to enable each college to allow its Undergraduates to study, eat, and sleep in reasonable comfort, to participate in its extracurricular activities, and to enjoy its social events. The rules governing possible annoyances to all members of a college (i.e., rules relating to noise, rowdy behavior, anti-social conduct in dining halls, misuse of alcohol and drugs, sexual harassment) are explicitly stated, as is the authority of the Residential College Masters and Deans to impose penalties for infractions, and, in most respects, these rules need only reaffirmation by Yale College and compliance by its students. However, two aspects of college life currently appear to raise problems: the not infrequent overindulgence in alcohol and the resultant rowdiness leading often to destruction of property.

1. Student self-government. In communities as large as those now comprising each Residential College and Yale College itself, there is a need for more formally constituted and representative means of self-government. Democratically elected Student Councils within each Residential College should provide greater opportunity for all Undergraduates to exercise the rights and undertake the responsibilities of self-government.

2. We recommend that while Undergraduates should not be subject to restrictions on the private use of alcohol in their own rooms, they must be made fully aware that no Residential College explicitly fosters its use and that Masters and Residential College Deans will not accept drunkenness as an excuse for rowdy and destructive behavior on, or off, campus.

3. To this end, we suggest that each Residential College Student Council not only continue to assist the Master in setting college policy but also:

(a) be given all the Student Activities Fees collected (on a voluntary basis as at present) from the college's Undergraduates and be responsible for their allocation to the various student activities in the college, and any committee that may manage them, and where appropriate or necessary, for oversight and coordination of those activities or committees;

(b) play a role in assuring that students comply with the Undergraduate Regulations, though the authority to impose penalties for infractions remains the prerogative of the college Master and Dean;

(c) give careful consideration to including among its activities the sponsoring, with the guidance and cooperation of Dwight Hall, of specific New Haven-community service projects;

(d) serve, when requested by the Dean of Yale College, as the primary source of student opinion about their college dean and, when requested by the President, as a source of student members for a committee he may convene to advise him on the selection of a new Master.

We also suggest that the terms of the Residential College Councils run from January through December (rather than coincide with the academic calendar year): students would select their council members (in a manner to be decided by each college for itself) late in the Fall Term. Each council should have at least one member for each ten Undergraduates. This procedure should allow time for incoming Freshmen to become well acquainted with their classmates and with the activities of their college before they vote and also provide for continuity of council membership from one Spring Term through the following Fall Term.

Upon taking office in early January, each Residential College Council should immediately select two (or more) of its members as its representatives on the "Undergraduate Council," whose one-year term of office would begin on February first. Thus, the "Undergraduate Council" would readily be able to function as required during the summer (e.g., organize activities for incoming Freshmen). As its members will be drawn solely from students belonging to Residential College Student Councils, the "Undergraduate Council" will be fully aware of colleges' activities and views and so will be better able to coordinate activities involving all the Residential Colleges and to represent the opinions of Yale Undergraduates to the Yale College administration and to the University at large. We recognize that some colleges already pursue these and similar policies.

Obligations of the Residential College to its Undergraduates

Living conditions. The University has taken an important step in limiting the number of undergraduate students in Yale College in order to put a limit on the effects of crowding. The situation today is better than it has been in the recent past. Nonetheless, the problem of crowding remains. If it may be assumed that 500 Undergraduates will continue to live off campus, one solution to the problems arising from the present overcrowding might be achieved by reduction of the total enrollment in Yale College to 4400-4500 so as to restore the overall occupancy of the 12 existing Residential Colleges to their preferred capacity of about 2900. Because it seems more probable that the Yale College enrollment will remain at about 5000, there remains the obvious need to provide room for at least 3400-3500 Undergraduates in the Residential Colleges.

4. To achieve the goal of restoring the occupancy of the 12 existing colleges to their preferred capacity, we recognize the desirability of a large new Residential College. Although the idea of a new college poses difficulties with respect to both raising funds for its construction and to finding a site suitable for its construction, the possibility of such a college is important in planning for the future of the Residential College System. If the addition of such a college led to an increase in enrollment we would not favor it.

We suggest that such a new college might well include within it a student activities center, if the latter cannot be established in a building of its own. Together, a new college and activities center would permit not only reduction in the numbers of Undergraduates now housed in each of the present colleges and in the even greater numbers using the college dining halls, but, even more important, would also ease the strains now imposed on the use of the dining halls as theaters and of the libraries and meeting rooms as the only quiet places in which many students can study. Likewise it should permit allotment of additional rooms devoted to teaching, language laboratories, and housing of Graduate Affiliates, as well as return space for use by Fellows.

A new college would not, however, relieve the obligations of the Residential Colleges to provide places to entertain and house visitors to the University and to accommodate meetings of New Haven community groups. For those purposes we recommend:

5. the creation of a faculty club that would also provide rooms for meetings of faculty committees and restore to the University faculty at large congenial surroundings for social events.

Counseling and advising of Undergraduates. The responsibility for helping with personal problems and advice on academic programs is shared, to varying degrees, by the Master, Dean, Members of the Fellowship, and Freshman Counselors in each Residential College. Present practice is adequate to ensure that most students will receive help, or are directed to sources outside their college that can provide help needed to solve personal problems.

Because the academic advising of Freshmen is the responsibility of the Residential College staff, improvement in current procedures requires careful selection of both Freshman Counselors and Faculty Program Advisors as well as thorough coaching of members of each group concerning its duties.

6. We therefore suggest that before the appointment of a Freshman Counselor, the relevant Director of Undergraduate or Graduate Studies, or similar person, be asked for an opinion not only about the ability of the potential Counselor to undertake the duties associated with that position but whether such duties will in any way interfere with the candidate's academic work.

