

CAMPUS LIFE

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE
ON CAMPUS LIFE

Study of Coeducation in the
Undergraduate Program

May 25, 1984

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SOCIAL LIFE, FRATERNITIES AND INDEPENDENT STUDENTS

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL LIFE,
FRATERNITIES AND INDEPENDENT STUDENTS
(A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS LIFE)

This sub-committee was asked to consider, relative to the coeducation study, that portion of the Committee on Campus Life's responsibilities relating to "the character and quality of social and extracurricular...programs at Washington and Lee University... the fraternity system...and all other policy matters which have bearing on the extracurricular life of the Washington and Lee student". A number of topics, drawn from President Wilson's memorandum to the Board of Trustees dated February 13, 1984, were specifically suggested for consideration, including:

1. How women in residence might alter the shape of social life.
2. How the fraternities might change if women are admitted.
3. The possible impact on the number of independent students and the increased demand for more all-university social events.
4. The accommodation of national fraternities to changes instituted at other colleges undergoing the change to coeducation.
5. How fraternity structures and fraternity life were altered at places that insisted upon converting these organizations to coeducational housing/social units (e.g., Amherst).
6. What the advent of sororities could mean to undergraduate life here.
7. Whether the physical side of the Student Center would have to be changed.

The sub-committee's approach to this assignment was in three parts: first, Mr. Touchton made a two-day on-site visit to the campus for the purpose of visiting with a number of student groups as well as with some members of the faculty and administration. Second, Mr. Gallivan conducted telephone interviews with deans and others at a number of institutions which previously had made the transition to coeducation. Third, Dean of Students Lew John, in

conjunction with Assistant Dean of Students for Fraternity Affairs Dan Murphy and Student Center Director Michael Cappeto, was asked to draft responses to the topics referred to above, based on their many years of combined experience with student life issues, supplemented most recently by their fact-finding visits to other institutions. These responses were then reviewed by Messrs. Touchton and Gallivan who do not pretend to have the same degree of experience and expertise with these issues but nonetheless found that their independent visits, interviews and conversations produced findings that permitted them to agree in general with the responses prepared by Dean John and his associates. In any event, the goal of this combined effort was to develop information which would permit us to express to the entire Board of Trustees certain facts, thoughts and opinions that would assist the Board in its full study of the coeducation issue.

It is important to point out that there previously have been prepared certain reports which must be considered an integral part of this sub-committee's report since they deal specifically with some of the suggested topics. Those reports, included as Exhibits are:

- A. "The Impact of Coeducation on Fraternity Life" prepared by Assistant Dean of Students for Fraternity Affairs Dan Murphy in December, 1983.
- B. "Visits to Selected Colleges for Study of Fraternity and Residential Life Issues" prepared by Dean John and Assistant Dean Murphy in September, 1983.
- C. Excerpts pertaining to student life from "The Report of the Committee on Coeducation at Washington and Lee University, April 4-5, 1970."

Everyone involved in this sub-committee's work properly points out that much of the information requested of this sub-committee is speculative and conjectural in nature relative to changes that might occur at W&L vis-a-vis what occurred at other institutions. Recognizing this as being true, a special effort was made in the on-campus visit to obtain a broad spectrum of thought and opinion from students, faculty and administration who both favor and oppose coeducation.

This sub-committee's responses to the suggested topics are as follows:

- 1. How women in residence might alter the shape of social life.

Coeducation at Washington and Lee, in all likelihood, would not have a sudden or perhaps even a readily perceptible impact on the social life at Washington and Lee initially. Instead, a slow evolutionary process would be more probable.

The initial number of women to arrive on campus in the first coeducational freshman class would likely be quite small relative to the overall student population. Even assuming the warmest reception by the undergraduate male population, these women would be too few in number to alter in any real sense the social patterns which have long been established with the neighboring women's colleges. Indeed, until subsequent coed classes enrolled, and until something very close to parity in numbers was reached in the male/female ratio, Washington and Lee would not become a self-sufficient social entity. Indeed, if the university chose to adopt a prescribed enrollment pattern of admission, such as 1,000 men and 500 women, it might never be. While we would continue to have some students traveling between Washington and Lee and the women's colleges under any circumstances, the numbers involved would depend ultimately on the proportion of men to women on our campus.

It was frequently suggested by students, faculty and others that the nature of the social interaction between male and female students would be less frenetic should coeducation occur. Many students, fraternity as well as independent, currently complain of the false nature of the social life which is largely dependent upon fraternity parties and alcohol on Wednesday nights and weekends. The opportunity to perceive women as equals in the classroom and in social situations removed from a party atmosphere could well reduce the social pressures about which many of our students complain and might also reduce, to a degree, the inconsiderate behavior about which women from the surrounding women's colleges complain. A student might think more carefully about his behavior toward a female peer whom he will see in class the next morning than he might toward a female student from "down the road". This is, of course, speculation based more on hope than on any concrete evidence.

Comments from other institutions - Davidson and Sewanee, for example - would seem to give credence to this view, however. A Sewanee official has recently indicated that the presence of women has "civilized" that institution somewhat and that parties are "less frenetic, manic, all-or-nothing". He is of the opinion that "most person-to-person commerce is done with greater consideration and thoughtfulness".

2. How the fraternities might change if women are admitted.

The loss of some of the university's financially and numerically weaker fraternity chapters should be expected. Fraternities would lose some - perhaps much - of the monopoly on student social life they now enjoy and would be forced to offer services and

opportunities beyond the merely social. Coeducation could be seen as an opportunity for a more complete integration of fraternity social behavior and residential life into overall university standards; student opposition to coeducation and poor treatment of early classes of women might well be increased, however, if coeducation were viewed as an excuse for the institution to make undesired changes and to impose stricter regulations on fraternity life. (See Exhibit A: "The Impact of Coeducation on Fraternity Life.")

3. The possible impact on the number of independent students and the increased demand for more all-university social events.

Independent students now at W&L (37% of the student body) feel strongly about the need for a restructured social life, and many are very supportive of coeducation. The number of independent students at Washington and Lee undoubtedly would increase as a result of coeducation. Although it is difficult to assess the impact on the percentage of independent male students, the number of independents would rise as a result of (a) a larger student body and/or (b) the presence of females who, at least initially, would be independents.

Coeducation, as indicated previously, would in all likelihood reduce to some degree the predominant position fraternities now occupy in the social life of the campus. Students would have numerous other opportunities for social contact with women, and the ability of fraternities (and perhaps eventually sororities) to attract members would depend on virtues and strengths beyond the obvious social attractions. In addition, coeducation should also reduce, at least in the longer run, the Washington and Lee male student's dependence upon women's colleges for social contacts and the social events those colleges provide.

As a result, we could likely expect the Washington and Lee student body to demand more all-university social events to supplement both the "down the road" activities and the "keg of beer and a band" fraternity activities. The primary reason for the proposed pavilion has been the demand for an appropriate facility in which to hold more all-campus events. Coeducation, it is assumed, would make the pavilion even more important to university social life.

In addition, it should be noted that coeducation would be likely to cause greater diversity and creativity in student activities once women are in a position to influence their

nature and scope. The Student Activities Board may well sponsor such activities as talent shows, dancing lessons, art exhibits, more culturally balanced film series, and arts and crafts programs, all of which are standard at coeducational institutions but which have been neglected by our SAB over the years.

4. The accommodation of national fraternities to changes instituted at other colleges undergoing the change to coeducation.

National fraternities have generally accommodated to the advent of coeducation quite easily, except where colleges have required that all organizations become coeducational. (See Exhibit B: "Visits to Selected Colleges...")

5. How fraternity structures and fraternity life were altered at places that insisted upon converting these organizations to coeducational housing/social units.

Amherst College provides the most relevant example of such an institution. The Amherst Board of Trustees, after requiring for a number of years that all residences, including fraternities, be coeducational, has just recently voted to abolish fraternities. If W&L becomes coeducational, this sub-committee does not suggest that the Amherst approach be used as a guide to be followed on this campus. (See Exhibit B: "Visits to Selected Colleges...")

6. What the advent of sororities could mean to undergraduate life here.

Should Washington and Lee become coeducational, we could reasonably assume that once the number of women on campus became substantial, the university would receive overtures from national sororities wishing to establish local chapters on campus. Recognizing that university policy currently supports the existence of fraternities on campus, and assuming a sufficient degree of interest from female students, it would seem only fair to honor requests for the establishment of sororities at Washington and Lee. Fraternities, at least in their finer moments, have been instrumental in the development of character, leadership, and camaraderie among Washington and Lee men for generations. Sororities should be expected to do no less for Washington and Lee women. Further, they could provide important support structures for women in a community where the coeducation of women is a relatively new phenomenon. Housing for sororities could perhaps be provided in former fraternity houses or in sections of university residence halls.

The experience of Dartmouth College following the advent of coeducation could be a likely scenario for Washington and Lee in this regard. (See Exhibit A: "The Impact of Coeducation...", p. A-3)

7. Whether the physical side of the Student Center would have to be changed.

Mike Cappeto is of the opinion that no physical changes in the University Center would be necessary to accommodate women since a substantial increase in the student body size is not contemplated. There is currently a proposal to partition the browsing library in that building to provide additional office space for career planning and placement and for student activities functions, but those changes are thought to be desirable regardless of the decision on coeducation. There undoubtedly would be dramatic changes in programs and possibly an increase in the number of people using that building, including the Cockpit, but no physical changes would be anticipated specifically because of coeducation.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this sub-committee's investigation was to seek to make some determination about the ways in which social life in general would change if W&L became coeducational at the undergraduate level. Components of the study included consideration of the role of fraternities and the effect that coeducation might have on the social lives of independent students. The possibility of sororities being created on campus was given only a small amount of attention since it seemed premature to do otherwise.

We believe that it is appropriate for this sub-committee to take an opportunity in this report to make an important statement relative to the social/fraternity/extracurricular life of this University. Whether or not W&L becomes fully coeducational, we believe positive changes must occur in the present social life arrangement. A great deal has been written on this subject in so many reports that it need not be repeated here. For example, see President Wilson's comments on social life and fraternity issues in "Taking Thought on Coeducation", Alumni Magazine, November, 1983. In addition, an eleven-page report dated March 15, 1984 of the Ad Hoc Committee on Fraternity Affairs to President Wilson and the

Student Affairs Committee, which has not yet been circulated to the entire Board of Trustees but was requested for review by this Campus Life sub-committee, contains much current information and many recommendations for change, not all of them unanimously approved by that Ad Hoc Committee. We strongly believe that much of the negative comment directed toward the fraternities' too-important role in the social life of the University is accurate, although Deans John and Murphy indicate to us that a turnaround in behavior patterns has already occurred and that more recent classes of students have been more cooperative with the administration in positively responding to criticisms of the system. We do not believe that fraternities should be abolished. Nor do we believe that coeducation should be considered solely as a way in which to deal with "the fraternity problem". Moreover, it would be foolish to believe that all social problems would disappear should W&L become coeducational. They would not do so under any set of conditions on any university campus. We would certainly trade one set of problems and opportunities for another - although there was not a single institution with which we consulted who indicated that its social/extracurricular life had worsened as a result of coeducation.

It is our considered judgment, relative to the social life/fraternity question alone, and without seeking to invade the prerogative of the Board of Trustees' Executive Committee which is studying the question of "Intangibles" in the Washington and Lee experience, that coeducation would result in strongly positive changes occurring throughout the social and extracurricular life of the University.

The Impact of Coeducation on Fraternity Life

Fraternities at Washington and Lee today are at least as strong numerically and financially as they have been over the last fifteen years. Following a drop from an affiliation rate of approximately 80% of the student body in the mid-60's (a rate which had held steady for at least the previous thirty years) to a low of 52% in 1973, the percentage of students in fraternities has climbed back to, and appears to have stabilized at about 63% of the student population. While the percentage of students affiliating with fraternities has dropped, the actual number of students in fraternities is not much different now than in the mid to late 60's owing to the overall increase in the undergraduate student body. From 1964 - 1967 the average number of students in fraternities was 862; from 1980 - 1983 it was 815. The average size of fraternities both then and now is forty-eight.

Today, Washington and Lee supports seventeen fraternities ranging in size from twenty-seven to seventy-three men. According to the most recent financial review of their status, only one was judged to be in danger of financial failure, and that fraternity has recently been placed under alumni control. Although there have been occasional crises when a fraternity has had to petition the treasurer's office for leniency in meeting a mortgage payment, by and large the fraternities have met their financial obligations in a routine manner. (See Attachment #1 for the size of each fraternity, current mortgage balances, repayment schedules and maintenance reserve balances.)

The fraternity houses themselves, for the most part, are structurally sound. Of the seventeen, only two have problems of a major nature which would require a substantial amount of money to repair. On the other hand, the majority of the fraternity houses would benefit greatly from extensive cosmetic work and improved house-keeping practices.

In general, then, while fraternities are by no means the most cost-efficient way to house and feed students, and setting aside the arguments of anti-intellectualism, exclusiveness and anti-social behavior which have been raised against fraternities for decades, one would have to acknowledge that the majority of students at Washington and Lee continue to see fraternity affiliation as an integral part of college life, valuing the fraternal camaraderie and perceiving the social advantages of fraternity life as an almost indispensable part of the Washington and Lee experience. Though many students, both non-fraternity and fraternity, will admit to certain flaws and shortcomings in the fraternity system, by and large the W & L fraternity man is fiercely loyal to both fraternity and University and is loathe to see change in either. An objective observer might have difficulty calling the current fraternity system healthy, but relatively little trouble describing it as strong.

Assessing the impact of coeducation on the Washington and Lee fraternity system is highly speculative at best. Working strictly from numbers, and assuming no change in student interest and the nature of the system, one can draw a very simple conclusion. An enrollment of

1,000 men with the current affiliation rate of 63% will support thirteen fraternities of forty-eight members, the current average size of a fraternity at W & L. But this simplistic approach disregards, on the one hand, the determination of a fraternity to survive in the face of reduced membership and, on the other, the need for a fraternity to survive in a coeducational setting. Would it not be possible for seventeen fraternities with an average membership of thirty-seven to continue; with women on campus would they all wish to?

