

Old Duke — New Duke



A REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

by

WILLIAM H. WILLIMON

Dean of the Chapel and Professor of Christian Ministry

November 2000

From Where Have We Come?

Duke is a young university, having just celebrated the seventy-fifth year of James B. Duke's gift that transformed a small southern college into a great international university. Many of our "outrageous ambitions" (in President Sanford's words) have been fulfilled. Yet today many among us feel that the excellence we have attained in academic life is unmatched by our attainments in experience outside the classroom. James B. Duke's creation of an incredibly beautiful place for the development and transformation of incredibly talented young people sets the tone for our current concern to make student life at Duke all that it ought to be. A great treasure has been committed to our care, both in our physical campus environment, and in the gifted young adults who come here. How can we, in our time and place, be true to that trust?

Among our undergraduates and younger alumni there has been a lively debate concerning what they call "Old Duke" and "New Duke." There is a sense among many that someone is attempting to change us, to transform a beloved older Duke into some strange and less lovable "New Duke."

I believe that I have been sent out to observe student life and to report to the President, not from some sinister desire on the part of someone to destroy Old Duke in favor of the new, but rather in the best tradition of "Dear Old Duke." This university was founded in great part upon Trinity College's distinguished tradition of undergraduate liberal education and out of a stunning vision of all that undergraduate college life could be if given the leadership and the resources to make it so. This report is offered to a research university that historically has taken its undergraduates seriously and cherishes them dearly. Duke wants to become, for these talented novice adults, all that it ought to be.

I have been asked by President Keohane to revisit my 1993 report on student life, "We Work Hard, We Play Hard." During the past three months, I have individually interviewed over a hundred students, faculty, and staff. I have spent six weekends on campus and have met with dozens of student groups. I have also attempted to familiarize myself with the current literature on undergraduate student life and have visited six other campuses. This report is offered as a modest attempt to assess what we have done and what we have left to do in student life at Duke.

In the intervening eight years since I first ventured forth, at President Brodie's request, to study student life at Duke, there have been some significant modifications that give credence to the notion of a "New Duke." President Keohane's leadership in making East Campus a First Year Student campus is widely praised as a dramatically constructive step toward establishing class identity in a positive environment.

In my earlier report I lamented the lack of eating areas that encourage communal interaction. Though I find the Marketplace to be chaotic, and the still darkened eating spaces in the Bryan Center to be grim, the coffee bars on West are a significant addition to our community life. The Freeman Center for Jewish Life also enriches options for campus life and diverse dining facilities.

I criticized the way that we virtually abandoned our students after dark and on weekends. Since then the Faculty-in-Residence Program was created, along with the Faculty Associates. While these programs have had a less than desired impact upon student life, they are significant new attempts to address the problem of a campus bereft of adults on nights and weekends.¹

I criticized the privileged place of fraternities in the housing on West. The housing shake up, while perhaps more modest than some hoped (though traumatic for some of the groups involved), at least changed residential living patterns and some fraternities' expectations that they were entitled to some of the most desirable housing on campus. There were some unintended consequences as a result of these housing moves. We are still giving a virtual subsidy to some selective living groups on campus, by giving them the most desirable space. Are they groups that are worthy of such major university support? Whether these changes were for the better or the worse is still under debate.

I noted the sad state of Duke recreational facilities. With the Brodie and Wilson Centers, we now enjoy state-of-the-art recreational opportunities. While there are some issues with the administration of these facilities, our students' recreational opportunities have been dramatically improved.

Until I published my report, I did not know that on many American campuses, administrators were in denial about student life problems like alcohol abuse, eating disorders, and poor social interaction. Since the publication of "We Work Hard, We Play

"We observed lots of students out and about on West Campus and large numbers of students arriving on the buses from East Campus. Students were traveling from party to party carrying cups, open cans and bottles of beverages. We noted cans and broken bottles on the grounds. The stench of spilled beer (and in some locations urine)... a drug exchange (marijuana) which was observed in Edens...we observed intoxicated students plus a drinking game occurring in a room.... Overall, we are very concerned about the environment we observed on West campus: specifically, the number of students engaging in high-risk behavior; the safety hazards from large numbers of students in areas not designed to accommodate them; the level of intoxication; and the lack of any controls...."

*West Campus Tour, 11 p.m. – 2 a.m.,
Saturday, September 2, 2000*

REPORT BY DEANS ADAMS AND BAKER
OFFICE OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT.

Hard" in 1992, I have visited at least sixty campuses to speak on these subjects, encouraging them in their efforts to make their campus life more congenial to the academic aims of their schools.² A number of our faculty have written important books on the future of higher education. We ought to be proud that Duke has become a leader in the national debate over campus life.³

Where Ought We To Be Going?