Faculty Program Advisors in each Residential College should ordinarily be members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences unless their potential appointment has been approved by the Dean of Yale College. Every Freshman Advisor should be willing, if asked, to continue with his or her advisees during Sophomore year, up to the point where the student has declared his or her major and arranged for an official major-department advisor.

Selection of both Counselors and Advisors should be made as early as possible in the Spring Term in order to allow sufficient time for them to become thoroughly familiar with the current Academic Regulations of Yale College.

Teaching within the Residential Colleges. Because this has become a valuable and distinctive feature of the Residential College system at Yale, and has played an important role in the academic life of so many Undergraduates, we recommend that:

7. Concerted efforts be made by the colleges to increase their educational role but do this without detracting from, or infringing upon, the role of the academic departments. Among the ways to accomplish this are:

(a) Expansion of the Early Concentration Programs for Freshmen. Thus, programs recently offered in subjects such as American Studies, English, French, History, Mathematics, and Music should be continued and additional programs introduced in subjects that now attract large enrollments, e.g., other modern languages, Political Science, Economics.

(b) Introduction of "Area Studies for Freshmen." Included in this group would be area studies in the humanities and in the social sciences, some of which might be informal, non-credit, group meetings similar to the Non-Credit Classics Forum sponsored by Morse College that is now in its tenth year. Here, also, is an opportunity to provide offerings attractive to outstanding Freshmen with special interest in science.

(c) Restoration of the practice of teaching in the colleges (or assigning to the colleges) specific sections of very large courses, with the section for each college being taught by a Fellow (or Graduate Affiliate).

(d) The establishment of Faculty Fellows Advisory Councils in each college to help shape its education program and permit more long-range planning in it. (For the composition of the Advisory Council, see below, p. 38). The educational programs of the colleges should consist of a variety of modes, including the present College Seminar program, and should encourage innovation. (For example, see below, p. 40). The Advisory Council should provide faculty members for each College's Seminar Committee, which would continue its work on the same basis as at present.

Any new programs or courses proposed by the Faculty Fellows Advisory Council would continue to be subject to approval by the Course of Study Committee and the Faculty of Yale College, and where appropriate, by the Junior Appointments Committee.

(e) Continuation of the practice of having Writing Tutors in each Residential College and, where appropriate, of planning some college seminars as "writing intensive" courses. Here, it is essential that the Residential College Writing Tutors all meet a uniformly high standard of ability and that they are visible members of their college who are readily accessible to students needing their help.

The expansion of the educational role of the colleges as outlined above will sometimes require new sources of financial support. In particular, funds may be needed to help the academic departments hard-pressed when one or more of their faculty members take on, in the colleges, teaching duties that are not part of the regular departmental offerings.

8. We recommend that funds be sought to support the expanded educational programs in the colleges.

## THE FELLOWSHIP

### Expectations

The Residential College Fellowships should provide their members with opportunities for social and intellectual contact across departmental and professional lines and an opportunity for true fellowship. It should also provide the opportunity for its members to make significant contributions to the quality of life in the colleges and to the education of the students.

Acceptance of appointment to a term as Fellow of a Residential College should imply the acceptance of an honor and responsibility, an opportunity for service, and an obligation to make a contribution to the activities of the college in some of the many ways available. Each Fellow will make a different contribution, according to his or her interests, ability, and the time available. The level of contribution will vary with the level of other demands on the Fellow's time. There will be periods of greater activity and some of lesser involvement, but the Fellowship should be understood as a positive commitment to the college and its purpose.

### History

When the Residential College System was established, each College was planned to have twelve Fellows, who met daily for lunch at a table reserved to them and weekly in a Senior Common Room. Each College was designed to house from four to seven Resident Fellows. Although Residential Fellows were originally counted against the twelve, before long they were seen as in addition to the Twelve Who Ruled, so that the Fellowship of each college commonly numbered between 17 and 20, including the Master. The Fellows "governed and regulated the life of the College," though there was no clear definition of what was meant by this. Fellows were meant to be full-time teaching members of the faculty. Untenured faculty members could be included in the small group. While the Master officially presided over Fellows' Meetings, most colleges also

elected a member of the Fellowship (calling him Chairman of the Senior Common Room, Executive Fellow, etc.) to preside at lunch.

By the late 1950s this tight exclusiveness had been loosened, partly because the student body had grown in size, partly because students and faculty, as the result of the maturing experiences associated with the events of World War II, imprinted on the Colleges their quest for greater democracy. The Fellows more and more took on the roles of proctor, warden, counselor, and general presence in the Colleges. Thus, an expectation of their involvement with students in the College increased. The selection of Fellows in a balanced mixture (half untenured, half tenured, with both teaching and research eminence taken into consideration), drew the Fellowships more closely together, as junior members of the faculty felt they could learn from their senior colleagues, most of whom could be found at their reserved table at lunch, in part because of the free meal privilege afforded Fellows but chiefly to enjoy informal conversation with colleagues from other disciplines. Since Colleges now differed even more in the size of their residential student population, and because the size of the Fellowship was no longer prescribed, a Fellowship of 30 to 35 was usual. The upper figure often was set by the practical consideration of the size of the Senior Common Room. With a Fellowship of this size, virtually all Colleges had an Executive Fellow or equivalent. Perhaps half the Fellows were given some small, but defined, task to perform on behalf of the Fellowship and its relations with the students.

In 1960 the institution of Sophomore Seminars in the Colleges resulted in the teaching of small sections of large lecture courses in the Colleges by Fellows of the Colleges. This innovation, representing the beginning of the involvement of Fellows in the formal role of classroom teachers in the College setting, lasted a few years and was subsequently replaced by the present College Seminar system, amplified in some Colleges by the Early Concentration Program.