A common argument against coeducation raised by fraternity men at W & L is that the addition of women will indeed make fraternity affiliation less attractive, if not superfluous, and lead to a weaker fraternity system, meaning in their minds fewer houses and fewer fraternity men. The alternate argument is that the introduction of women to campus life will force fraternities to review carefully their contribution to student life and the University community as a whole. Those houses which offer their members only a social outlet might well fold in the face of coeducation. The fraternities that survive will offer, beyond social opportunities, opportunities for leadership development, personal growth, community service, and intellectual discourse.

Drawing upon the experience of other colleges which made the transition from all male to coeducation in the mid-60's to early 70's, one might conclude that the impact of coeducation on the fraternity system at W & L will depend largely upon the willingness of the University to allow our fraternities to continue to exercise some degree of autonomy in their internal operations. Amherst College, for example, caused seven national fraternities to leave the campus by insisting that all residences, including fraternities, become coeducational. While two national fraternities and six local fraternities currently remain, the system has been so weakened and altered that there is a strong chance that the remaining fraternities will soon be abolished. A similar situation exists at Trinity College, whose faculty voted to recommend that the Trustees of the College phase out fraternities over a three-year period. Failing that, the faculty at Trinity believe the fraternities should be required to become coeducational.

If one assumes that fraternities at Washington and Lee are a valued aspect of student life and that the fraternity system's existence should be encouraged, the tack taken at Dartmouth College and the resulting situation provides perhaps the best example of what might transpire following coeducation at Washington and Lee. Dartmouth's very strong fraternity tradition is quite similar to W & L's. Recognizing that strong tradition, Dartmouth's administration has chosen not to require the coeducation of its fraternities. Rather, social organizations have been allowed a freedom of choice. The result today is a system of twenty-seven organizations, including five coeducational local fraternities and five sororities. Approximately half of the student body at Dartmouth participates in the system today, essentially the same pattern that existed prior to coeducation.

While a move to coeducation might well result in the loss of some of Washington and Lee's financially and numerically weaker fraternity chapters, one should not necessarily expect the vacated houses to remain

long empty. There are certainly options available to the University for their use, such as language houses, faculty housing or student apartments. However, the fraternity tradition, so deeply engrained in the fabric of the University, may well carry over to Washington and Lee women, many of whom will enroll from the south and southeastern portions of the United States where sororities have been a common part of the social culture and the college campus. In addition to the emergence of sororities, certain fraternity chapters currently on the campus might choose to open their doors to women rather than close their doors altogether. Thus, the Washington and Lee man who no longer requires a fraternity in a coeducational W & L and leaves the fraternity system could very possibly have his place in the social organization structure filled by a woman who finds a sorority affiliation a supportive base and a valuable part of her college experience; or yet, that place might be filled by a liberal-minded male who would not have joined an all male fraternity because of a perceived sexist attitude on the part of the fraternity, but when given the opportunity to affiliate with a coeducational organization would gladly join.

As mentioned earlier, these arguments are largely speculative. And it would take several years for the various changes to evolve. But one should keep in mind that, while basing these projections on 1,000 men at Washington and Lee, overall the University's size will increase by 150 with the addition finally of 500 women, many of whom will come from backgrounds similar to the men, into a college where the tradition of fraternity is strong. One should keep in mind, too, that fraternities and sororities, always strong in the south, are experiencing a great resurgence in all other parts of the country, including the northeast and midwest. It may well be unrealistic, then, to predict more than seventeen or eighteen social organizations on the Washington and Lee campus. That is about the highest number the University has ever been able to support. But it might be equally unrealistic to predict fewer.

FRATERNITY LOANS

Fraternity	# of men	Date Originated	Original Amount	Term (Years)	Interest Rate	Payment Amount	Maintenance Reserve Amt.	Land Rent	Balances Loan	11-30-83 Reserve
Beta Theta Pi	47	7-1-69	\$50,000	25	4%	\$1,591SA	\$1,500	50 SA	\$28,097	\$8,296
Chi Psi	43	10-9-82	20,000	25	7%	853SA	NR	34 Mo.	19,689	
Delta Tau Delta	34	1-1-66	35,000	35	4%	465 Q	NR	-	23,128	
" " "		9-18-80	4,200	4	7%	611SA	NR	-	1,161	
Kappa Alpha	59	10-1-79	75,000	25	4%	2,386SA	1,500	72 SA	67,389	11,040
" " "		6-10-82	100,000	25	7%	4,263SA	NR	-	99,237	
Kappa Sigma	52	1-14-83	15,000	20	9.62%	852SA	NR	225 Mo.	15,000	
Lambda Chi Alpha	37	7-7-78	30,382	25	4%	966SA	1,500	72SA	26,878	4,338
Phi Delta Theta	67	10-14-68	50,000	25	4%	1,591SA	1,500	50SA	28,097	21,300
Phi Gamma Delta	32	9-11-78	46,000	25	4%	1,463SA	1,500	-	40,045	1,577
" " "		9-1-81	10,000	25	7%	426SA	NR	-	9,678	
Phi Kappa Psi	57	3-15-69	60,000	25	4%	3,841 A	3,000	50SA	36,037	12,574
Phi Kappa Sigma	73	7-6-78	4,000	10	7%	281SA	NR	25SA	2,341	
Pi Kappa Alpha	69	3-2-80	43,709	25	4%	1,390SA	1,500	50SA	39,867	12,324
Pi Kappa Phi	63	7-14-79	35,554	25	4%	1,131SA	1,500	50SA	31,946	11,749
Sigma Alpha Ep.	61	6-24-77	75,000	25	4%	2,386SA	1,500	-	63,107	21,441
Sigma Chi	50	2-1-75	67,000	25	4%	2,132SA	1,500	-	51,147	7,875
Sigma Nu	28	6-9-78	37,000	25	4%	655*	NR	-	32,733	
Sigma Nu		7-1-83	50,000	25	8.54%	2,436SA	NR	-		
" " Advance		7-1-83	50,000	3	8.54%		NR		25,352	
Sigma Phi Ep.	56	8-31-63	25,000	20	4%	914SA	NR	-	PAID	
" " "		7-7-78	33,400	25	4%	1,062SA	1,500	-	29,076	12,410
Zeta Beta Tau	27	5-12-82	5,500	10	7%	386SA	NR	57SA	4,896	

* Not required, Interest Payment Only

maintained by the college. Amherst bought the houses (voluntarily) in the 1950's for financial and maintenance reasons.

Amherst's plan for coeducation was to increase enrollment from 1200 to 1500, with male enrollment dropping to 900. All dormitories became coeducational (by corridor or by suite) immediately, while fraternities were allowed to remain single-sex. Several years later, however, the Board of Trustees issued a mandate requiring that all residences, including fraternities, be coeducational. This decision was made on two grounds: (1) all students pay the same room and board charges and should therefore have access to all facilities; and (2) since Amherst receives federal monies, all college-owned facilities should legally be open to members of both sexes. Six or seven national fraternities left the campus as a result of this decision; two national and six local fraternities remain. Houses that were formerly fraternities have been converted to other types of residence--lottery dorms, language houses, etc.

Amherst maintains all residences, but Dean Nussbaum believes that the fraternities get second-class treatment from college buildings and grounds personnel. Damage costs billed to students run five to six times higher in fraternities compared to the dormitories. Fraternities do not have resident counselors, as do dormitories, but each has at least a half-time college custodial person. The two national fraternities are the best maintained, since each has a full-time janitor, with one-half of the cost borne by the alumni corporation.

Concern with fraternity life at Amherst led President Gibbs to promulgate in November 1982 six principles for improving fraternity life. These included: (1) the elimination of all forms of hazing activities; (2) the reduction of "hurt and humiliation" associated with rush; (3) the guarantee that any student wishing to live in a fraternity house shall have the opportunity to do so for at least one semester; (4) the replacement of the dual categorization of residential and social members, with a single membership of residential members being accomplished through an "objective, non-selective process" i.e. if a student lists at least four fraternities, he or she is guaranteed a bid to at least one of them; (5) maintenance of facilities in "safe, sanitary conditions" with effort to eliminate damage and vandalism; (6) a significant increase in the number of upperclass live-in members.

As with Washington and Lee, one major problem is that over 80% of fraternity residents have been sophomores. Proposals to modify this situation have been formulated by the IFC and the college administration. Effective this year, at least four fraternity officers must reside in each house, and priority will be granted to rising juniors and seniors; by the 1985-86 year, at least 50% of the residents must be juniors or seniors.

Despite optimistic statements and written documents, Dean Nussbaum believes the fraternity system to be "in a shambles"--poor behavior and maintenance of houses, no community service, parties every night of the week, abuse of females by returning alumni, etc. Administrative encouragement of change, in his opinion, has not worked, and he feels that fraternities may well be eliminated following the current capital fund drive and the construction of a student center.

2. Dartmouth College

Visited on August 16, 1983, and talked with Edward Shanahan, Dean of the College, and Lee Levison, Assistant Dean of the College for Fraternities and Sororities.

Dartmouth has slightly over 4,000 undergraduate students (55% male in the Class of 1987) and 800 graduate students. It became coeducational in 1972, at the same time adopting a year-round calendar to permit expansion of its student body. Dartmouth is 90% residential and has a fraternity system of 27 organizations, including five coeducational local fraternities and five sororities.

Approximately one half of the student body participates in the system. Of the 25 residences, including three of the five sororities, only five are owned by the college, with the remainder in the hands of alumni corporations as private property.

Fraternities have been a source of continuing concern and attention at Dartmouth for some time. The faculty in 1978, for example, voted to abolish fraternities on the basis of their anti-intellectual, anti-social, and sexist attitudes and actions. The trustees rejected this recommendation, but outlined a ten-point program for change (with no time deadline). The practical result was a more formalized college-fraternity relationship, with the creation of an advisory Board of Overseers providing at least paper accountability; this Board, chaired by an alumnus, is perceived by students as a buffer between them and the dean.

Dean Shanahan describes Dartmouth's current posture as beginning a "developmental mode." He believes strongly in effecting change by working with and through student leadership, in the enforcement of objective, measurable standards which are jointly determined, and in the treatment of fraternities within the general context of residential and dormitory life in regard to behavior, plant, and program. He advocates college funding of social and intellectual activities, leadership training programs, and compensating faculty members for associating with fraternities and sororities. He favors direct college ownership and control for fraternities--with custodians provided on a regular basis as in the dormitories, for example--rather than a lease-back arrangement with alumni corporations. His philosophy is that the college should not attempt to regulate students' out-of-class behavior, that the college should not tell students when they can and cannot party. He strongly believes that improved student behavior will follow as a result of the implementation of his proposals.

The foundation for the current approach at Dartmouth is found in four resolutions approved recently by the Committee on Undergraduate Life and the Fraternity Board of Overseers:

- (1) The application to fraternities and sororities of general residential life concepts. Specific emphasis is to be placed on faculty advising, leadership development, program development, and improvement of social spaces.
- (2) A cap on the number of recognized organizations at 30, with no increase in the number of fraternities but with growth in the number of sorority and "alternative houses." In reaction, the IFC supported continued growth in the sorority system, but questioned "whether this should be done at the expense of other viable, established fraternal organizations."
- (3) Ultimate ownership or leasing on a long-term basis of all of the recognized fraternities and sororities. The CUL/FBO resolution recommended that the administration explore with the Board of Trustees the means by which this can be accomplished as a condition for continued or future recognition. The IFC objected strongly to the mandatory nature of the proposal; it is likely that ownership or lease will be regarded as a desired goal, but to be achieved only on a voluntary basis.
- (4) The adoption and implementation, according to a set evaluation schedule, of a Minimum Standards document. Standards were initially drafted by the IFC and then revised by other groups and individuals. Minimum Standards are in seven areas:
 - (a) Leadership e.g. orientation programs for new officers; IFC- or college-sponsored leadership development programs; alumni corporation meetings.
 - (b) Budgets e.g. room rents of not less than 85% of the college average; vacancy level of no more than two beds per term; a capital improvements and major deferred maintenance budget of 10% of annual gross revenues.
 - (c) Membership e.g. range of house size of approximately 35-90 dues-paying

members; rush and pledge education programs.

(d) Program Development e.g. development of a program schedule that reflects major social, cultural, educational and athletic events; internal house rules and goals regarding use of alcohol.

(e) Alumni e.g. relations and meetings with alumni representatives; outreach programs.

(f) Behavior e.g. organizational accountability for violations of college policy; internal adjudicating mechanisms; internal codes of ethical behavior for members.

(g) Physical Plant Standards - specific standards outlined for exterior and interior of houses e.g. grounds must be free of all litter, and lawns must be kept trimmed to a height of no more than 3"-5"; no vehicles parked on lawns; all bathroom sinks, toilets and showers must be functional, without leaks and meeting code requirements per occupant, with all bathroom areas free of litter, dirt, odors and standing water.

Evaluations of fraternities and sororities will be held by the college during the fall term of 1983, with action lists prepared for each; all identified deficiencies must be corrected by the fall term of 1984. Organizations will be responsible for adherence to all standards beyond that fall term, subject to quarterly inspections and spot checks. Dean Shanahan states that the purpose of the standards is to improve every house and to preserve the system, but that the result may be fewer houses. Student suspicion is that the administration wants fewer fraternities so as to accommodate the need for more residential sororities.

3. Trinity College

Visited on August 17, 1983, and talked with David Winer, Dean of Students, and briefly with Wayne Asmus, Director of Student Activities.

Trinity has 1,700 students, 52% male and 48% female, and has been co-educational since 1969. The college is 91% residential. Approximately 17% of the student body belongs to one of the two sororities and eight fraternities; only six fraternities of the ten Greek organizations have houses, which are privately owned by alumni coporations. Five serve meals, and three are residences.