Alcohol

"I can't believe that you expended so much attention upon alcohol," said a Duke administrator, when I presented my report of eight years ago. "You know as well as I that's an old, old story on campus. What can be done about it?"

How that discussion has changed in less than a decade. There was the 1993 Henry Wechsler study from Harvard showing that 44 percent of American students were binge drinking, not only highlighting a national problem but also adding a new phrase to our campus vocabulary.⁴ Thursday Kegs were banned at Duke in 1993 and our alcohol policies have been under almost continual review and revision since then.

To be honest, the most significant changes in the alcohol climate at Duke have been due more to external factors rather than to our efforts. The legal drinking age was changed to twenty one in 1986, thanks to Congress and the U.S. Department of Transportation. That which previously had been a risky behavior became a chargeable offense. Increased legal liability has motivated some national fraternities and sororities to take even stronger measures against alcohol than we have taken at Duke. Equally important is the increasing diversity of our student body with larger numbers of our students finding little meaning in an alcohol-dominated social scene.

Yet what has really changed? This September, Wechsler published a new comprehensive follow-up study of binge drinking among the nation's students after seven years of attack upon the problem. Binge drinking still hovers at about 44 percent.⁵ Here at Duke, 86 percent of our students drank alcohol in 1998. 41 percent admitted that they engaged in binge drinking, just slightly below the national average. Eighteen of our students were admitted to the Emergency Room for serious alcohol illness during the first two months of this school year; thirteen were First Year Students. Last year, 74 percent of all alcohol violations were committed by First Year Students.⁶ While arrests for disorderly conduct at Duke dropped significantly, those charged for driving while intoxicated are about five times higher in 1999 than in 1998, perhaps as a result of more campus police attention to this matter.⁷ Interim Vice President for Student Affairs, James Clack, confesses "a certain amount of dread" at the beginning of each weekend.⁸

Our university should be commended for its willingness to place this issue at the forefront of campus concern. Denial, I have found, is still prevalent among too many student administrators on too many campuses. The Division of Student Affairs, though frustrated and mostly disappointed by the results of its extensive alcohol initiatives, ought to be commended for its efforts.⁹

What remains to be done related to alcohol? Student life administrators, Duke Police, and Residence Advisors all complain that our alcohol policy is in disarray, sending mixed messages and conflicting signals to the students. We made some steps toward taking alcohol seriously but we still seem ambivalent and uncertain about the message that we want to send to our students on this issue. That which is prohibited on East Campus is condoned on West. We say we do not want underage drinking, but we distribute cups to First Year students before basketball games, knowing that they are engaging in underage drinking. Open containers are a feature of alcohol use on West, even though such consumption practices have been shown to contribute to abuse and are illegal elsewhere. We allow parties in dorms where we know that a majority of the students are underage. Quad Councils use the twenty-five dollar per semester student fee money to purchase alcohol for their parties. Our Athletic Department profits, at least indirectly, from beer advertisements during televised games. Residence Advisors complain that, when they write up a student for alcohol violations, they do not feel supported by their supervisors. "The students who abuse alcohol really feel that they can get away with anything," complained one RA. "I understand the amnesty provision [a student who is admitted to the emergency room for alcohol sickness will not be disciplined] but it's a bit strange that, if you get just sort of drunk, you can be punished. But if you get dead, dangerously drunk you will receive amnesty."

Many of our alcohol rules make sense, but, in the words of one administrator, "are a farce in their application." I have heard administrators lament the alcohol climate on campus and

in the same breath say, “Of course, we all know that the twenty-one year old restriction on drinking is stupid,” or “Alcohol laws are unenforceable on campus.”

Two First Year students, both of them abstainers, spoke of their dismay at having an Engineering professor say, at the conclusion of one Friday’s class this fall, “Be sure to come to kegs this afternoon. It’s a school tradition. Come meet other engineers and get wasted.” When one of the class members said, “But we’re freshmen. We can’t drink,” the professor replied, “Don’t most of you have fake IDs?” It is a shame that those many students (in fact, a majority of our students) who manage to blow off steam and to party enthusiastically without binge drinking receive so little support.

Alcohol abuse is symptomatic of other more subtle but nevertheless pervasive problems. Alcohol is this society’s best-loved substitute for otherwise difficult to obtain experiences

“You are coming to a great university where you can expect a great education, an exciting and enjoyable social life, and the making of friendships that will last a lifetime. Don’t mess up this opportunity by giving in to pressures to become a dangerous drinker.... If you want to major in alcohol, please go elsewhere.”