In the 1960s a major change overtook the former, rather cozy Fellowship arrangements. In 1960-61 an experiment with Assistant Masters in some Colleges

demonstrated to the Masters what the Dean of Yale College already knew: that a second adult presence in each Residential College, charged with significant administrative responsibilities, was essential to the successful administration of Yale College. In 1963 College Deans were appointed, and they have remained of great significance in the Colleges ever since. While the Master continued to be captain of the ship as the presiding officer, the Dean was seen as fully in charge of the engine room: responsible for the progress of students in an orderly fashion toward attaining their degrees. Deans, however, soon found the need for a larger group of Fellows, and especially junior faculty members, who could provide informal academic advising in the majors, and in time this advisory capacity was made formal. The Masters therefore agreed that, if possible, there ought to be one Fellow (and in the case of large departments, two or more Fellows) from each major. Since there was a growing number of majors -- 47 by the late 1980s -- this alone meant growth in the Fellowship. It also meant selection on a rather different basis. Presumably, earlier Fellows were chosen for their academic potential, their ability to relate their field to the concerns of others, and also for their conversational ability: it was this last criterion that gave the Fellowships something of the air of a club. Fellows were now chosen for their knowledge of the intricacies of a major, for their relative youthfulness because they might relate more readily to undergraduates, and for the probability of their attaining tenure in a far more competitive situation.

By 1965 the typical Fellowship numbered 60, and various amenities had to be abandoned: were all the Fellows to attend, Senior Common Rooms would no longer accommodate them, and Christmas Dinner (as well as each College's annual Feast Night), to which spouses were customarily invited, became intolerably crowded, so that spouses -- and thus Fellows -- increasingly stayed away. The paradoxical situation was now clear: as there were more Fellows, they in fact had less contact as a group with the students, for they disliked the

crowded Dining Halls and they disliked even more, the growing expectation on the part of some students that their sole purpose in being in the Dining Hall was to advise the students. Students were ill-informed on how the Fellowship, by bringing scholars of diverse disciplines together, actually benefited the students. By the late 1960s general hostility between students and faculty was also reflected in the Dining Halls, where virtually all Masters abandoned Fellows' tables, the wearing of academic gowns at Feast Nights, and other symbolic gestures to what earlier had been perceived as virtually a British parliamentary arrangement: the students had been the House of Commons, the Fellows the House of Lords.

The death blow to the old concept of the Fellowship came with the decision that every teaching member of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (and most powerful members of all other faculties, by virtue of their desires) should be placed in a Fellowship after one year at Yale, even if that faculty member did not wish to be a Fellow and emphatically did not want to join the Fellowship that "chose" him. Fellowships grew by the early 1970s from 80 to 110 members. As the senior faculty began to lose interest, so too did many of the junior faculty, since they could no longer count on finding mentors in the mysterious ways of the University present even at Fellows Meetings, not to speak of the abandoned Fellows' Table. In time came the whittling down of the meal privilege and its virtual abolition when, in the face of the ever increasing size of the Fellowships, the University felt unable to afford the cost any longer. Masters could no longer find functions for so many Fellows to perform, so that many had no role in the College.

As a group the Masters did not utterly abandon the original intention of the Fellowship, though they had to be emboldened by a new President. In 1979 they were asked to cut the Fellowships in half, the suggestion being made that there ought to be one Fellow for every ten students in the College. Some Colleges restored Feast Night and Fellows' Tables, but these were fruitless gestures when a final budget cut eliminated meals even for those Fellows who

had faithfully performed their functions. Erosion of the Residential Fellowships, to the point that most Colleges have only two, not only proved demoralizing to the Masters and Fellows, but further confused the students as to the value of the Fellows. Why ought students place any value on the Fellowship when other responsible agencies of the University did not? Budgetary pressures were disproportionately hard on the Residential Colleges, while the community as a whole, with no ill intent, placed inappropriate demands on the structure of the Fellowship. It was to serve the cause of town and gown: hence fire chiefs and local lawyers should become Associate Fellows. It should function as a meeting place for administration and faculty: hence every appointee with "flag rank" became a mandatory Fellow. It was to be an advising wing of Yale College: hence more pressure to appoint Fellows in the enrollment-heavy disciplines. It was to provide a sense of status and belonging to echelons of administration not originally perceived as needing to use the Fellowship for a sense of worth. It was to provide a forum where librarians, coaches, and financial aid officers might get to know the faculty and the faculty know of their activities. It was to take on the functions of a Faculty Club, which no longer existed at Yale.

The Masters abolished the mandatory rule for faculty membership in 1980. Some Fellowships defined minimal expectations for activity in the College and cut Fellows who were unwilling to meet those expectations; no College was successful in cutting more than five Fellows, so that the Fellowship remained large. One or two Masters temporarily abandoned the Fellowships entirely, neither calling them to meet nor attending when they did meet.

Both faculty and students ask increasingly, what is the function of the Fellows? If indeed there is a function it must be defined, based on past structures, expectations as they have changed over time, and the present realities and needs. The following recommendations for the structure and function of the Fellowship are designed to fill this need.

### Recommendations

The place of the Fellowships and the role of the Fellows in the life of the Residential Colleges is unclear at present. The small, elite groups of Fellows characteristic of earlier times are said to have provided true fellowship among its members, to have given fine opportunities for social and intellectual contact across departmental lines, and to have produced a Fellowship devoted to the College. They did, however, exclude most people from participation and made little direct contribution to the education of the students as a Fellowship. The current system, which admits to the Fellowship virtually all faculty members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, as well as many others, has removed the sense of exclusiveness, but in so doing it has largely lost the advantages of the old system without introducing many new ones.

As the report on the Fellowship prepared by the Committee chaired by D. Allan Bromley in 1971 made clear, the nature and size of the residential college Fellowships had changed markedly from its inception mainly by increasing the size and as a result decreasing the sense of cohesiveness and responsibility to the College.