Trinity has lacked social spaces on campus, and historically there has been a heavy dependence on fraternities for social life. Renovation this past summer will provide some larger social areas in the student union. Dean Winer describes the administrative posture toward fraternities and sororities as basically reactive. Until recently, it was one of "benign neglect," but the college has been successful, according to Dean Winer, in overcoming the student argument that "we don't have to abide by your rules since we are on private property." A more active IFC has agreed that Greek organizations should abide by general college regulations covering all student groups and facilities e.g. closing of parties at a specific time, serving of alternative beverages, housing standards primarily concerned with state and local safety codes. The physical condition of the houses is not considered to be a real concern, but the outside appearances of several houses raised some serious doubts in the minds of the two Washington and Lee visitors.

The major policy concern at the present time--one that is causing a serious rift between faculty and trustees--is the question of coeducation within the fraternities and sororities. Following a 16-month study by a committee of six faculty members and two students, the faculty recommended that Greek letter societies at Trinity be phased out over a three-year period. The rationale for such a proposal was one of principle, based on discrimination, sexism, and

exclusivity. A second part of the motion said that if fraternities and sororities were not abolished, they should be required to become coeducational.

The Board of Trustees in May voted to permit continuation, but the President will be authorized to require all new organizations to be coeducational. Existing fraternities and sororities may apply to the President for an exemption if 75% of their undergraduate members vote to seek one. The trustees also called for periodic reviews of the single-sex organizations to determine whether they contribute to or detract from the overall quality of student residential life, and the trustees created a new advisory council to assist the President in regulating residential life.

The faculty, in response to the trustees' decision, appointed an interim fraternity committee, which met frequently over the summer. The faculty will most likely vote early this fall to ask the trustees to reconsider. Dean Winer indicated that two major issues will face Trinity over the next several years: (1) Will fraternities remain and, if so, in what form? (2) How will the college deal with behavioral problems and violations of regulations pertaining to all student activities?

4. Davidson College

Visited August 25. Met with Dean of Students Will Terry. Undergraduate enrollment is 1300. 60% male, by design. 95% residential. Co-ed 1973.

Davidson, of the colleges visited, is probably the one most similar to Washington and Lee in terms of size and character. And in 1970, the size and strength of its fraternity system was remarkably like that of Washington and Lee. At that time there were twelve national fraternities which dominated the social life of Davidson College.

However, in 1970, at the urging of the President, the Davidson Board of Trustees passed a resolution to introduce a self-selection process into the fraternity rush system. Prior to the resolution, Davidson's fraternities and freshmen rushed in a competitive system. Fraternities determined which freshmen they would invite to join. Freshmen who received several bids had a choice; those who received no bids were excluded from the system. Under the self-selection system, a freshman was (and still is) entitled to join any fraternity he wished, regardless of the fraternity's views.

The self-selection process was not well received. The students believed it was an attempt to drive fraternities off campus. The alumni of the college were also quite upset with the decision. And the national fraternities bailed out; eight of twelve fraternities left the campus. Six fraternities left Davidson completely while two others continued to operate off campus.

Today, sixty-five percent of Davidson's upperclassmen are associated with one of four fraternities, two women's eating clubs, or three co-ed eating clubs. (Hereafter, the term fraternity will also apply to the eating clubs.) Each fraternity is located in college-owned, college-maintained houses on the Davidson campus. The structures are used primarily as dining and social facilities; one or two students at most live in the fraternities. The college assumes responsibility for providing and maintaining the kitchen equipment and all other aspects of maintenance except furniture. The fraternities are responsible for the hiring of cooks and the billing and collection of food and social revenues.

Fraternity rush at Davidson begins in early October. At that time, each freshman dormitory section visits each fraternity. On the basis of those visits, a freshman may select up to three houses, at each of which he will eat four meals over the course of a week. Freshmen are allowed to visit fraternities at any time beginning in October.

In February, a freshman may "single shot" by announcing his intention to join a specific fraternity or he may list up to three fraternities he is willing

to join. If a freshman lists more than one fraternity, he is randomly assigned by a computer to one of his choices.

The self-selection process has become an increasing headache, according to Dean Terry. When it was first introduced, the fraternities quickly developed a system of verbal encouragement to pledge those freshmen they most preferred. However, in recent years, there has been an increasing incidence of fraternities verbally discouraging those freshmen with whom they would prefer not to associate. Student sentiment on the campus now is estimated by Dean Terry to be split evenly between retention of the current system and a return to the old competitive rush system. It is likely that Davidson's Committee on Student Life will review the issue this year and perhaps ask the Board of Trustees to reverse the policy.

Coeducation at Davidson College, which began in 1973, has not affected the fraternities per se, according to Dean Terry, but it has affected the social life of the college greatly. Davidson is no longer the "suitcase school" it once was. Fraternities now party with the women's eating clubs regularly. In addition, the change has eased the social life for the non-fraternity student to a large degree. Dean Terry stated, "Coeducation is the best decision Davidson ever made."

While fraternities are no longer the only social outlet, they continue to make the most consistent contribution to the social life at Davidson College. Fraternities generally offer parties every Thursday night. In addition, a disco party is held in the College Union every other Thursday. The Davidson faculty objects to the Thursday discos in the Union but not to the fraternity parties because "they respect fraternity autonomy," says Dean Terry. The faculty is not happy with the Thursday night socializing, but there is no attempt to legislate or control fraternity parties.

5. Duke University

Visited August 26. Met with Dean for Student Life Suzanne Wasiolek. Undergraduate enrollment is 5700. 50% male. 90% residential. Became coeducational in 1901, with separate campuses merged in 1973.

Duke University bears relatively little resemblance to Washington and Lee in terms of the size of its campus and enrollment, the living patterns of its students, and consequently, the nature of its fraternity system.

Ninety percent of Duke's 5700 undergraduates live on campus and are divided between East Campus and West Campus. Until 1973, men were housed exclusively on East Campus and women on West. Though segregated for living purposes, class instruction was coeducational. Today both campuses are fully co-ed and virtually 50/50 in male to female ratio.

Freshmen are housed separately from upperclassmen in "clusters" which also are nearly evenly split by sex. Freshmen may select either single-sex or co-ed housing. However, only 250 of this year's 1400 entering freshmen requested single-sex housing.

Between thirty and forty percent of the undergraduate men are members of the twenty national fraternities at Duke while forty percent of the undergraduate women affiliate with thirteen different sororities. Sixteen of the twenty fraternities are residential. Three of the four non-residential fraternities are black and do not wish to be housed together. The fourth will become residential next year. The sororities at Duke are not residential by choice.

The residential fraternities at Duke, which average approximately 45 members each, are housed in dormitories set aside by the University for their use. A fraternity dorm is just like any other dormitory on campus and it is common for sophomores, juniors, and seniors to live together. Fraternity members generally eat in University dining halls. The fraternities themselves do not offer food services.

Fraternity rush is conducted informally throughout the fall semester, though the Interfraternity Council does regulate, to some degree, freshman visitation at the fraternities. The first invitational parties are held at the end of the fall term; formal rush and pledging take place at the beginning of the spring term.

Dean Wasiolek notes that the biggest problem with the fraternities at Duke is that they are housed next door to people who do not respect or appreciate them. As a result, there is a constant undercurrent of independent lifestyles conflicting with fraternity lifestyles. Many independents resent a perceived favoritism toward fraternities on the part of the Duke administration. Dean Wasiolek says such favoritism does not exist. Rather, it appears that fraternities get more attention and more favors simply because they are well enough organized to accomplish more, both socially and politically.

While independent students may tend to complain about the fraternities, it is not uncommon for them to participate in fraternity social functions. All fraternity parties are open to all students. Dean Wasiolek openly states, "Fraternities provide the social life of the campus."

Though there is some concern among the faculty about the impact of fraternities on academics, there is no attempt on the part of the University to regulate fraternity parties. (Statistically, the academic performance of fraternity members and independent students is equal.) And, while the administration has placed a cap on the number of fraternities at twenty, the fraternity system at Duke appears quite safe. No one in the upper administration wants to do away with them, according to Dean Wasiolek.

6. Williams College

Because of conflicting schedules, we were unable to meet with the administration of Williams College. We did, however, receive documents from the College which outline the decision by Williams to phase out fraternities as facilities for living and dining in 1962 and, subsequently, to ban them from the campus completely in 1968.

The rationale behind that decision is most clearly stated in the conclusions drawn by a committee of the Board of Trustees in May of 1962. Those conclusions are:

"1. Fraternities at Williams have come to exercise a disproportionate role in undergraduate life, and as a result the primary educational purposes of the College are not being fully realized.

2. Long continued delegation to the fraternities by the College of a large part of its responsibility with respect to the housing, eating, and social accommodations of the student body is a major cause of many existing conditions which are harmful to the educational purpose of the College; and early steps should be taken by the College to re-assume this responsibility and integrate these functions into the life of the College, where they properly belong."

In response to these conclusions, Williams determined that the College should assume complete responsibility for providing housing, eating, and social accommodations for the entire student body in units owned and operated by the College. The implementation of the program led nine of fifteen fraternities to discontinue their operations almost immediately. Six fraternities continued to operate on a purely fraternal basis as allowed by the College. In 1968, however, Williams asked the remaining chapters to discontinue operations also. This decision was made on the basis of the fraternities' closed, exclusive nature and on their "unwillingness or inability to live within the stated College policies governing their operations."

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON
COEDUCATION AT WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY
(April 4-5, 1970)

PART III EFFECTS ON STUDENT LIFE...

(d) Cultural and Social Activities:

In general, the evidence is that greater interest in campus cultural activities will result from a decision to admit women. Not only do certain cultural activities require women's participation but also taking a date to a concert or a play is widely held to be more fun than going with your roommate! Drama is a field in which female participation is essential. It has usually been possible for the Troubadours to find women for the necessary roles in the plays presented; however, since the activities of the Troubadours are designed for the education of students, plays of great interest often cannot be considered for production since many of the important parts require women. A decision to admit women to the University in substantial numbers would thus enrich offerings at the theater.

Similarly, in music, a decision to admit women would increase our opportunities. The committee recognizes that a quite satisfactory program has been worked out for men alone, especially when so many nearby women's choruses are willing to cooperate for special concerts. In the area of choral music, a decision to become coeducational would in no way limit our capacity to have an all-male chorus. It would simply give us an added opportunity to have both a mixed chorus and a female chorus. The brass choir, too, is an area in which men commonly specialize. The decision to replace some of the present male students with females would likely result in fewer people interested in the brass choir. A decision to expand overall enrollment by the addition of 800 women simply gives us a larger base for building a brass choir. The committee believes that the addition of women would bring more string players, more interest, and would increase opportunities for all students to participate in the musical arts. (The committee takes note of the fact that an expanded program in the performing arts would highlight and accentuate the need for an auditorium in the Lexington area.)

The student exhibitions in the fine arts have overflowed the available facilities. The fine arts courses are overflowing with students so there would seem to be no need for the stimulation in these areas which would most probably occur with the addition of women to the student body. Rather this would be an area in which both faculty and facilities would need to be expanded. Needs are projected in the appendix.

Dance weekends (University-wide social functions) as such and other social activities would not be affected significantly.

Beyond the merely cultural and social, there are no indications that women could not find a place for themselves in existing student organizations. Indeed, they should and undoubtedly would seek membership and offices in all campus organizations. It would be to the benefit of the newly coeducational institution to have women thoroughly assimilated into the student body.

As for the possible introduction of sororities, the University need take no position one way or the other. It would be mere conjecture to say that the founding of sororities would follow the first coeducated class, but there is no reason to think it would not happen. The inception of sororities should not be stifled and their birth and growth would be determined by the type of women, and their interests, who come here. There are no foreseeable problems with sororities, vis-a-vis either fraternities or the University. They would presumably be subject to the same regulations as fraternities. In fact, we might find fraternities promoting the growth of sororities. On many campuses such alliances prove to be mutually desired.

(h) Fraternities

We find no way of predicting the precise effect of coeducation on fraternities. One point of view is that fraternities exist now largely because they serve two main functions: they facilitate social intercourse with surrounding women's schools by providing contacts and transportation, and they provide eating, sleeping, and partying functions within the University. If this is a proper view the admission of women would partially eliminate the need for the first of these but would not significantly affect the second. The need for fraternities would appear to be reduced by some immeasurable amount with the likely result that the fraternity system would play a smaller role in the life of the University. The need for some kind of social organization would remain.

Another point of view is that fraternities would be strengthened through the establishment of sororities and through the feeding and housing shortages attendant upon expansion of enrollment. Whatever may be one's viewpoint, there is no reason to believe that fraternities could not or should not adjust to a new coeducational situation.

It is quite clear that a number of houses could not survive at all if the decision were made to admit women in place of men. Some chapters are already in financial difficulty with only a few members. If the number of males is reduced sharply to 750 the number of fraternities would likely be reduced at least proportionately.

Given a decision to add women to the present enrollment the committee believes that the usefulness of fraternities would be somewhat reduced and that relatively fewer male students would elect membership. If new dormitories for male students were built still fewer student would opt for fraternities.

The effect of coeducation on fraternities has been used as an argument for as well as against a decision to become coeducational. The committee would make neither argument. We agree that it would be undesirable to preserve fraternities artificially and that they must adjust to existing needs of students. The needs which could be met by fraternities would be fewer if Washington and Lee were coeducational. We cannot translate that likelihood into predictions about the demise of chapters.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESIDENTIAL AND DINING FACILITIES

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY
HOUSING AND DINING FACILITIES
(A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS LIFE)

The following models provide projections, through 1994, of additional residential spaces for undergraduates which would be needed under varying enrollment assumptions, both with and without coeducation, under current housing policies, (with freshmen required to live in University dormitories and upperclass students given the opportunity to live in University housing if they so choose). Any change in housing policies would require entirely new projections, requiring more number crunching regardless of the coeducation decision.

We do not suggest that the 4 non-current plus 1 current enrollment models are the only models to choose from--they are simply indications of directions possible to take.

The figures are based on an assumption that 65% of upperclass women will choose to live in the dormitories (as opposed to the current 20% upperclass male volunteers' rate). This is a very risky assumption, since information from other college provided little help in projecting the proportion of upperclass females who would choose to live in University facilities:

- Randolph Macon and Lafayette Colleges have residence requirements for all four years.
- The University of Virginia, with a housing policy similar to ours, houses approximately 32% of its upperclass students, experiencing less than a 5% differential in the proportion of males and females who request housing.
- Wake Forest, also with a policy similar to ours, houses approximately 74% of its upperclass males, and 90-95% of its upperclass females.