Letter to new students, August 2000

JAMES CLACK, INTERIM VICE PRESIDENT
OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

like intimacy, conviviality, joy, vulnerability, and friendship. When our students abuse alcohol they only mirror some of the worst aspects of our culture. Yet part of a university’s mission is to give talented young members of a community the means to rise above the limits of their society.

Some of our students arrive here after already having abused alcohol in high school. The students tell me that many of our students may be particularly susceptible to the lures of alcohol because many of them arrive among us socially inexperienced. Many Duke students see themselves as under tremendous pressure to perform, to reason, and to produce.

Alcohol gives some of our students, in the words of one Campus Minister, “a mini-vacation from having to be productive, successful and good.” Duke must

continue to search for alternatives to alcohol as the predominate social catalyst. Duke must be clear that alcohol abuse and violation of state alcohol laws have no value in an academic community. While our policy ought to continue to be that of either abstinence or informed, responsible, safe, legal consumption, we must have the concern for our students and the commitment to the academic mission of the university to assert zero tolerance for alcohol policy violations. Duke must not be a haven for disobeying the law nor must our policies encourage extended adolescent irresponsibility by some of our students.¹⁰

Alcohol abuse at Duke has become “A Tale of Two Campuses.” The First Year Campus on East has given us the opportunity to target the newest and most vulnerable segment of our student population for alcohol education and enforcement. However, it is somewhat bizarre that all a First Year Student need do is to board a Duke bus, take a five minute ride, and engage in all the alcohol related behavior on West that is prohibited on East. In addition, emergency room statistics and administrative reports indicate that many of our First Year students are “front loading” in their rooms before going to parties.

Our students have shown us that alcohol abuse is age-specific, a greater problem for our younger than our older students. Alcohol dominated socializing is not a problem for the majority of our students. It is not enough to say, “our students ought to behave like responsible adults.” They are not yet adults and have shown that they do not function well in

an environment where there is unlimited access to alcohol. If twenty-one is the age for consumption, that is the law. Parental notification for serious alcohol violations makes sense. As MIT recently discovered, parents hold the university accountable for alcohol related tragedies and so do the courts.

We have made some positive steps toward making students responsible and accountable for their actions, steps such as the breakage fees and Saturday clean-up of excessive refuse in the common rooms after Friday parties. In general, our goal ought to be, not to make our campus a haven of privilege and irresponsibility, but rather a space that is relatively congruent with the “real world” outside our campus. Even better, we ought to be a school that models experiments in community and human interaction that the world outside Duke has not the resources to imagine.

Life Together

Duke sometimes ought to remind itself of what a distinctive view it has of higher education in insisting, from our beginning, that the best undergraduate education was residential education. The current national trend is toward commuter colleges and students living off campus. Duke still believes, or ought to believe, that the sort of dramatic human transformation that liberal education is meant to be takes place best in a residential college community of scholars.

I believe that much of the widely lamented lack of civility and the poor social climate on campus are directly related to problems in our residential life patterns. We have transferred most of our campus living problems to the Sophomore Year. About February, First Year Students become consumed with, “How to avoid Trent.” Groups of friends made on East disintegrate. People either feel driven toward a fraternity or other selective housing, or else frantically attempt to assemble a “block” for Trent. For some, being relegated to Edens, outside a block, can be even worse than Trent, for at least Trent gives students the possibility of rooming near a group of friends. Duke’s highly touted goal of “diversity,” the great achievement of our Office of Undergraduate Admissions, disintegrates as students hunker down with their few friends for the rest of their years here.

I would like to see consideration given to creating an all-Sophomore Main West to build on the community cultivation that occurred during the first year experience. Such a campus would enable us to challenge the sense of entitlement of some of the unproductive West Campus groups and continue a strong sense of community that was formed on East. It would enable us to expand and to continue some of the student advising process that began on East with our Faculty-in-Residence and Faculty Associates program, advising that is now virtually absent on Central or West.

Last year, 35.2 percent of African-American students, 19.9 percent of Asian students, and only 12.1 percent of white students lived on Central Campus. We tend to stress diversity in admissions and in our curriculum but not in our student living arrangements. A large proportion of our student body eats, sleeps, and lives with a minimum of contact with the rest of the school. The new Edens-West Link dorm hopes to create four modules, of about one hundred students each that will provide increased options for community on campus. Surely this is a step in a good direction.