The situation in 1983 remains essentially the same as that described in 1971. There is a sense among many of the faculty that in many cases this has resulted in the erosion of the significance of the Fellowship to the faculty and has consequently been seriously downgraded in the life of the University.

We think that there is a way of revitalizing the Fellowship so that it serves both the Residential College system and the University as a whole. Such a revitalization, of course, will raise the stature of the Fellowship and presumably once again permit the development of a cohesiveness that appears to be lacking in many of the colleges now.

1. College Fellowships are now too large. They range from 141-213 members. To make it clear that it is an honor to be a Fellow of a College, and further to assure that Fellows be active, we recommend that the size of the total Fellowship be progressively reduced to no more than 100 for each college. This number includes Fellows and Associate Fellows, and does not include Professors Emeriti

or guest Fellows. A Fellow or Associate Fellow will be appointed by the Council of Masters for a term of four years, and reappointed on the recommendation of the Master. Regular members of the faculty who have taught in Yale College for a period of two consecutive years without being invited to join a Fellowship should receive such an invitation from a residential college in the Fall of their third year at Yale. Reappointment should be based on contribution to the life of the College. While the total Fellowship will continue to draw on other components of University life (including persons from outside the University who contribute to its well-being), the faculty will continue to constitute the core of the Fellowship.

2. The President, upon the recommendation of the Master, should appoint in each college a Faculty Fellows Advisory Council. This will be composed of 15 Fellows who are faculty members (chosen from among Instructors through Professors Emeriti) and will advise the Master on matters arising in the College as an undergraduate enterprise within the wider university setting. The term of appointment would be three years and renewable by the President with the advice of the Master of the College. The Master would be the Chairman of the Council and the Dean would be an additional member ex officio.

The concept of a Faculty Fellows Advisory Council has important ramifications for the structure of the educational life of the Residential Colleges, therefore its role must be outlined in some detail:

(a) A primary role of the Advisory Council would be to review, participate in and supervise the educational programs of the Residential College. A major part of this is the role of teaching in the colleges. Each faculty member of the Advisory Council would be expected to teach at least one semester course in the College, during the course of his or her term on the Council. This would guarantee a solid core of courses from the college's own Fellows. The modes of teaching to be employed would be determined by the Advisory Council. Among models that might be chosen are the Sophomore Seminars in which regular departmental courses, particularly general ones without prerequisites, would provide the subject, sections of large courses taught to students of the College by College Fellows, the Residential College Seminars as they now exist, and

the Early Concentration Program. The Advisory Council should be encouraged to experiment with other ideas as well. As a continuing body with rotating membership, the Advisory Council could plan ahead to produce a coherent program and also to take advantage of educational opportunities that require commitments made even several years in advance.

(b) Members of the Advisory Council would participate in advising undergraduates in the College and help in identifying Faculty Fellows who can also be called on as advisers.

(c) The Advisory Council would devise an appropriate method for seeking opinion and advice from students residing in the College concerning the educational program, and ways in which to encourage the interaction of Fellows and students.

(d) The Advisory Council would advise the Master on the awarding of the Fellows' Prizes.

(e) The Advisory Council should advise the Master on the maintenance of the quality of the college library.

(f) The Advisory Council would provide a channel for transmitting names and qualifications of candidates in the search for a new Master to the President's search committee. As a body of informed members, it could also be called on by the President for advice about the College.

By meeting together regularly, planning the educational program, consulting with the Master, teaching and advising students, the Fellows, as members of the Advisory Council would soon acquire a thorough knowledge of the College, a reasonably broad acquaintance with students, a sense of fellowship with colleagues from different departments, and a sense of participation in and commitment to the life of the College. The advantages to the students of having a number of Fellows contributing so much to the College would seem to be obvious. Over time, membership in the Advisory Council would change, and the circle of those Fellows who would have shared this relatively deep experience in the College would grow.

In order to achieve this ideal, new relationships must be established. First, the right kind of Fellow must be attracted to become a member of the Advisory Council. This will take the skill of the Master, buttressed by the interest of the President, in convincing faculty Fellows to see the value of such participation. Second, the Departments must be convinced of the value of the participation of their faculty members in the enterprise. This would be aided by the fact that some, if not many, of the courses taught in the colleges might carry Departmental numbers, as in the days of the Sophomore Seminars, and that some type of student advising would be implemented through the colleges. Third, the members of the Advisory Council should be granted the privilege of five meals each week, not so much as a reward for their participating intimately in the life of the college, but as a way of encouraging their active presence in the college dining hall to provide a focus for student and Fellow participation in the life of the college at these times. Fourth, a majority of this committee recommend that each nonemeritus member of the Advisory Council should be allowed access to \$500 a year (cumulative for three years if so desired) for the sake of extraordinary research and education expenses.

3. We recommend that a small fund be established to support the activities of the Advisory Council in each college.

4. We recommend that a substantial fund be established to support the expanded programs of education in the colleges.

Among the most important resources of the College are the Resident Fellows, generally married couples who reside in the college. Resident Fellows are initially appointed for one year, and thereafter on three-year terms (with no appointment to extend beyond one year past the appointment of the Master who initiated the appointment). These Fellows are expected to perform functions, as agreed upon with the Master, that go well beyond the activities of regular Fellows and Associate Fellows. Typically a Resident Fellow might serve as a Senior Tutor, chairing the Residential College Seminar Committee; another Resident Fellow might take charge of the Fellowship itself, acting as its Executive; or Resident Fellows might be placed in charge of intercollege athletics, or of drama or music, in the Residential College. As these Fellows often have small children,

and normally take lunch and dinner in the college, they provide a significant link between the Fellowship as a whole and the students, as well as acting as the eyes and ears of both Master and Dean. It is normally expected that they will attend all major college functions, and one Resident Fellow is designated as "in charge" of the College, by formal communication to the Campus Police, should the Master and Dean find it necessary to be absent from the college at the same time. The number of Resident Fellows has been reduced, and ought to be restored at least to the number that prevailed three years ago. No college, whatever previous number of Resident Fellows it may have had, should in the future house fewer than three Resident Fellows, since they, with the Master and Dean, comprise the hands-on faculty presence in the College, and a smaller number cannot work effectively among so large a group of students.