Some points about projections of need for new dormitories:

- Projections assume that 75-100 additional students could be housed in the private housing and that;
- 180 additional freshmen could be accommodated by converting single rooms to doubles.
- Model A-1 would not require new dorms until '88-89 by which time perhaps sorority/mixed fraternity question may have been addressed;
- Model A-2 would result in severe crowding, requiring converting practically all single rooms to doubles, for at least one year.
- Model B-5 offers various possibilities for tempting or requiring some/all upperclassmen to live on campus;
- The placement of women in current facilities would be through scattering them through the dormitories, coeducating primarily by floor or vertical dormitory section.

Consideration could be given to converting Baker, from law students to all freshman women's dormitory if desired.

Once the decision is made on the question of coeducation, we would be in a position to begin planning for the next phase of residential development at Washington and Lee. This planning would involve longer term considerations, such as size of the student body and specific needs for additional undergraduate housing, law school needs, types of accommodations, and ways to attract or require additional upperclassmen into university housing.

Current: 360 Freshmen, 1350 total undergraduates

Beds Needed
Circled Figures Indicate Earliest Requirement
For Additional Dormitory Spaces***

	1985-6	1986-7	1987-8	1988-9	1993-4
--	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

A. With Coeducation

1. No Growth in Student Body. 360 Freshmen:
240 Men and 120 Women admitted each year.
1350 Total Undergraduates.

0 +60 +110 +160.....+160

2. 2000 Undergraduates Ultimate Goal.
540 Freshmen: 360 men and 180 women
admitted each year.

+180 +285 +390 +495.....+495

3.* 1500 Undergraduates Ultimate Goal. 405 Freshmen:
270 men and 135 women admitted each year.

+45 +110 +175 +240.....+240

B. Without Coeducation

4. No Change from Current Policies.
1350 Male Undergraduates

0 0 0 0.....0

5.** Enrollment Reduced to Admission Office's
projections of How Many Males We Can Enroll and
Maintain Academic Standards: 1000 undergraduates
ultimate goal.

-10 -22 -36 -52.....-144

3* 270 males is based on Admission Office's projection of our ability to maintain current academic standards over the next decade through a reduction in class size.

5** This figure is also based on Admission Office's projection of how many males we can enroll while keeping our current academic standards over the next decade. Assumption of a reduction of 10 students per freshman class, beginning in 1985 and continuing until 1993, when the size of the freshman class would be 270, with a total student body of 1,000.

*** Dean of Students' detailed report attached, and includes possible use for "extra" beds in Model #5

Food service through current facilities in Evans Dining Hall: Mr. Darrell estimates that he could accommodate an increase in the number of students on the full board plan from the current 500 to 800 through extended meal hours, increased staffing, and some minimal expenditures for additional equipment.

	<u>Current Fall term</u>	<u>Projected/ Proposed</u>
No. of boarders	500	800
Average number of point card holders at lunch	85	150
Average participation at breakfast	300	480
at lunch	575	920
at dinner	525	840

The following would have to occur to provide service for the above projected numbers of diners:

EXTENDED MEAL HOURS

Breakfast hours could remain the same, 7:15-9:00 a.m. (we extended them this year, from 7:45-9:00 a.m.). See "additional staffing" to follow. Lunch hours, currently 11:50-1:40 would be extended forty minutes to 11:30-2:00.

The dinner hour would have to be extended by an hour, from 5:00-7:00 p.m.

Before any decision about the effect of coeducation on Washington and Lee's physical facilities can be made, other models must be run based upon:

- 1) Board decisions on numbers of total student body and proportion of women;
- 2) Serious professional research on upperclass women's desire to live on campus.

Placement of Students Under Residential Models

Summary: A basic assumption is that the private housing market in the Lexington area can absorb some limited number of additional students, perhaps in the neighborhood of 75-100. Not all of these would be regarded as desirable accommodations, however, and some would be substandard. Given this assumption, however, new university housing facilities would be necessary by 1986 for Model A.2., by 1987 for Model A.3., and by 1988 for Model A.1. Details are as follows.

- A.1. 1985-6: No additional spaces required.
 1986-7: 60 additional upperclassmen could obtain private housing. Alternatively, some single rooms in current freshman dormitories could be converted to doubles, with some current freshman space converted to upperclass housing.
 1987-8: 110 additional upperclassmen could be housed through a combination of above two methods.
 1988-9: New facilities should be completed by September 1988 to house 160 additional upperclass students.
- A.2. 1985-6: Could house 180 additional freshmen by converting single rooms to doubles.
 1986-7: New facilities would be strongly desirable by September 1986, since we would have to house 180 additional freshmen plus 105 additional upperclass students. If new facilities were impossible, we could once again double up in freshman rooms and attempt to place the upperclassmen in private housing.
 1987-8: New facilities would be absolutely necessary by September 1987 in light of the demand for 210 upperclass spaces in addition to the 180 freshmen.
- A.3. 1985-6: 45 additional freshmen could be accommodated in existing facilities.
 1986-7: Additional facilities might be desirable, but would certainly not be necessary. The doubling of freshmen could continue with 65 upperclassmen required to find private housing. Alternatively, Baker Dormitory could be used as an upperclass, rather than as a law facility, with all rooms converted to doubles. Additional Woods Creek apartments could be reserved for the displaced law students, and only 30 additional upperclassmen would need to find private housing.
 1987-8: Additional facilities would be needed for 195 additional upperclass students, plus the 45 freshmen.
- B.5. For the model of an all-male student body, reduced in size, various alternatives exist to try to fill the empty spaces.
 (1) Attempt to attract additional upperclass and law students into university housing. This would be relatively easy during the early years with fairly small numbers, but might be difficult to accomplish, without other changes, in the later years. Davis Dormitory could be converted in stages from a freshman to an upperclass and/or law facility. Baker Dormitory could also be converted from a law student dormitory into an undergraduate dormitory, with additional spaces in Woods Creek Apartments reserved for law students.
 (2) Renovate some existing facilities into upperclass and/or law student suites or apartments.
 (3) Convert some double rooms in the freshman dormitories into singles.

(4) After several years, require sophomores to reside either in dormitories or in fraternity houses, perhaps with the percentage of sophomores in each house restricted to no more than, say, 50%. A requirement for all sophomores to live in dormitories would necessitate additional spaces unless we would experience the shift of a significant number of juniors and seniors from university housing to fraternity houses.

Of the three models for coeducation, A.1. would obviously provide the fewest housing problems because it would involve no additional freshman spaces and the fewest upperclass demands. Model A.2. would provide the most difficulties, with severe crowding in the freshman dormitories, the greatest upperclass demands, and the earliest requirement for additional facilities. Practically all single rooms capable of housing two students, however crowded, would have to be converted into doubles for at least one year.

In regard to the specific placement of women in current dormitory facilities under the coeducation models, various configurations are possible, depending on whether Baker Dormitory remains a law facility and whether we convert any singles into doubles on a temporary basis. The main objective, however, would be to scatter the women throughout the current dormitories, coeducating primarily by floor or by vertical dormitory section. A fairly small, all-female dormitory, such as Baker, could be offered if that were considered to be a desirable alternative for freshman women. Insofar as possible, women would be assigned to upper floors for security purposes.

For Model A.3., the two most practical alternatives for housing a freshman class of 265 men and 135 women in the initial years of coeducation are the following:

(1) Use of the existing freshman dormitories, increasing their capacity by converting some of the larger single rooms to doubles. Dean Huntley projects that by converting thirty-seven such rooms in Davis Dormitory, and five in Graham-Lees, the total freshman residence hall capacity could be increased to 411. Mr. Arthur, however, is concerned that the rooms will lose their attractiveness and may not be large enough to accommodate the additional furniture; this problem is made more severe by the "built-in" nature of Davis Dormitory furniture. On the other hand, we used all of these Davis rooms as doubles during the year of Graham-Lees renovation, and at least on a temporary basis, we could do so again. Also, no law or upperclass students would be displaced.

(2) Use of Baker Dormitory, currently a law student facility, on an interim basis as a freshman hall, with some additional space for law students provided in Woods Creek Apartments. With the present room configurations, approximately 405 freshmen could be accommodated. The disadvantage of this alternative is that some upperclass and/or law students would be displaced until additional facilities are completed.

Various plans have been studied for the placement of 135 women throughout the freshman dormitories. One possibility, for example, with the use of Baker Dormitory would provide the following: (1) thirty-six beds in Baker as an all-female dormitory; (2) thirty-two beds in Davis Dormitory, utilizing all of the second and third floors; (3) twenty-six beds on the second and third floors of the north section of Gilliam Dormitory; (4) forty beds on the third floor of Graham-Lees, room 335-382. This plan provides for the placement of

134 women plus eight counselors.

The conversion of our current dormitory facilities into coed residences could be accomplished with relatively minimal physical alterations. Dean Huntley and Mr. Arther have studied this matter and have concluded that the primary alterations needed would be in the plumbing and in the security arrangements. Urinals should be removed, and individual shower stalls, perhaps provided in Graham-Lees and Gilliam as they are now in Davis, through the addition of some partitions in the bathrooms of the sections reserved for women. All outside doors should probably be locked at a certain hour each night, with keys provided for all residents. No significant changes are expected for the individual bedrooms, and no additional parietal regulations or separate rules of conduct for women are anticipated.

Campus Life Committee
Residential Life Subcommittee

Insofar as housing and dining facilities are concerned there appears to be no barrier to the acceptance of women to full undergraduate status in 1985. Females could be accommodated on a short-term basis in current University facilities according to any of several enrollment models, up to a maximum addition of approximately 180 women to our current male freshman enrollment of 360 men. This last model, however, would involve some rather severe crowding of freshmen, with a large number of single rooms converted temporarily into small doubles.

The following models provide projections, on a year-by-year basis, of additional spaces for undergraduates which would be needed under varying enrollment assumptions, both with and without coeducation. It should be noted that all models assume the continuation of current housing policies, with freshmen required to live in University dormitories and upperclassmen given the opportunity to live in University housing if they so choose. Any change in housing policies would, of course, require entirely new projections. The first three models assume the enrollment of women, at the freshman level only, for the first time in 1985.

	<u>1985-6</u>	<u>1986-7</u>	<u>1987-8</u>	<u>1988-9.....</u>	<u>1993-4</u>
A. <u>With Coeducation</u>					
1. No Growth	0	+60	+110	+160	+160
2. Addition of Women	+180	+285	+390	+495	+495
3. Intermediate	+45	+110	+175	+240	+240
B. <u>Without Coeducation</u>					
1. Stable Enrollment	0	0	0	0	0
2. Reduced Size	-10	-22	-36	-52	-144

Assumptions of Above Models

- A.1. Replacement of 120 males in each freshman class by the same number of females. Each freshman class to include 240 resident males and 120 resident females, with an ultimate student body of 900 males and 450 females. Need for additional spaces caused by difference between 20% of upperclass males choosing to live on campus and assumed figure of 65% for females. (Note: Information from other colleges provided little help in projecting the proportion of upperclass females who would choose to live in University facilities. Randolph Macon and Lafayette Colleges have residence requirements for all four years. The University of Virginia, which houses approximately 32% of its upperclass students, experiences less than a 5% differential in the proportion of males and females who request housing. Wake Forest, also with a policy similar to ours, houses approximately 74% of its upperclass males, and 90-95% of its upperclass females).
- A.2. Addition of 180 females to current freshman class of 360 males. Projections of upperclass residential students, as in A.1., of 20% and 65%. Overall enrollment growth to approximately 2,000 undergraduates.

- A.3. Reduction of male enrollment to 270 per freshman class (based on Bill Hartog's projection of our ability to maintain current academic standards over the next decade through a reduction in class size), with the addition of 135 freshman women. Overall enrollment growth to approximately 1,500 undergraduates (1,000 men and 500 women). See January report on "Residential Development at Washington and Lee" (pp. 2-3) for alternative means of housing freshman classes in current facilities.
- B.1. No change from current student body enrollment.
- B.2. Congruent with A.3. projection of reduced male enrollment to maintain current academic standards. Assumption of a reduction of 10 students per freshman class, beginning in 1985 as an alternative to coeducation and continuing until 1993, when the size of the freshman class would be 270, with a total student body of 1,000. The problem with this model would be that of attracting additional upperclass and law students into existing spaces, rather than the building of additional spaces.

Food service through current facilities in Evans Dining Hall would pose no problems for any of the above models, with the possible exception of A.2. (growth of the undergraduate student body to 2,000). Mr. Darrell estimates that he could accommodate an increase in the number of students on the full board plan from the current 500 to 800 through extended meal hours, increased staffing, and some minimal expenditures for additional equipment. His attached memorandum provides details as to our capacity for feeding additional students.

Once the decision is made on the question of coeducation, we would then be in a position to begin planning for the next phase of residential development at Washington and Lee. This planning would involve longer term considerations, such as size of the student body and specific needs for additional undergraduate housing, law school needs, types of accommodations, and ways to attract or require additional upperclassmen into university housing.


In regard to law student housing, law school officials are of the opinion that the primary need is for married student housing. Dean Henneman also believes, however, that a significant number of additional single first-year students would live in university facilities if attractive, apartment units with kitchens were made available. His best estimate is that we could fill perhaps an additional fifty spaces with law students in that type of accommodation. Baker Dormitory is not particularly popular as a law school residence because of its dormitory-style rooms, location, and noisy surroundings. Many law students live there for the first year and then move into Woods Creek Apartments or into apartments off campus. If additional apartment units are built, Baker Dormitory could then be converted into an undergraduate facility.

An important aspect of the planning for additional housing will be to try to determine student needs and interests as to the types of accommodations which will prove attractive and which will cause students to want to live on campus. Preliminary assessment would indicate that double rooms are acceptable for freshmen, but are not appealing for upperclassmen, who prefer single rooms, suites, and apartment units. Law students express a definite preference for apartments with kitchen facilities, in the vicinity of other law student, rather than undergraduate, housing.