In 1981 the Council of Masters resolved that all future appointments of Resident Fellows should (with the single exception made for the in-residence representative of the Dean of Yale College on the Yale Campus) be active teaching members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, or the equivalent thereof. In 1981 all colleges were asked to convert one or more Fellows' suites to accommodate additional students. It is not too late to reverse this policy, as serious damage has not yet been done -- though in time it inevitably will -- to the fabric of the suites.

5. We recommend that the recent policy be revised and that the colleges begin the process of restoring Residential Suites for Fellows as soon, and as many, as possible.

One way or another the plan suggested here would cost more money. In the minds of some of the founders of Yale's Residential College system was the intention of providing endowed funds to support Fellows of the college who would teach in them. That intention was never realized. Perhaps, after fifty years, the time has come to fulfill the higher educational hopes of some of the Founders, to seek endowed funds to provide for a flexible and continuing teaching program in the colleges and, at the same time, to provide the foundation for a lively, active, functioning, and rewarding Fellowship.

## GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS

### Expectations

The community of Graduate and Professional students is a resource to be used by the residential colleges for the benefit of undergraduates even as the faculty and community are such resources. These senior students, deeply committed to a particular discipline, should provide to the undergraduates some understanding of the character of scholarly, professional and artistic commitment and achievement. Since many Yale undergraduates will proceed into graduate and professional training of the kind which Yale provides, Yale graduate and professional students can give advice on the academic and intellectual character of such training and the social and personal aspects of this phase of their careers.

As veterans of undergraduate schooling, graduate and professional students may also be valuable as general academic advisors to undergraduates. In some circumstances, graduate and professional students may also make important contributions to dramatic, artistic, athletic and musical activities in the colleges, and contribute to their social life and administrative structure. Although the welfare of undergraduates must remain the primary objective of the residential college system, the colleges are a part of Yale as a university, and benefits to the graduate programs through their students should be given some weight in the consideration of the relations of the residential colleges to these students. In particular, residential colleges might contribute to the quality of life of graduate and professional students by giving them an opportunity to interact with undergraduates.

### History

The college system, derived from the examples of Cambridge and Oxford Colleges, perhaps through Wilson's (failed) plan for a Princeton Quadrangle system, was certainly considered by William Harkness as a Yale

College facility designed to improve the character of Yale College education socially and intellectually. Although the Yale Corporation and Harkness were not necessarily insensitive to the importance of graduate and professional education (contributions by Harkness played a central role in the founding of the Yale Drama School), the interaction of graduate and professional students with the colleges was probably considered only in terms of the contribution to undergraduate education.

It is possible that the original views of the fellowship, influenced perhaps by the very successful Princeton preceptorial system, might have included some senior graduate students as representatives of the promising younger teachers at Yale, but in fact the fellowships (originally there was a limit of 12 per college including the Master) which were allocated to younger members of the community, were given to young Instructors and Assistant Professors with the goal of providing a "system of closer personal contacts of students and faculty . . ." (Provost Seymour, 1930). Graduate and professional students had no place in the infant colleges.

Although it appears that those students who were affiliated with a college as undergraduates, and stayed at Yale as graduate and professional students, played some role in college activities in the early years, the formal introduction of graduate students into college affairs followed from the Graduate Affiliates Programs which began in the 1950s and has continued to the present.

#### The Graduate Affiliates Programs

The Graduate Affiliates Program constitutes a general rubric for a set of individual programs in the different colleges which reflect the immediate needs of those colleges as seen by the Masters. Even as the needs and resources of the colleges differ, the Graduate Affiliates programs vary widely. The number of Affiliates associated with a college ranges from fewer than 5 to more than 25. Most colleges have a few resident Affiliates. Compensation for most is slight, occasionally no compensation is offered, most often a number of meals

(typically, one meal a week) are given. For a few Affiliates, discharging important and onerous responsibilities, the compensation is substantial -- though usually in kind, i.e. room and board.

The Masters may draw on various sources for the funds to support the Affiliates Programs. Freshman advisors are paid by the Yale College Dean's Office, and in certain cases, such as the Bates program in Jonathan Edwards College, special funds are available to support graduate and professional students as Junior Fellows. The modest compensation for most Affiliates, however, comes from the Master's discretionary funds and certain budgetary line items.

Graduate Affiliates of a college have various duties and the colleges use their Affiliates in different ways. Graduate students have been used to organize and form a center for language studies at meals. Graduate students have acted as assistants to the Masters and Deans in organizing social activities such as Master's teas. Affiliates coordinate College Seminar Programs and have, in special circumstances, played important roles as disciplinary figures. Graduate students have coached college athletic teams and filled positions as players on such teams. Professional students have directed musical and dramatical productions and played important roles in such productions. Graduate students have served as tutors for undergraduates as well as advisors.

Masters are free to select the Affiliates in whatever manner they feel convenient and effective. There seems to be no general pattern or mechanism designed to guide such selections. Usually Affiliates are chosen with regard to the contribution they are expected to make to specific college programs. Hence, the choice of Affiliates reflects the particular requirements of the college as seen by the Master. While it can be presumed that the Graduate Affiliates programs are of value to the graduate and professional students who take part, the programs are devised by the Masters primarily for the benefit of the undergraduates.

Most Masters believe that their programs work well enough, and there seems to be little interest in expanding them. Of eight Masters who responded to a query concerning their need for more funds for graduate programs, only one wanted more money for that purpose. Some undergraduates feel that the graduate programs were quite valuable; there was no indication that they felt the programs created problems. On the other hand, there seems to be some mild dissatisfaction among graduate and professional students who are not involved in the programs. Some perceive inequities in the selection of Affiliates and in the narrowness of opportunities for them to take part in college activities as Affiliates.

In addition to the Graduate Affiliates programs, the College Seminar program recommended by the Hall Committee and initiated in 1968 also acts as a link between undergraduates and graduate and professional students since many of the seminars are taught by senior graduate students. During the semester in which the seminar is presented, those graduate students are appointed as guest fellows in the college, broadening the opportunities for interaction with the undergraduates.

#### Evaluation

At present, the interaction between undergraduates and graduate students in the residential colleges is largely limited to the relations between Graduate Affiliates and the students they meet in the course of their assigned duties. In addition, Graduate Affiliates have limited contact with other students (especially at their subsidized meals) and a few meet undergraduates as teacher-to-student in College Seminars.

There is, in the residential colleges, little if any formation of informal collegia of scholars, counting graduate and professional students as a normal part of such a group. Such collegia do exist in many graduate school departments and most, if not all, professional schools. Undergraduates are often, though perhaps too rarely, accepted into these graduate department communities-of-scholars; they are seldom a part of the similar professional school group.

In view of the variety and importance of the departments at Yale (and at nearly all American universities) as centers of their particular disciplines, it would seem that the special disciplinary collegia are best constructed about the department structure and have no reasonable place in the residential colleges. It may be argued, however, that the size and variety of the residential college community is such that the residential colleges should constitute centers of cross-disciplinary intercourse where graduate students might play a useful role.

Some colleges have drawn upon students at the graduate schools of Art, Architecture, Drama, and Music for special assistance in initiating and supporting college programs in the arts. Typically, such Affiliates supply technical competence and leadership to undergraduate productions, as well as act, albeit sometimes implicitly, as undergraduate advisors.

Volunteers all, the Graduate Affiliates appear to value their college experience. Hence, the offering by the college to graduate students of opportunities to take part in college activities can be considered a contribution of the residential colleges to the quality of graduate and professional training. However, this contribution, as well as other possible contributions by the residential colleges, to graduate and professional education is severely limited by the disparity between the number of graduate students at Yale and the resources the colleges can make available. Yale is a relatively small undergraduate institution with about 5,000 students in Yale College, but Yale is a relatively large graduate and professional university with an equal number of graduate and professional students. It is, then, very difficult, perhaps impossible, for the residential colleges to make a substantial contribution to post-graduate education and the quality of post-graduate student life without weakening the ability of the colleges to discharge their unique role in undergraduate education and undergraduate life.

Although we conclude that the Residential College System cannot, and should not, be expected to contribute more substantially to the welfare of the

graduate and professional student community, we observe that the colleges affect that community strongly. The very existence of the residential colleges defines, in part, the character of Yale University and hence the character of the communities which comprise the University. Since the college system at Yale supplants institutions such as Student Unions, common at other schools, which form centers of undergraduate and graduate student (and faculty) activities, the existence of the colleges, devoted almost exclusively to undergraduate concerns, has an impact acting to reduce the quality of graduate and professional student life. Yale, with its college system for undergraduates, lacks the broad centers of activity found elsewhere which serve naturally as foci of graduate and professional activities. Though compensatory actions by the University designed to create structures benefiting the broader Yale community may be in order, we suggest that the University should best proceed in such pursuits through agencies other than the residential colleges.

#### Recommendations

A maxim, sometimes taped to equipment used in experimental science, states, "If it isn't broke, don't fix it!" While the present restricted use of graduate and professional students by the colleges is, like all human institutions, subject to improvement, we see no serious structural flaws in the programs and we believe that the existing offices of Master and Dean have sufficient powers to make any changes they consider warranted. Although it may be argued that the University has not been as successful in establishing as deep a relationship between graduate and undergraduate education as might be possible, and new programs are in order, we are not convinced that the colleges are equipped to carry the burden of any substantial new programs involving graduate students, and we recommend no such programs.

Some graduate students are dissatisfied, thinking that opportunities for their affiliations with the colleges are too slight, are not equitably handled, and that there should be better means to allow them to be considered for such

positions. We have met and discussed these matters with officers of the Graduate and Professional Organization. Full satisfaction seems unattainable; opportunities for affiliation must remain limited, and the Masters must retain full control over the recruitments for their programs. Better identification of prospective affiliates, however, would be useful. To that end, the officers of the GPO are tentatively planning to establish lists of graduate and professional students interested in the affiliates programs together with their qualifications. These lists would then be made available to Masters as an aid in their efforts to organize their Affiliates programs.

We propose no new programs, but we are aware of the various valuable services graduate and professional students, as formal Affiliates or in other roles, can supply efficiently and inexpensively. As examples, we have mentioned the educational contributions of graduate students as leaders of language tables and the artistic contributions of professional students as directors of dramatic and musical productions. Although we conclude that the role of special educational, artistic, athletic, and professional programs in the colleges is properly addressed in the context of undergraduate life and education rather than as a part of graduate student relations, graduate students can play an important role in such programs.

The use of Graduate Affiliates is limited by the funds available to Masters. It might be argued that an increase in the use of graduate and professional students as Graduate Affiliates would strengthen both undergraduate education and graduate and professional training. Since we believe that the discretionary funds made available to the Master should be unencumbered and flexible, we do not recommend that funds be earmarked especially for Graduate Affiliates programs. The importance of such programs, however, should be considered in any discussion of the proper level of those funds.

ALUMNI

In recent years Alumni have begun to play an increasing role in the life of the Residential Colleges. Programs currently in place such as the affiliation of alumni classes with colleges and career advice and assistance, have been well received by the students. We think it likely that further association between alumni and the colleges would be beneficial to both.