Campus Correspondence

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

TO: Lewis G. John

FROM: Jerry Darrell 

DATE: April 5, 1984

Dear Lew,

I am responding to your question, "What is the maximum number of people we can serve, on a regular basis, in our existing Evans facility"?

After consulting with Chef Dunn and putting a pencil to the paper I am suggesting that we could accomodate 800 folks on the board plan, which would give us meal participation numbers as follows:

	<u>current FALL term</u>	<u>projected/ proposed</u>
No. of boarders	500	800
Avg. no. of point card holders at lunch	85	150
Avg. participation at breakfast	300	480
at lunch	575	920
at dinner	525	840

The following would have to occur to provide service for the above projected numbers of diners:

EXTENDED MEAL HOURS

Breakfast hours could remain the same, 7:15-9:00 a.m. (we extended them this year, from 8:45-9:00 am). See "additional staffing" to follow.

Lunch hours, currently 11:50-1:40 would be extended forty minutes to 11:30-2:00.

The dinner hour would have to be extended by an hour, from 5:00-7:00 p.m. There are complications here to be considered in extending the dinner hour to 7:00. Athletes now eating a special "late" meal 7:00-7:15 would now have to finish practice a little earlier, in time to eat regular dinner by 7:00. Banquets currently scheduled for a 7:15 or 7:30 starting time would now be delayed to a 7:45 or 8:00 pm starting time. The additional labor costs for these special functions can be passed on to the banquet patrons, i. e. banquet prices will go up.

STAFFING

Breakfast & Lunch One serving line is currently opened for breakfast. Two lines will be required for 480 diners. The majority of additional serving labor (line server) could come from the student work study force, to help keep costs down. Obviously more technical, regular staffing will be required for preparation with more food to prepare in less time, since we will now be serving lunch at 11:30, with early lunch at 11:00 a.m., just two hours after the closing of the breakfast line!

Dinner Will probably only require one more full time person, perhaps one and one half persons, with the line servers and dish crew coming from the student labor force.

EQUIPMENT

An expenditure of \$10,000. - \$12,000. for additional service-ware and equipment such as a refrigerator for the serving line, a 60 qt. mixer, french fryer, 20 gal. steam kettle and a hot food cart will need to be made.

SEATING

In all probability the side dining rooms will have to be opened for regular cafeteria seating at lunch and dinner. Again the poses problems with starting times for banquets.

In a related matter Lew, some time ago President Wilson asked me for a "ballpark" figure regarding the construction of a new dorm; how many folks would we have to have on a board plan to justify, financially, including a cafeteria in this dorm? My research, including conversations with colleagues at UVA and Univ. of Maryland, suggests a magic number of 400-500 boarders. However it is relative in that, to cover fixed expenses with a lower number of boarders, a higher board rate is required and visa versa. My personal feeling is that we could justify a new commons, excluding amortization of the new building itself, with 350-400 boarders.

I hope this gives you the information you need. Give me a call if further data is required.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY
LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA 24450

DEAN OF STUDENTS

January 1984

Residential Development at Washington and Lee

A. Current Status

At the start of the 1983-84 academic year, 635 students resided in University dormitory facilities. Of this total 358 were freshmen and 90 were law students. Approximately 19% of our undergraduate upperclass students (187 of 974) lived in University-owned facilities. Another 250 students, primarily sophomores, lived in our seventeen fraternity houses (three of which are owned by Washington and Lee). Attachment #1 provides a detailed breakdown of dormitory occupancy as of September 1983.

B. Without Coeducation

The desirability of additional residential development at Washington and Lee, whether or not we become coeducational, is evident. Although there is apparent balance between the supply of, and the demand for, upperclass and law housing (all students seem to find some place to live), students and parents frequently voice the desire for additional, attractive upperclass facilities on campus. The two most recent housing surveys, conducted by Mr. Parsons during the fall term matriculation periods in 1982 and 1983, provide evidence supporting this need. Some private places of residence in the city and county are obviously substandard. In addition, some of us associated with the University feel the need to develop alternative housing facilities which can provide a more cohesive and less dispersed upperclass living experience.

The size of the additional need is yet to be determined with any degree of precision, but we could probably fill, on a volunteer basis, a minimum of one hundred additional beds in configurations attractive to upperclass and law students i.e. primarily single rooms, single bedrooms within suite arrangements, and/or apartment units. The need would obviously be greater were we to choose to abandon our present policy of complete freedom of choice for upperclass students in favor of some additional requirements for campus residence.

One possible requirement, for example, would be for all sophomores to live on campus. Alternatively, we might require all sophomores to live either in University dormitories or in fraternity houses, with the percentage of sophomores in each house restricted to no more than, say, 50%. A policy of this nature, in addition to providing a more cohesive and less dispersed upperclass living pattern, would also have the added advantage of reducing the current sophomore dominance of fraternity house living.

In any event, even with a stable student population, it is not unreasonable to anticipate the construction of some additional upperclass housing in the near future. If, for example, we were to project an increase in the overall percentage of our undergraduate student body in University housing from the current 40% up to 50% (which would mean an increase in the upperclass percentage from nineteen to thirty-two), we would require an additional 121 beds. To this number must be added some figure for additional beds for law students. Law school officials have for several years indicated a fairly sizeable, unmet need for attractive rooms or apartments, especially for first-year students. Mr. Parsons is currently conducting a survey of law students in an attempt to determine that need more precisely.

C. With Coeducation

If we assume a decision to become coeducational, with an increase in the size of each entering freshman class to four hundred and in the size of the total undergraduate student body to 1500, the need for additional housing becomes considerably more acute. For the first year or two, the larger, co-educational freshman class could be housed in current facilities, but the pressure on upperclass housing would require the construction of additional dormitories or apartments as soon as possible.

The two most practical alternatives for housing a freshman class of 265 men and 135 women appears to be the following:

(1) Use of the existing freshman dormitories, increasing their capacity by converting some of the larger single rooms to doubles. Dean Huntley projects that by converting thirty-seven such rooms in Davis Dormitory, and five in Graham-Lees, the total freshman residence hall capacity could be increased to 411. Mr. Arthur, however, is concerned that the rooms will lose their attractiveness and may not be large enough to accommodate the additional furniture; this problem is made more severe by the "built-in" nature of Davis Dormitory furniture. On the other hand, we used all of these Davis rooms as doubles during the year of Graham-Lees renovation, and at least on a temporary basis, we could do so again.

(2) Use of Baker Dormitory, currently a law student facility, on an interim basis as a freshman hall, with some additional space for law students provided in Woods Creek Apartments. With the present room configurations, approximately 405 freshmen could be accommodated.

Various plans have been studied for the placement of 135 women throughout the freshman dormitories. One scheme, for example, with the use of Baker Dormitory would provide the following: (1) thirty-six beds in Baker as an all-female dormitory; (2) thirty-two beds in Davis Dormitory, utilizing all of the second and third floors; (3) twenty-six beds on the second and third floors of the north section of Gilliam Dormitory; (4) forty beds on the third floor of Graham-Lees, rooms 335-382. This scheme provides for the placement of 134 women plus eight counselors.

Various configurations are possible, depending upon whether or not Baker

would be used, and whether or not we would convert any singles into doubles. The main objective, however, would be to scatter the women throughout the current dormitories, coeducating primarily by floor or by vertical dormitory section. A fairly small, all-female dormitory, such as Baker, could be offered if that were considered to be a desirable alternative for freshman women. Insofar as is possible, women would be assigned to upper floors for security purposes.

The conversion of our current dormitory facilities into coed residences could be accomplished with relatively minimal physical alterations. Dean Huntley and Mr. Arthur have studied this matter (see Attachment #2) and have concluded that the primary alterations needed would be in the plumbing and in the security arrangements. Urinals should be removed, and individual shower stalls, perhaps provided in Graham-Lees and Gilliam as they are now in Davis, through the addition of some partitions in the bathrooms of the sections reserved for women. All outside doors should probably be locked at a certain hour each night, with keys provided for all residents. No significant changes are expected for the individual bedrooms, and no additional parietal regulations or separate rules of conduct for women are anticipated.

Beyond the greater need for additional residential development which would come with a larger student body, the inclusion of women in the student body should increase this need further. It is likely that a larger percentage of upperclass women would choose to live on campus than is presently the case for men. The absence of off-campus facilities for women, similar to the fraternity houses for men, would certainly be one major factor, at least in the early years of coeducation. Many, if not most, sophomore women would therefore choose to live in University dormitories as would also, in all likelihood, a significant proportion of junior and senior women.

If we assume a student body of one thousand men and five hundred women, with approximately 20% of the upperclass men and 65% of the upperclass women voluntarily living on campus, we would require approximately two hundred additional beds plus an unspecified number for law students. These assumptions would not appear unreasonable, given the lack of fraternity and other forms of alternative housing for women, if attractive facilities are provided.

We can also anticipate, at some time following the implementation of a coeducation decision, requests for additional upperclass housing, in units smaller than the standard dormitories. Requests may come for special interest or social unit housing, coed or all-female, and probably from sororities. Women at most colleges visited this summer have expressed interest in Greek organizations and have made requests for sorority housing. Facilities here, if we choose to respond positively, could come from former fraternity houses (if some chapters fail to survive) or from other houses owned by the University, such as we now have in the Lee House, the International House, and the Minority Student Center. An alternative approach might be to provide separate sections of University dormitories or apartment complexes for such groupings.

GRAHAM-LEES

Freshmen in single rooms	163
Freshmen in double rooms	70
Counselors	16
Total Occupancy	<u>249</u>

GILLIAM

Freshmen in single rooms	32
Freshmen in double rooms	52
Counselors	7
Total Occupancy	<u>91</u>

DAVIS

Freshmen in single rooms	32
Freshmen in double rooms	9
Counselors	4
Total Occupancy	<u>45</u>

BAKER

Law students in single rooms	36
Law students in double rooms	2
Total Occupancy	<u>38</u>

LEE I - Minority Center

Upperclassmen in single rooms	2
Upperclassmen in double rooms	4
Total Occupancy	<u>6</u>

LEE II

Upperclassmen in single rooms	3
Upperclassmen in double rooms	18
Total Occupancy	<u>21</u>

INTERNATIONAL HOUSE

Upperclassmen in single rooms	3
Upperclassmen in double rooms	2
Total Occupancy	<u>5</u>

COL ALTO STUDENT APARTMENT

1

APT 13B UNIVERSITY PLACE

1

WOODS CREEK APARTMENTS

Law students (male and female in single rooms)	52
Upperclassmen in single rooms	94
Upperclassmen in double rooms	32
Total Occupancy	<u>178</u>

PAID RENTALS

Freshmen	358
Upperclassmen	160
Law Students	90
	<u>608</u>

COUNSELORS

Freshmen	27
Upperclassmen	0
Law Students	0
	<u>27</u>

TOTAL OCCUPANCY = 635

Facilities for Coeducational Housing:

Only minimal renovations should be necessary for domiciling women in the present freshman dormitories; for one thing, women have been residing in our current freshman facilities, with no reported problems, during summer camps the past few years.

Plumbing:

1. Existing urinals are easily removable. To add an additional shower stall in this position, however, would entail going into the walls and terrazzo floors with a hot-water pipe with an approximate cost of \$2,000 a room. This seems unnecessary since there'll be no more people using these facilities than at present, and there've never been any complaints about availability.

Security:

1. A minimal degree of protection is provided by the simple expedient of domiciling women on upper floors.
2. Hall entry doors on third and fourth floor Gilliam can easily be fitted with locks, dispensing with the need for an outside lock on the building.
3. Some colleges have check-in areas for women's residence halls. If it seems necessary, this could be managed in Graham-Lees and Davis. The procedure noted in #2, above, should make it unnecessary in Gilliam.
 - a. In Davis women housed on the second and third floors would enter the building only by the center door, where a check-in system could be set up. The east and west wing doors on floors two and three could be furnished with panic bars for purposes of egress, but preventing entrance from outside.
 - 1) The same procedure would pertain for the women's hall in Graham-Lees.

The Infirmary:

1. Since the Infirmary is already more or less divided into two wards, no renovations should be necessary.
2. In addition there are two existing isolation rooms, one with a single-bed capacity, the other with a four-bed capacity.

Incidental Considerations:

1. Four hundred freshmen might require an additional laundry unit in the Graham-Lees laundry room. There's space available.
2. At some point full-length mirrors, similar to those in Graham-Lees, might have to be installed in Gilliam and Davis. At any rate, the University should go with what it's got and wait to see if there's

-2-

a demand.

3. The University will have to have a woman custodian to service the women's residency areas.
4. At some future time, some consideration will have to be given to providing adequate facilities for handicapped women.

H. Robert Huntley

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS, CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES AND
STUDENT GOVERNMENT AND ORGANIZATIONS

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON
ATHLETICS, CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES
AND
STUDENT GOVERNMENT AND ORGANIZATIONS

"A Subcommittee of the Committee on Campus Life"

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

May 18, 1984

The Committee on Campus Life of the Board of Trustees was given as its principle concern the character and quality of social extracurricular and residential programs at Washington and Lee University. This Subcommittee was asked to consider, relative to the co-education study, that portion of the Committee's responsibilities relating to "intercollegiate athletics, co-curricular activities, student government and organizations"...and all other policy matters which have bearing upon the extracurricular life of the Washington and Lee student." The specific topics assigned to this Subcommittee which were drawn from President Wilson's memorandum to the Board of Trustees dated February 13, 1984, include the following:

1. The changes to be anticipated in our athletic programs at all levels (i.e., physical education classes, intramurals, club sports, junior varsity and varsity).
2. The adequacy of our playing fields and indoor athletic facilities.
3. The impact (if any) on all on-going student organizations and agencies of student government.
4. How co-curricular activities (i.e., art exhibits, concerts, visiting lecturers, foreign films, and other cultural events) may be effected.