Recommendation

We recommend that the University undertake an investigation of how best alumni could make a greater contribution to the life of the colleges.

## SERVICES

### Expectations

The success of the system of residential colleges depends on the support services they need to function properly. These are provided chiefly by the departments in charge of physical plant, buildings and grounds, and dining halls. The buildings and grounds, physical plant and dining halls of the colleges should be kept safe and clean, and the machinery within them should be in good working order. All facilities should be examined, assessed, and repaired on a regular schedule that is available to the colleges as well as to the service departments. To reach these goals, communication between the service departments and the individual college offices should be swift and sure. Requests for services should be made by service personnel assigned to each college or by the college's staff, and response should be quick and effective. Normally, there should be no need for the Master's intervention.

The college's increasing role as an educational center and the progress of technology make further demands on space and resources. Every effort should be made to provide adequate computer and language laboratory facilities in all the colleges. The University should also attempt to make telephone service and good television reception available in the colleges at fees that accurately reflect service delivered. Athletic facilities for recreation, instruction and intramural competition should be accessible and adequate to student needs and should be carefully maintained.

### Description and Evaluation

Most of the colleges are a half century old, some structures even older, and in need of repair. They remain handsome, attractive, and pleasant places to live, but the University can anticipate considerable and mounting expense in keeping them in good condition as they grow older. The kitchen facilities of some of the dining halls need repair and renovation. It should be kept in mind that when the kitchens were first designed, the colleges had fewer students and the meals were served by waitresses. The demands placed on these kitchens

now far exceeds the original expectations. Recently, some of the colleges have had their kitchens renovated, but work remains to be done in more than half of the kitchens.

The dining halls also perform functions in their respective colleges other than simply being the place where meals are served. The most common of these are events such as plays, movies, dances, recitals and other entertainment. Some of the functions are suitable for the space provided, others are not. They interfere with the hall's capacity to serve meals.

All the colleges suffer from a lack of space. In addition to the crowding of students into rooms, space for the educational functions we espouse in the colleges is in short supply.

Facilities for athletic activities for undergraduates are, in general, splendid, and the intramural athletic program is one in which Yale can take great pride, but there are some problems. Space for recreational and intramural basketball and volleyball is inadequate. The playing fields around the Yale Bowl are excellent and spacious, but in recent years they have been heavily used, and the grass has been badly eroded and inadequately maintained.

The colleges now have some facilities for use of the computer, but the demand is growing rapidly, and already exceeds capacity. They also have facilities for the aural study of foreign languages, and these too will be in greater demand now that the University has a language proficiency requirement.

Despite the University's efforts, through the Committee on Responsibilities to Disabled Students and Employees, to accommodate the needs to its disabled students, many barriers remain which prevent disabled students from reaping the full benefits of residential college life. At this time, the colleges provide a very narrow choice of housing to students who use wheelchairs. These disabled students cannot reach all college libraries, nor can they reach a majority of Master's and Dean's offices. Eight college dining halls and most Common Rooms are inaccessible, thus barring disabled students from participating in the many activities which take place in these rooms, such as organizational meetings, plays, musical events, and SAC parties. Many stairways in

the colleges lack railings which are important to visually disabled students as guides. At this time, some residential colleges prevent disabled students from taking full part in all activities. Remedying this situation must become an integral part of Yale's plans for the residential colleges so that changes can be made as quickly and smoothly as possible, as part of Yale's commitment to provide a rich educational and social atmosphere for all students.

#### Recommendations

1. The University should make a full assessment of the needs of the colleges with respect to their buildings, grounds, and physical plant. It should then formulate a plan for renovating and maintaining them in good condition. The establishment of a fund for this purpose might well be part of the forthcoming fund drive.

2. Directors of the departments of physical plant, buildings and grounds, and dining halls, in consultation with the Masters, should study the existing systems of communication between their departments and the colleges, with the intention of establishing the most efficient system possible. A major goal should be to find ways to free the Masters as far as possible from involvement in the details of these operations. Naturally, Masters should continue to play an important part in the establishment of policy.

3. Funds should be sought to continue the renovation of the kitchens of the following eligible colleges: Branford, Berkeley, Calhoun, Davenport, Pierson, Saybrook and Silliman.

4. To relieve pressure on the dining halls and the public spaces in the colleges we recommend that the University give serious consideration to buying or building a Student Activities Center. If such space contained athletic facilities it might relieve some pressure on the Payne Whitney Gymnasium as well. It might also provide office space for campus-wide student organizations, as well as for those from the colleges. We do not, however, recommend that all such functions be moved out of the sponsoring colleges.

5. We recommend that plans be made to improve further the condition of the playing fields at the Yale Bowl and for their future maintenance.

6. We recommend that the Masters make a survey of the space needs of their respective colleges to meet their educational responsibilities. These should include seminar rooms, space for computer and language laboratories, offices and suites for resident Fellows. The University should use the results as a basis for estimating and planning needed renovations. Funds for this purpose might be sought through the coming campaign.

7. Space allocation in the colleges for housing and other purposes is now based on the Riese report, issued in 1968 and revised several times since then. We recommend that space allocation for all purposes be re-examined in the light of the expectations set forth in this report.

8. We recommend that the University form a committee to plan for improved computer facilities in the colleges. The same committee, or some other group, could plan for improved facilities for aural language study. When the costs for these educational facilities are known they might be included in the fund drive.

9. A study should be completed quickly of ways to improve communications facilities in the colleges, for instance coaxial cables. It should include consideration of ways to reduce telephone installation costs for students and to improve the quality of radio and television reception.

10. Every effort should be made to adapt the colleges to the needs of disabled students as soon and as fully as possible.