Report of the Subcommittee on Athletics, Co-curricular Activities,
and Student Government and Organizations
May 18, 1984
Page 2

This Subcommittee has approached its assignment in the following manner:

1. Mr. Leggett had numerous discussions on the subject of athletic matters with Mr. William D. McHenry, Athletic Director, during their trip to Yellowstone National Park in February.
2. Mr. Leggett met with members of the University Athletic Committee on the evening of Tuesday, March 20, to discuss that committee's "Report on Co-education and the Athletic Program" dated January 30, 1984. In addition, Mr. Leggett had several telephone and personal conferences with Professor George Ray, Chairman of that committee.
3. On Thursday, April 26, Mr. Leggett met with eight student leaders for about two and one-half hours to discuss how, in their opinion, co-education would impact upon athletics and student government and organizations. On that day, a public honor trial was being conducted so the subject of the Honor System was very much on the minds of Bob Jenevein, Student Body President, and two members of the Executive Committee with whom he met during dinner.
4. Mr. Leggett and Bishop Keller, the other member of this subcommittee, met at the Roanoke, Virginia airport on Friday, March 30, to review this subcommittee's assignment and decided that Mr. Leggett would undertake the on-campus interviews because he resides close to Lexington. Bishop Keller has been consulted by telephone whenever needed.
5. President John D. Wilson and Dean Lewis G. John have offered suggestions for the direction that this inquiry should take and have been valuable sources of information on the subjects under study.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Athletics, Co-curricular Activities,
and Student Government and Organizations

May 18, 1984

Page 3

The objective of this effort has been to develop information which would permit the Sub-Committee to express to the entire Board of Trustees the facts, observations, and opinions that will assist the Board in its study of the co-education issue.

Numerous reports on the general subject of co-education at Washington and Lee and on specific areas of the inquiry of this Sub-Committee have been prepared previously and were used extensively in the preparation of this report. "The Report on Co-Education and the Athletic Program" prepared by the University Athletic Committee dated January 30, 1984 is included as Exhibit A. Throughout this report, reference is made to "The Report of the Committee on Co-Education at Washington and Lee University" dated April 1970 and "Volume I: Summary Volume" dated August 1975 of the Washington and Lee University Trustee Study Committee on Co-Education. "The Student Handbook, 1983-84", published by the Office of the Dean of Students, was used extensively in studying the areas of student government and organizations. Specific references to these publications are indicated by footnotes in this report. Every effort has been made to include facts wherever available to substantiate the conclusions of this report. However, due to the nature of this study and the distinct characteristics of The University, it has been difficult to avoid both speculation and conjecture as to what may happen if Washington and Lee were to co-educate.

* * * * *

The topic of ".....changes to be anticipated in our athletic programs at all levels...." were specifically addressed in the "Report on Co-Education and the Athletic Program", Exhibit A of this report. What follows will be purely a summary of the important findings of that Report.

The program offerings of the Athletic Department include physical education, intramurals, club sports and intercollegiate sports. The Committee concluded that "...co-education would have only a minor effect upon our present impressive range of nearly 30 basic skills in physical education offerings." Other than the addition of courses in dance and movement, the Committee believes that "Almost all the basic skills courses can be easily be taught as "co-ed" courses."

Report of the Sub-Committee on Athletics, Co-curricular Activities
and Student Government and Organizations

May 18, 1984

Page 4

Intramurals and club sports would experience considerable growth if co-education were adopted. At schools which have co-educated in recent years, women have participated with men in those sports in which they do not have a physical disadvantage. Where women required or desired a sport in which men do not normally participate, these would be conducted on a "separate but equal" basis. Club sports for women would probably flourish in the initial stages of co-education. Some of these would involve into varsity sports when sufficient women were available to fill competitive teams, and other sports, in which there was sufficient interest, would continue on a club basis.

The Athletic Committee concluded, and experience in other schools confirms, that the intercollegiate sports program would be significantly affected by the admission of women. Two conclusions are important to note here. About 25% of the male students have participated over the years in intercollegiate sports. If the number of men is reduced to, say 1,000, there will be approximately 88 fewer male students available than are presently participating in these sports. By the time co-education is fully implemented, the number of intercollegiate athletic teams in which women will participate should total 10. The Committee points out that "Ten Virginia colleges and universities already offer intercollegiate league and championship play in eight women's sports sanctioned by the Old Dominion Athletic Conference."

The Athletic Department's staff would be increased by three full-time female members by 1990. The specific positions to be added are discussed in the report. Several female interns, e.g., trainer, swimming and tennis would be added as needed throughout the period. The female staff members with coaching responsibilities will also teach physical education courses. It should be noted that coaches Norm Lloyd and Boyd Williams will reach normal retirement age (65) in 1989 and 1992 respectively. So, to accommodate co-education, the net addition of full-time staff upon the retirement of these two gentlemen will be one. The Report of the Committee goes into much greater detail in regard to the addition of female staff.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Athletics, Co-curricular Activities
and Student Government and Organizations

May 18, 1984

Page 5

It is very surprising to find that the changes and additions to existing facilities to allow co-education are relatively few. A minimum of two full size playing/practice fields are needed whether or not women are admitted. Resurfacing of the tennis courts under the footbridge has a high priority and is now included in the Capital Projects to be undertaken in 1984 if approved by the Board at the May meeting. The Student Pavillon, already approved for construction, will provide practice space for some teams during inclement weather.

Alterations to the Warner Center as a result of co-education are limited to providing locker room space for female students and additional team and faculty locker rooms, physical education classrooms and coaches offices. The details of the re-arrangements of Warner Center are fully described beginning on Page 3 of Exhibit A. Fortunately, this facility was designed with the possibility of co-education in mind and does not require extensive renovation to provide adequate facilities for female students. Included in Exhibit A is a "Proposed Alterations of Warner Center to Co-Ed Use" which includes schematic drawings of the proposed changes and cost estimates associated with these changes.

The impact of the expenditures budget of the Athletic Department are summarized on Page 6 of Exhibit A and a sheet entitled, "Co-Educational Phase - In Chart" which is a part of Exhibit A. Because the dollar amounts included in Exhibit A were unadjusted for inflation, a schedule entitled, "Added Athletic Department Expenditures to Co-Educate Based on UAC 1-30-84 report to JDW (except women enter Fall, 1985)" is included as Exhibit B to this report. The following are the amounts of added expenditures for program and staff to enable co-education in the Athletic Department:

1985	\$ 51,350	
1986	\$ 56,900	
1987	\$ 88,850	
1988	\$ 114,500	
1989	\$ 133,450	(assumes that Coach Lloyd retires in June 1989)
1990	\$ 141,750	
1991	\$ 150,750	
1992	\$ 105,250	(assumes that Coach Williams retires in June 1992)

The major capital costs for renovating Warner Center include \$140,000 for the female student locker rooms to be spent in 1985 and \$125,000 for the additional classrooms, team and women faculty locker rooms, etc. to be spent in 1987. Renovation of the coaches' offices on Level 500 of the Warner Center are desired but no cost estimates for this work have been made. It is expected they will be nominal. The Committee does not foresee any other capital cost associated with co-education.

This Sub-Committee wishes to make some observations on the following subjects based on its interviews with Mr. McHenry, a few of the coaches and some members of the student body, as well as the information contained in reports from previous co-education study committees:

1. Student Attendance at Athletic Events. Attendance should benefit from the fact that co-education would provide an easy and relaxed dating opportunity at athletic events. In a separate report, a projection is made that increased numbers of students will live on campus if women are admitted.(1) The convenience of athletic events may encourage increased attendance. Women who are dating athletes and friends of athletes would be likely to turn out in support of athletic teams. And, finally, as co-education causes changes in dating patterns, a reduction of road trips to women's schools would occur as male students begin to date the co-eds and, therefore, would be available to attend athletic events.
2. Quantity and Quality of Male Athletes Enrolled and the Effect on Intercollegiate Performance. One of the main concerns of the athletic director and the intercollegiate sports coaches is the reduction in the number of male athletes that would occur with co-education. Assuming that 1000 male students and 500 women students were enrolled, a reduction of approximately 350 male students would occur. As explained earlier in this report, if the traditional 25% participation of student body in intercollegiate athletics continues, then the number of male students available for intercollegiate athletics would be reduced by 88.

(1) "Report of Sub-Committee on University Housing and Dining Facilities - Committee on Campus Life." April 1984, pp. 1-3.

2. Quality of Male Athletes Enrolled and the Effect on Intercollegiate Performance (continued)

The Athletic Department fears that the quality as well as the quantity of male athletes will be reduced by co-education. Their argument is that the need to admit academically less well qualified male students will decrease with the admission of female students. The students with strong academic qualifications are not usually the most competitive athletes. This argument is countered by the possibility that some good athletes are either not applying or not accepting admission offers of the University because the school is not co-educational. It is known that a significant percentage of those who declined Washington and Lee admission offers say they do so because the school is all male. The coaches do believe the level of competitiveness will be reduced especially in the large team sports, e.g., football, soccer, lacrosse, baseball and track, due to the reduced number of qualified athletes.

3. Contributions to Campus Life with the Implementation of Women's Intercollegiate Sports. Successful performances of women's intercollegiate teams will attract female student athletes. This should enrich the intercollegiate athletic program of the University. It may be stretching the point to say that having dedicated women athletes on campus will improve the quality of campus social life, but it is believed that this will tend to dilute the intensity of social occasions that depend primarily on women coming from other schools. There also may be some value to the male students by learning about women's sports.

In concluding the section of this report that deals with the athletic program, this Sub-Committee would like to make a comment about the athletic facilities available to W&L students. The indoor facilities are among the best for schools of our size. The outdoor facilities, although lacking sufficient playing and practice fields, are considered to be adequate. With the improvements to the latter which have been approved and/or budgeted for future completion, this University should have excellent athletic facilities of all kinds. The University is fortunate to have the option of admitting women without incurring large financial expenditures for athletic facilities.

* * * * *

It is very difficult to forecast what impact the admission of women will have on student government. At Davidson in 1975, two years after co-education was begun, a woman had been elected vice-president of the Student Government Association.(2) At Sewanee, "Women are quite active in extracurricular activities and have held a number of leadership positions".(3) It is not anticipated that significant changes in the structure of student government would occur as a result of a decision to co-educate; and, in fact, schools which have made the transition in recent years have generally witnessed an increased interest and participation in existing student government activities when women have been admitted. It is expected that the women students would be integrated into the student government as they have in other institutions. In the Report of the Committee on Co-Education at Washington and Lee University dated April, 1970, the conclusion was made that "...they (women) should and undoubtedly would seek membership in offices in all campus organizations".(4)

- (2) W&L Trustee's Study Committee on Education "Volume I: Summary Volume" August 1975, Davidson College Visit Section, p. 8.
- (3) Ibid., Sewanee Visit Section, p. 10.
- (4) See referenced report, p. 18.

The students interviewed by this Sub-Committee expect that election campaigns would probably be more lively and that the student interest and participation in the election process would be increased. Some students feel that women will be more serious than the men about the political process. Of course, it can be anticipated that initially women will have some frustration about their representation in student government because of their small numbers. The Law School experienced this until the proportion of women in the total student body reached about 30%.

One of the most important functions of student government is the Honor System. This Sub-Committee defers to the wisdom and experience of the Executive Committee of the Board to deal with this subject. The students who have been interviewed considered that the size of the student body influences the effectiveness of the Honor System more than the gender of the students. These student leaders do perceive women to be more lenient than men in determining punishment for honor offenses and that male/female relationships may compromise a student's willingness to report an honor violation. Again, the Honor System which deserves much more attention than is given in this report will, by mutual consent of the Rector and President, be the subject of inquiry by the Executive Committee of the Board.

"The Student Handbook 1983-84" lists and explains a number of the separate activities of student government beginning on Page 6 and ending on Page 16. These activities include the following:

1. The Student University Council
2. Student Control Committee
3. Student Affairs Committee
4. Student Activities Board
5. Student Financial Relations Committee (cold check)
6. Student Emergency Loan Committee
7. Voting Regulations Board
8. Recruiting Committee
9. Contact and University Publications Board

Report of the Sub-Committee on Athletics, Co-curricular Activities,
and Student Government and Organizations

May 18, 1984

Page 10

This Sub-Committee has had great difficulty in trying to determine what effect co-education will have on any or all of these student government activities. We can say with some assurance that women will participate in these activities and will bring the female point-of-view to bear on the particular concerns of the individual Boards and/or Committees. In schools that have recently adopted co-education, women have actively participated in these campus activities. (5)

* * * * *

A number of student organizations and campus activities would, in the opinion of the Sub-Committee, receive real benefit from the admission of women to Washington and Lee. Among those are musical and choral groups, e.g., the Brass and Percussion Ensemble, the String Ensemble, the mixed chorus and the concert guild; the University Theatre; service organizations, e.g., the University Federation of Volunteers consisting of Big Brother- Big Sister Program, tutoring program and a companionship therapy program with Western State Mental Hospital in Staunton; the Inter-varsity Christian Fellowship which would involve female athletes; the Student Association for Black Unity (SABU) and the Mock Convention. Those organizations and activities on which co-education may have a neutral effect include political organizations, e.g., Young Democrats and College Republicans, The International Club, The Debate Team, The Outing Club, Student Telephone Union, honorary societies, e.g., Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Delta Cappa Phi, Eta Sigma, Beta Gamma Sigma, and the literary works, e.g., The Political Review and Focus-Excelsior. It is believed that women would certainly participate in these organizations but it is not known in what measure they will benefit them.

- (5) The "Report of the Committee on Co-Education and Washington and Lee University", April 1970, p. 18.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Athletics, Co-curricular Activities,
and Student Government and Organizations
May 18, 1984
Page 11

As with student government organizations, it has been substantiated that women become active in such student organizations very quickly and very enthusiastically.(6) In a few instances, the formerly all-male organizations have resisted inclusion of women into their activities, but resistance generally diminishes two or three years after co-education begins.

Students who were interviewed were generally positive about the involvement of women in student activities and feel that they will improve the quality of the programs and heighten the activity level of these organizations. It is possible that once women have been completely integrated into student activities, they also may become complacent, losing their initial drive to succeed where women were not previously given an opportunity.

* * * * *

Co-curricular activities are those which enhance and reinforce the academic curriculum. Art exhibits, musical concerts, guest lecturers, foreign film series, campus workshops comprise this category of activity. Attendance at these activities is considered by all campus constituencies to be very poor. Students seem to think these type of activities would provide them with natural dating opportunities and that they would be encouraged to attend. Women generally have a stronger interest in cultural activities than men, and it is felt they would encourage their male friends to attend with them. Also, with a large proportion of female students living on campus, attending co-curricular activities will be more convenient than for male students who do not reside on or near the campus. There should be an increase in the variety of co-curricular offerings as a result of admitting women. Modern dance and ballet groups are notably absent. The Sub-Committee feels strongly that co-curricular activities would enjoy a resurgence of interest and attendance were women to be admitted to W&L.

* * * * *

(6) Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, The University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee, Douglas Pashcall's letter to Dr. John D. Wilson, March 12, 1984, p. 3.

Report of the Sub-Committee on Athletics, Co-curricular Activities,
and Student Government and Organizations
May 18, 1984
Page 12

SUMMARY

With the exception of the known changes in athletic program and facilities that would be caused by co-education, the majority of the conclusions contained in this report are mainly speculative. It may be helpful in the period between the regular May Board meeting and the special July meeting to visit some colleges and universities that have adopted co-education in recent years for the purpose of gathering specific data on student organizations and activities and student government. These topics were not given a great deal of attention in the previous studies on co-education so there is very little information available with which to forecast what may happen. Therefore, the Sub-Committee feels that with the exception of the detrimental effect on the competitiveness of large team intercollegiate athletics, the impact of co-education on other phases of the athletic program, student government and organizations, and co-curricular activities will be very positive.

January 30, 1984

To: Dr. John D. Wilson, President
 From: The University Athletic Committee

Report on Coeducation and the Athletic Program

The University Athletic Committee has understood its task to be studying the implications of a decision to coeducate at Washington and Lee upon all aspects of our athletic program. The Committee's report is based upon a ten-year evolutionary model which assumes:

1. earliest decision to coeducate: May, 1984
2. earliest implementation of coeducation: Fall, 1986
3. full coeducation to be achieved by 1990 with student body of 1500 students (1000 men and 500 women) engaging in 13 men's intercollegiate sports and approximately 10 women's intercollegiate sports, either separately coached or integrated teams
4. an incremental accretion/diminution of women/men, from a base figure of 100 women matriculating in 1986, which projects the following approximate yearly enrollment figures:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Total</u>
1985	0	1300	1300
1986	100	1250	1350
1987	200	1200	1400
1988	300	1150	1450
1989	400	1100	1500
1990	500	1000	1500
1991-4	500	1000	1500

The Committee devoted its November meeting to a determination of desiderata and set up a four man subcommittee (consisting of the Athletic Director, one of the alumni representatives, one student, and the Chairman) which subsequently met several times for preliminary discussions of the issues and inspection of the Gymnasium complex. The Committee also made use of the relevant segments from previous Washington and Lee studies on coeducation and met with the University architect, Professor Henry Ravenhorst, at its January meeting.

From its study thus far, the Committee offers the following assessment of the likely impact of coeducation upon our program offerings, staff, athletic facilities, and operating budget.

I. Program offerings:

A. Physical education courses: Coeducation would have only a minor effect upon our present impressive range of nearly 30 basic "skills in physical education" offerings. Some courses, especially in dance and movement (e.g., aerobic dance, ballet, modern dance) probably would be added, but there should be no appreciable quantum change requiring more, or fewer, staff members. Almost all the basic skills courses can easily be taught as "coed" courses.

B. Intramurals and Club Sports: Coeducation would create considerable growth, perhaps as much as 50%, in our intramural sports programs. Where women would not be at a physical disadvantage (for example, in such sports as softball, touch football, and volleyball), the programs would be coeducational; otherwise, the sports would be conducted on a "separate but equal" basis.

We assume also that a number of Club Sports, requiring only faculty sponsors, would come into being during the early phase of coeducation. Some of these, depending upon the inclination of the club members, might prefer to keep their club status, as men's rugby and Ultimate Frisbee now do, whereas others may evolve to varsity status in due time.

C. Intercollegiate sports: Our projections are based on the assumption that roughly the same percentage of women will participate in intercollegiate sports each year as the men traditionally have, that is to say, 25%, or approximately 125 of the 500 women matriculating by 1990.

We can not, of course, precisely predict the growth rate or the patterns of interest, but we do foresee the formation of at least ten women's varsity teams by 1990--three in the fall (cross-country, volleyball, field hockey), three in the winter (swimming and diving, basketball, indoor track), and four in the spring (tennis, golf, track, lacrosse). We assume that those sports emphasizing individual prowess and requiring relatively small team rosters will form first and that the larger, more expensive team sports (e.g., lacrosse and field hockey) will develop later. (See the "Coeducation Phase-In Chart" for our projected rate of implementation.

It should also be noted that Washington and Lee's women's teams would have no difficulty developing attractive schedules with schools of compatible size and athletic philosophy. Ten Virginia colleges and universities already offer intercollegiate league and championship play in eight women's sports sanctioned by the Old Dominion Athletic Conference. (See page 3 of the ODAC 1983-84 Information Guide and Directory.) As a charter member of the Conference, Washington and Lee could have its female athletes compete as individuals in ODAC championships in cross-country, fencing, tennis, and swimming and diving from the very inception of coeducation.

11. Staff:

To offer effective coaching and teaching coverage for our expanded programs, we estimate that the Physical Education department would add three fulltime female members by 1990, for a net gain of only one staff member because Coaches Norman Lord and Boyd Williams will reach the mandatory retirement age of 70 in 1990.

We foresee that these staff members will be hired in the following sequence:

A. In 1986 a woman, probably in her thirties with previous collegiate coaching and administrative experience as an Assistant Athletic Director, who would report to the Athletic Director, would direct the women's athletic programs and have coaching duties as well. This appointment should be mindful of the counsel of Dr. Ruth Adams, former President of

Wellesley and Vice-President of Women's Programs at Dartmouth, quoted in the 1975 Trustee Report, that in the transition to coeducation "major efforts need to be made to bring in highly qualified, relatively senior female faculty and administrative members, not just at the instructor or assistant professor level":

B. In 1988, a woman qualified to coach both volleyball and basketball.

C. In 1990, a woman qualified to coach both field hockey and lacrosse.

The Committee also anticipates the hiring of a number of female interns e. g., a female trainer, and interns for the women's swimming and tennis teams, to supplement these fulltime personnel. In the short run, the present athletic staff could coach women in such sports as cross-country, golf, tennis, track, and swimming. The Washington and Lee School of Law, now over 30% female, would also be a potential source for assistant coaches for the women's teams.

III. Facilities:

A. Outdoor:

1) The most pressing need, whether we coeducate or not, is for more field space; additional cut-and-fill work on the field alongside Route 60 would provide two full-size fields and reduce some of the pressure on the existing practice fields. In addition, the area on either side of the Liberty Hall ruins might be developed for recreational, intramural, or team use.

2) The longest-standing need has been the rebuilding and resurfacing of the six "Har-Tru" tennis courts under the footbridge with an all-weather surface. (See Mr. McHenry's letter to Frank Parsons as of March, 1983 for a complete long-term listing of desirable renovations or additions to our existing athletic facilities).

B. Indoor:

The only modification absolutely essential to coeducate in the first year is the partitioning of the main locker room on the 300 level to provide adequate lockerroom space for the women. Prof. Ravenhorst has presented a plan (see sheet 3-1, overlay 1) of Mr. Ravenhorst's "Proposed Alterations Warner Center to Coed Use" which the Committee believes makes sense from the standpoint of security and traffic patterns, and would comply with Title IX, the federal regulations governing sex discrimination. Were we to adopt the Ravenhorst plan, basically the east end of the Doremus gym would become the women's locker room, the antiquated gang shower room would be replaced by modern stall showers, and a cinderblock partition would insure privacy for the women and an entrance to the auxiliary pool for the men.

The Committee has also considered other probabilities and possibilities for reallocating space and remodelling although we have not yet had time to study these options in sufficient detail to make final recommendations. The present stage of the Committee's thinking on our

options is summarized below floor-by-floor: (By referring to the space use diagrams and Mr. Ravenhorst's blueprint overlays the reader may better visualize the changes.)

1. 100 level:

a) The present women's locker room (121) could become the women's faculty locker room, or, perhaps, the men's faculty locker room for those faculty members using the pool or indoor courts.

b) The present faculty locker room (156) could become the women's swim team locker room. Because access to the pool deck can be gained from both ends of the room, 156 could also be partitioned and used by female faculty members as well.

c) The present men's swim team locker room (104) would probably remain as is, but if space needs are acute, this room might also be partitioned to accommodate more than one team.

2. 200 level: This level would remain unchanged unless space needs might dictate conversion of the dormitory (225) to a visiting team locker room. At present this room has no shower facilities; visiting teams must use the showers in 343 on the next level. According to the Athletic Director, the dormitory is used well over 100 days a year and helps us to schedule intercollegiate opponents who otherwise might not come to Lexington because of prohibitive travel expenses. (See letter of January 23, 1984 from Mr. McHenry)

3. 300 level: If we retain the present "one team/one locker room" concept, by 1990 a crunch on lockerroom space might develop when there presumably would be three women's teams in both the fall and spring seasons needing separate locker rooms. Additional rooms could be freed by having "out-of-season" teams (i.e., lacrosse and tennis) vacate team rooms in the fall or by reducing the number of rooms now designated for visiting teams. In addition, the present women's locker room by the auxiliary pool could be used by one of the smaller teams or even used as a women's weight room if separate weight training facilities are deemed to be necessary or desirable.

If any lebensraum problem developed which could not be solved by these measures, then several options could be entertained, among them remodelling of the auxiliary pool to provide several additional locker-rooms (see Prof. Ravenhorst's sheet 3-1, overlay 2). The auxiliary pool, however, is used often enough now when the main pool is unavailable and patronized daily by recreational swimmers who prefer the intimate "Roman bath" setting of the Doremus pool to warrant retaining it in its present form for now. (The cost of maintaining and heating it is negligible; about \$150 worth of chemicals are used each year).

If we were to modify the present proprietary approach to locker rooms and simply regard the seven "team rooms" with their total capacity of 230 lockers as space to be allocated to our intercollegiate athletes, men and women, regardless of their team affiliation, then we might make more efficient use of these rooms.

The present coaches' and guest lockerroom, fitted out with additional lockers and shower heads, would be large enough to serve as the men's faculty lockerroom (now located on the 100 level). The equipment, laundry, and training room areas should not have to be expanded, though office space will have to be found for the female trainer somewhere. The laundry area has space for an additional washer if necessary; however, the simplest way to handle the anticipated increase in volume would be to create a "night shift" and let members of the custodial staff run the laundry equipment then.

4. 400 level:

a) The present officials' locker room would probably be designated as the female coaches' locker room.

b) The office in the administrative complex now being used for office supplies (or the SID's office) would become the office for the Director of Women's Athletic Programs. If additional office space should be needed, the rooms off the lobby adjacent to the rest rooms now used as a public lounge and as an office by the custodial staff could be converted.

c) Finally, whether or not the auxiliary pool is retained, the present auxiliary pool balcony area could be remodeled to provide additional offices and classrooms or a practice area suitable for the full range of dance and movement classes we will likely be offering by 1990. (See Sheet 4-1, overlay)

5. 500 level: The two additional female coaches would eventually move into the offices now occupied by Coaches Lord and Williams at the time of their retirements. Alternatively, there could be some "doubling-up" in the larger offices, or some of the offices might be repartitioned to provide a suite for the football staff and hence create more office space. Furthermore, the office now being used by the University Proctor could be recaptured for use by members of the athletic department.

It should be also noted in passing that because half the classroom area is now serving as an office for four interns, a better sound-proof divider should be installed in the classroom.

Of the various longer-term options available for remodelling the interior of Warner Center to provide more space, the Committee views Prof. Ravenhorst's proposal for converting the balcony space at the north end to be the most attractive and cost-efficient. This area, structurally designed to take the weight of additional stands for the basketball arena, has never been needed for spectators; instead, it has been used occasionally for fencing and badminton (it is lined for these sports) and for tennis and martial arts classes. Mr. Ravenhorst's plan (see Sheet 5-1, overlay) would convert this balcony into two lockerrooms, three offices, and a medium-sized classroom.

IV. Budget:

The yearly estimated costs of a coeducational athletic program are displayed on the "Coeducational Phase-In Chart." The annual expenditures would rise from an initial estimated outlay of \$41,000 in 1986 to \$112,000 in 1990 when all of the anticipated women's programs would be in place. The Athletic Director estimates that starting salaries for the full time staff members and interns would total \$80,000 by 1990, a figure unadjusted to reflect annual salary increases. The Athletic Director also estimates that yearly athletic team expenses (e.g., for equipment, travel, meet expenses and recruiting) would amount to approximately \$32,000 by 1990. Again, these figures are unadjusted for inflation; hence, the full financial impact of a fully expanded coeducational athletic program upon the University budget would be somewhat greater. Perhaps \$125,000 by 1990 would be a more realistic cost estimate to work with.

The "Coeducation Phase-In Chart" also provides current estimates for the indoor and outdoor construction contracts with the highest priority, but the Committee wishes to stress that almost all of these capital improvements to our physical education facilities are ones we should undertake anyway and are not directly tied to the coeducation issue. If the Board of Trustees votes for coeducation, then we would have to modify only the interior of the 300 level of Doremus Gymnasium to provide separate and sufficient lockerroom facilities for female students, a job Prof. Ravenhorst estimates would cost \$140,000. Thus the minimal "start-up" cost of coeducating our athletic program by 1986 would appear to be approximately \$180,000.

Respectfully submitted by the
University Athletic Committee,

*Prof. George Ray, Chairman
Prof. Herman Taylor
Prof. Sam Kozak
Prof. Barry Machado (on leave)
Dean F. L. Kirgis
Prof. Larry Lamont
Mr. Stephen H. Suttle '62
*Mr. William P. Wallace Jr. '75
Mr. Ian Banwell '85
Mr. Marty Bechtold '84
*Mr. Gordon Ogden '85

* Indicates members of the UAC sub-committee on coeducation.