Some practices occur in the area of university or college services that should be endorsed and continued. One of special note is the distribution of leftover food to the needy through the various New Haven agencies. This includes food prepared daily as well as stock remaining at the end of a term. This practice should continue to receive University support.

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### MASTERSHIP

1. Recognizing the inroads of inflation, and seeking to enable the Masters to meet the ever-increasing needs of their positions, we recommend that the Masters' Discretionary Funds be doubled.
2. We recommend that fund-raising priority be given to the needs of less well-off colleges.
3. The Mastership imposes a major burden on the spouse and family of a Master. There should be adequate funds to allow various forms of flexible domestic assistance to help ease the burden. We recommend that the housekeeping funds available to Masters be doubled.
4. We recommend that Masters be allowed to "bank" leaves; that summer stipends (one-ninth of salary) be established for Masters; that a special fund be made available for research expenses for Masters.
5. That the Masters' Administrative Assistants be re-classified Managerial and Professional.
6. Newly designated Masters should always undertake the established sequence of briefings.

### DEANSHIP

1. We recommend that College Deans be required to have the same qualifications as full-time junior faculty members.
2. We recommend that College Deanships be advertised as leading to careers in academic administration as well as conventional academic careers.
3. We recommend that Residential College Deans be granted one semester's leave with pay during their second term.
4. We recommend that a fund be established for summer research for College Deans.

5. We recommend that the current duties performed by Residential College Deans not be increased.
6. We recommend that the Dean of Yale College continue to make it clear for College Deans that their primary duty is to maintain the integrity of the academic and disciplinary process.
7. We recommend that the role of College Deans at the Executive Committee of Yale College be more clearly defined.
8. We recommend that College Deans continue to make every effort to inform faculty advisors of all aspects of advising freshmen, and attempt to match freshmen with appropriate advisors.
9. We recommend that Residential College Deans be allowed a more active role in helping students receive tutorial help.
10. We recommend that College Deans continue to encourage students to make use of the many sources of advice available to them.
11. We recommend that a resident nonstudent representative on the Old Campus be appointed.

#### COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

1. We recommend that efforts be made to keep at least one of the two administrative offices open between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.
2. We recommend that every effort be made to keep both offices open during the term.
3. We recommend that Masters' and Deans' offices be equipped with telephone answering equipment so that they may receive messages when the offices are closed.
4. We recommend that in vacations during the term, either the Master or the Dean, or the Master's designated representative, should be resident in the college and responsible for dealing with emergencies.
5. We recommend that wherever possible, a new Master and a new College Dean should not be assigned to a college simultaneously.

6. We recommend that Masters and College Deans inform each other in writing of impending overnight absences from the college; should both unavoidably be absent during the term, a resident Fellow or other appropriate officer of the college should be placed in charge, and the Campus Police so informed.
7. We recommend that the Master and College Dean not be on leave of absence at the same time.
8. We recommend that the Executive Office of the Council of Masters be restored to its original strength of two full-time employees with bursary aid.

#### UNDERGRADUATES

1. We recommend that while Undergraduates should not be subject to restrictions on the private use of alcohol in their own rooms, they must be made fully aware that no Residential College explicitly fosters its use and that Masters and Residential College Deans will not accept drunkenness as an excuse for rowdy and destructive behavior on, or off campus.
2. We recommend that Residential College student councils be more representative of students.
3. To relieve overcrowding and provide room for student activities, we recommend consideration of a new Residential College with a student activities center, without an increase in enrollment.
4. We recommend the creation of a faculty club.
5. We recommend an improvement in the current procedures for selecting Freshman Counselors and Faculty Program Advisors.
6. We recommend that the Residential Colleges increase their educational role without infringing upon the role of the academic departments.
7. We recommend that funds be sought to support the expanded educational programs in the colleges.

FELLOWSHIP

1. To signalize the fact that it is an honor and active responsibility to be a Fellow and to assure that Fellows be active, we recommend that the size of the Fellowship be limited to one hundred.
2. We recommend that the President, upon the recommendation of the Master, appoint a Faculty Fellows Advisory Council in each Residential College.
3. We recommend that a fund be established to support the activities of each Advisory Council.
4. We recommend that a substantial fund be established to support the expanded programs of education in the colleges.
5. In recognition of the fact that Resident Fellows play a very important role in the colleges, we recommend that recent policy be revised and that Residential Suites for Fellows be restored.

ALUMNI

1. We recommend that the University undertake an investigation of how best alumni could make a greater contribution to the life of the colleges.

SERVICES

1. We recommend that the University make a full assessment of the needs of the colleges with relation to their buildings, grounds, and physical plant. A fund for this purpose could be part of the forthcoming fund drive.
2. We recommend that managers of departments of Physical Plant, Buildings and Grounds and Dining Halls establish a more effective system of communication between their departments and the Masters' offices.
3. We recommend that funds be sought to permit the renovation of kitchens in the following colleges: Berkeley, Branford, Calhoun, Davenport, Pierson, Saybrook and Silliman.

4. We recommend that the University give serious consideration to buying or building a Student Activities Center.
5. We recommend that the condition of the playing fields at the Yale Bowl be improved and their future maintenance be assured.
6. We recommend that Masters make a study of their needs for educational space (e.g. seminar rooms, computer and language laboratories), to enable the administration to plan for appropriate adjustments.
7. We recommend that space allocation be re-examined in the light of the expectations set forth in this report.
8. We recommend that the University explore the possibility of constructing a new college in order to resolve the current problem of overcrowding.
9. We recommend that a committee be formed to plan for improved computer facilities in the Residential Colleges.
10. We recommend that a study be made of ways to improve the quality and cost-efficiency of communications facilities (including telephone installation costs, and radio and television reception).
11. Every effort should be made to adapt the colleges to the needs of disabled students as soon and as fully as possible.