Coeducational Phase-In Chart

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u> (# of women athletes)	<u>Intercollegiate</u> <u>Offerings</u>	<u>Estimated</u> <u>Program</u> <u>Cost</u>	<u>Staff</u> (approximate starting salary in parentheses)	<u>Facilities</u>	<u>Cumulative</u> <u>Budget</u> <u>Increase</u>
1985					resurface Har-Tru tennis courts (\$70,000)	
1986	100 (25)	Fall: x-country Winter: swimming & diving Spring: tennis	\$1000 \$2000 \$2000	1 intern (\$8000) 1 women's ass't AD (\$20,000) 1 intern trainee(\$8000)	modify 200 level of Warner to provide separate locker rooms for female students (\$140,000)	\$41,000
1987	200 (50)	Spring: track (championship meets) golf	\$1000 \$1000			\$43,000
1988	300 (75)	Fall: volleyball Spring: track	\$4000	1 volleyball coach (\$16,000)	develop, grade, & seed Rt. 60 fields (\$125,000)	\$63,000
1989	400 (100)	Winter: basketball	\$6000	(volleyball coach will coach BB) 1 tennis intern (\$8000)	construct additional lockerrooms, classrooms & offices on basketball arena balcony?(\$105,000)	\$77,000
1990	500 (125)	Fall: field hockey Spring: lacrosse	\$7500 \$7500	1 field hockey/lacrosse coach (\$20,000) (retirement of Coaches Lord & Williams)	Rt. 60 fields available	\$112,000
1991- 1994	500 (125)	Add other sports as sufficient interest develops			Build a field house?	
TOTALS by 1990	500 (125)	10 sports	\$32,000	3 coaches 3 interns (\$80,000)		

MEN'S SPORTS

COLLEGE	SPORT	BASEBALL	BASKETBALL	CROSS COUNTRY	FOOTBALL	GOLF	LACROSSE	INDOOR T&F	OUTDOOR T&F	SOCCER	TENNIS	TOTALS
Bridgewater		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	8
Catholic		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	9
Eastern Mennonite		X	X	X					X	X		5
Emory & Henry		X	X		X			X	X		X	6
Hampden-Sydney		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	8
Lynchburg		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Maryville		X	X		X			X	X	X		6
Randolph-Macon		X			X	X	X				X	5
Roanoke			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	8
Washington & Lee		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	9
TOTALS		9	9	7	7	7	4	6	8	7	9	

WOMEN'S SPORTS

*COLLEGE	SPORT	BASKETBALL	FENCING	FIELD HOCKEY	LACROSSE	SOCCER	SWIMMING & DIVING	TENNIS	VOLLEYBALL	TOTALS
Bridgewater		X		X	X			X	X	5
Eastern Mennonite		X		X					X	3
Emory & Henry		X						X	X	3
Hollins		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	7
Lynchburg		X	X	X	X			X	X	6
Mary Baldwin		X	X				X	X	X	5
Randolph-Macon				X	X	X		X		4
R-M Woman's College		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
Roanoke		X		X	X		X	X	X	6
Sweet Briar		X		X	X	X	X	X		6
TOTALS		9	4	8	7	4	4	9	8	

1983-84 O.D.A.C. SPORTS

Campus Correspondence

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

TO: Mr. Frank Parsons, Assistant to the President

FROM: William D. McHenry, Director of Athletics DATE: March 18, 1983

Subject: Priority List of Athletic Facilities Needed

1. Conversion of racquetball/handball courts, one per year by Jim Arthur. Two finished, four to go.
2. Resurfacing and rebuilding of lower tennis courts with same surface as upper courts. American Surfacing Co. Inc. Mr. Andy Hord. \$61,518.00.
3. Indoor field house with artificial surface that could accommodate indoor tennis, lacrosse, baseball, track, soccer, football and P.E. Classes. It could also be used as a multi-purpose area for concerts, dances, and campus-wide parties. Architect would have to provide cost estimate.
4. Expansion of athletic fields along Route 60. Area could be developed for two additional fields to accommodate outdoor sports, intramurals, and recreation. See Tom Borellis for price estimate.
5. Resurface and rebuild track and jumping pit runways with all weather track. Drainage system track construction and resurfacing by Moffett Paving and American Surfacing Co., Inc. \$125,476.00.
6. Stadium Renovation - annual maintenance on stadium to include press box renovation, improved seating, improved gate arrangements, painted periodically, and new restroom expansion. Much of this should be done by Jim Arthur while other work would need estimates by architect.
7. Improvement in baseball stadium to include new backstop, permanent seating, proper fencing. The farm house could be renovated as a club house with toilet facilities and storage, but wouldn't be needed if field house is approved.
8. Field Lighting - Needed for late afternoon practices in Fall and for expanded Intramural use. Fall presents serious problems for outdoor teams.
9. Tennis Courts Light for recreational use and late matches. This could be done at same time as field lighting.
10. Artificial Turf or prescription turf would help Wilson field to accommodate football, soccer and lacrosse. Thirty to thirty-five contests are played on Wilson Field each year.

11. Outdoor recreational facilities to include basketball courts, volleyball court, one wall handball courts, bike racks at dorms and public buildings.
Future dormitories should have space for universal gym and weight training.
12. Renovation of Old Gym - indoor track need attention. Radiators should be removed with alternative heating planned. Nets hung from track for indoor activities.

Note: this is not important if field house is a strong option.

Weight room needs better ventilation with exhaust fans installed.

WDM:am



Landscape Architects

GWSM Inc.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15217

Telephone (412) [REDACTED]

January 10, 1984

William McHenry
Athletic Director
Washington and Lee University
Lexington, VA 24450

Re: Washington and Lee University
Route 60 Field Construction

Dear Bill:

I went thru the past studies for this area and found some figures which we quickly could extract and update as a very rough 1984 cost estimate:

TOTAL FIELD CONSTRUCTION

Includes grading, topsoil, lawn (seeding)
and storm drainage

Does not include irrigation \$125,000.

For a sod playing field 22,000.

Another item which I'll pass on: In 1981, GWSM, inc. did a complete improvement-feasibility study for a local school district (heavy in field athletics). We compared various field surface alternatives (astro, prescription turf and natural turf); also synthetic track installations. Enclosed is a sheet from that report. These prices include 400 meters, 6 lanes and jogger's lane; relocation of track events (long jump and pole vault); excavation and removal of old track and subgrade preparation.

Best regards,

W. Thomas Borellis

WTB:jeb
Enclosure

cc: Mr. Frank Parsons
Mr. James Arthur
Mr. Scott Beebe

List of Tracklite II Installations

Hempfield High School

Oliver High School

List of Tartan Surface Track Installations

Pitt Stadium

Mt. Lebanon Stadium

Cost Estimate

The following costs are for replacement of the existing track based upon receipt of construction bids by April 30, 1981:

Tracklite II

5,800 sq. yds. @ 30.00 \$174,000.

*Tartan Surface

5,800 sq. yds. @ 56.00 \$324,800.

Note: Costs do not include drainage corrections which are presented elsewhere in this study.

*The Tartan Surface cost was not included in any of the preceding surface option cost estimates.

PROPOSED
ALTERATIONS
WARNER CENTER
TO
CO-ED USE

Shows the existing conditions in the Locker Room area

Sheet 3 - 1 (overlay 1)

Indicates renovations required to provide locker and shower facilities for women students. This consists of new structural partition which will separate the basket issue and dressing areas for men and women. The womens' locker area will have an entrance as indicated which will provide access with some control from the equipment issue room window.

Additional lockers will be needed. The existing shower room will be converted with new shower and lavatory facilities. Doremus pool will remain and will be accessible from both the men's locker room and women's locker room. The existing coaches' locker room will be changed to accommodate both faculty and coaches.

The estimated cost of this work is \$140,000.00.

Sheet 3 - 1 (overlay 2)

Indicates elimination of pool and constructing team rooms and related facilities.

The estimated cost of this work is \$148,000.00.

Shows existing conditions of the 400 Level

Sheet 4 - 1 (overlay)

This indicates the conversion of the upper space above Doremus Pool into class rooms and offices.

If this is constructed independent of the lower area (pool space -- see Sheet 3 - 1 (overlay2) the estimated cost would be \$95,000.00.

(Plus additional ventilation system for pool area, \$15,000.00.)

If this is constructed in conjunction with the conversion of the pool space (Sheet 3 - 1 (overlay 2) the cost is estimated to be \$70,000.00.

Shows existing conditions

Sheet 5 - 1 (overlay)

Indicates the conversion of the present balcony area (which is experiencing very limited use at present) into two team rooms, class room and three offices.

The balcony was originally designed to provide for bleacher seating but has never been used for this and present indications are such that it will not be needed for this use. The space as shown in this study will be well used. A limited balcony or walkway is retained to provide for good access and circulation. The conversion will necessitate new partitions, lighting, heating and ventilating; plumbing for showers and toilets, etc.

The cost of this work is estimated to be \$105,000.00.

(This does not include cost of renovating the existing coaches' offices)

Campus Correspondence

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

TO: Dr. George Ray
Chairman - Athletic Committee

FROM: William D. McHenry
Director of Athletics

DATE: January 23, 1984

Subject: Use of the Athletic Team Dormitory in the Gymnasium

For the academic school year 1983-84 we have already made reservations for 81 days usage of the athletic team dormitory by visiting teams. The normal pattern would be between 6 and 10 days per month with the exception of March which has 31 days use. In addition to these 81 days our football team will use it 14 days, during pre-season football and summer camps will use it for approximately 22 days. This gives us a usage of 117 days per year.

Unfortunately, Dick throws away the records of past years use since they are of no consequences to us. This would be a similar situation each year in my estimate between 75 and 100 days per year was not too far off.

Hope this information is helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,



William D. McHenry

WDM:am

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COST

1.	300 Level - per Overlay 1	\$ 140,000
2.	300 Level - per Overlay 2	148,000
3.	400 Level - per Overlay 1 (Independent of 2 above)	95,000
4.	400 Level per Overlay 1 (In conjunction with 2 above)	70,000
5.	500 Level - per Overlay (Does not include cost of renovation of present offices -)	105,000

Added Athletic Department Expenditures to Coeducate
Based on UAC 1-30-84 Report to JDW
(except women enter fall, 1985)

	1984-85 Amounts	Budget Years									
		1984-85	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94
Faculty & Staff - escalated at 6% & 7% as shown											
Woman intern - swimming - 6%	8,000		8,500	9,000	9,500	10,100	10,700	11,350	12,000	12,750	13,500
Woman Asst. AD - 7%	20,000		21,400	22,900	24,500	26,200	28,050	30,000	32,100	34,350	36,750
Woman intern trainer - 6%	8,000		8,500	9,000	9,500	10,100	10,700	11,350	12,000	12,750	13,500
Woman volleyball/basket- ball coach - 7%	16,000				19,600	21,000	22,450	24,000	25,700	27,500	29,400
Woman tennis intern - 6%	8,000					10,100	10,700	11,350	12,000	12,750	13,500
Woman field hockey/lacrosse coach - 7%	20,000						28,050	30,000	32,100	34,350	36,750
Coach Lord retires 6-30-89 - 7%	(25,133)						(35,250)	(37,700)	(40,350)	(43,200)	(46,200)
Coach Williams retires 6-30-92 - 7%	(26,833)									(46,100)	(49,350)
Net added salaries		38,400	40,900	63,100	77,500	75,400	80,350	85,550	45,150	47,850	
Fringe benefits at 20%		7,700	8,200	12,600	15,500	15,100	16,050	17,100	9,050	9,550	
Net added compensation cost		46,100	49,100	75,700	93,000	90,500	96,400	102,650	54,200	57,400	
Program Costs (i.e., Supplies & Equipment) - escalate at 6%											
X-country	1,000		1,050	1,100	1,200	1,300	1,350	1,400	1,500	1,600	1,700
Swimming/diving	2,000		2,100	2,250	2,400	2,500	2,700	2,850	3,000	3,200	3,400
Tennis	2,000		2,100	2,250	2,400	2,500	2,700	2,850	3,000	3,200	3,400
Track	1,000			1,100	1,200	1,300	1,350	1,400	1,500	1,600	1,700
Golf	1,000			1,100	1,200	1,300	1,350	1,400	1,500	1,600	1,700
Volleyball/track	4,000				4,750	5,050	5,350	5,650	6,000	6,400	6,750
Basketball	6,000					7,550	8,050	8,500	9,000	9,550	10,150
Field Hockey	7,500						10,050	10,650	11,300	11,950	12,650
Lacrosse	7,500						10,050	10,650	11,300	11,950	12,650
Total added program (S&E) costs		5,250	7,800	13,150	21,500	42,950	45,350	48,100	51,050	54,100	

Added Athletic Department Expenditures to Coeducate
(continued)

1984-85 Amounts	Budget Years									
	<u>1984-85</u>	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>	<u>1987-88</u>	<u>1988-89</u>	<u>1989-90</u>	<u>1990-91</u>	<u>1991-92</u>	<u>1992-93</u>	<u>1993-94</u>
Net added compensation cost		46,100	49,100	75,700	93,000	90,500	96,400	102,650	54,200	57,400
Total added program (S&E) costs		<u>5,250</u>	<u>7,800</u>	<u>13,150</u>	<u>21,500</u>	<u>42,950</u>	<u>45,350</u>	<u>48,100</u>	<u>51,050</u>	<u>54,100</u>
TOTAL ADDED OPERATING BUDGET COSTS		<u>51,350</u>	<u>56,900</u>	<u>88,850</u>	<u>114,500</u>	<u>133,450</u>	<u>141,750</u>	<u>150,750</u>	<u>105,250</u>	<u>111,500</u>
<u>Capital Costs</u> - escalate at 6%										
Separate Warner Center locker rooms	140,000	<u>140,000</u>								
Renovate Warner Center balcony	105,000			<u>125,000</u>						