Statistics indicate that we are becoming, to a great degree, a campus for First Year and Sophomore students. Many Juniors go abroad. Many of our Juniors and Seniors obtain off

campus housing. In 1993, 71 percent of Seniors lived on campus. This fall, 58 percent have on campus housing. Our Sophomore through Senior on campus residents have dropped from 85 percent in 1993 to 79 percent in 2000. When a student says that the sorry set of apartments in a decaying home off East¹¹ is, “my best residential experience at Duke since my freshman year,” something is wrong. In numerous ways, I believe that campus life today is suffering due to a drop in upperclass student presence on campus. We ought to take steps

“While I encounter in my classes each year a nexus of extraordinary students who keep me teaching, I likewise encounter.... the stunned or blank faces of students who exhibit a minimum of preparation or willingness for what I think of as the high delight and life-enduring pleasure of serious conversation in the classroom and elsewhere.”

December 1992, Founder's Day

REYNOLDS PRICE, JAMES B. DUKE
PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH

to keep upperclass students on campus including some level of seniority and selectivity in campus housing for Juniors and Seniors.

Some charged my last report with being anti-fraternity. Others said that I was not nearly negative enough about this historic living pattern at Duke. I do not believe that the thirty-eight percent of our students who participate in Greek life are at the root of all of our social problems.¹² Frankly, after extended conversations with students, with the counselors of Counseling and Psychological Services, and others, I believe that loneliness, fragmentation, and lack of community are greater risks for some of our students than unproductive groups. A student without friends and a network of support ought to be more a concern to us than a student who is located in an unproductive

or poorly led group.¹³ There is important work that young men can do in an all-male living group.¹⁴

I believe that we need more selective housing, rather than less. Fraternities can be complimented by more competition. And both selective houses and fraternities need more support and guidance. Our current annual review program for fraternities is not enough. The present system of fraternity annual review puts its stress upon sanctions and punishment rather than guidance and reward. The university ought to be willing not only to punish unproductive and detrimental groups but also to reward groups (with better housing, waved usage fees, etc.) that make positive contributions to our campus environment. It is difficult, in this culture, to get people together, to form a coherent, diverse, productive group. I have visited selective houses at Duke that have all of the negative characteristics of the worst fraternity at Duke, combined with a lack of any of the nationally imposed standards and guidance that many fraternities enjoy. It is too tempting to blame fraternities for anything that we do not like about social life at Duke. Little is to be gained by eliminating a major component of campus social life. Much is to be gained by augmenting and diversifying social life options.

In providing housing for groups, Duke has the authority to demand certain standards, to evaluate which groups it privileges with the best housing and which it does not. Fraternities do not need the very best housing on West. A person ought to join a fraternity because the student is truly committed to the ideals and purposes of fraternity life, not simply as a means to choice housing. At the same time, I would like to see better support, education, rewards, and guidance for those selective and Greek officers who are attempting to lead their groups well. John Hawkins' “Leadership Edge,” program in the fraternities is the sort of resource

that ought to be expanded in order to make the small group residential experience at Duke more educationally valuable.¹⁵

Wandering about campus on recent evening weekends, I was impressed by the difference in the environment that I remembered on West in 1993. There are fewer parties, an absence of kegs, and less visible rowdiness. The amount and the availability of alcohol have been reduced.

However there has been an increase in off campus parties, in the houses that students rent off East and in rented facilities about town.¹⁶ I am uncertain whether or not this is a positive development. On the one hand I find the off campus party locations, such as the restaurants that students rent after hours, to be attractive and safe places for parties, far better than the grim, dangerously overcrowded common rooms. On the other hand I share some students' concern that we are simply watching as our problems move "out of sight and out of mind" as more parties move off campus. The argument that, "If we are forced to party off campus we will get in cars and drive drunk and kill people," is a sad indictment of themselves that students should not want to make. If there are students who are so thoughtless and irresponsible as to drive under the influence, these students need dramatic and forceful attention from their fellow students and the university.

We ought to do all we can to promote on-campus social life. Many note the need for clean, attractive, safe facilities on campus, separate from the residence halls, where parties can be held with or without alcohol. We have a major need for social and meeting space that is affordable and accessible to students.¹⁷ Weekend parties in the common rooms of the dorms are often dangerously crowded. The space is cramped, unattractive, too close to the sleeping and living areas, and not designed for large parties. Widespread overconsumption of alcohol at a party that is held only a few feet from student rooms (including the consumption that occurs in the rooms themselves) is dangerous. Alcohol ought to be banned from parties near residential areas. However, such a ban can work only after we have insured that we have adequate social areas elsewhere.

Nearly all groups on campus report frustration in finding suitable meeting and party space on campus. From what I observed on campus, we badly need

"It is clear that students are spending less time studying and in class than recent generations. For example, take my university. In 1968, classes took place six days of the week. Students were required to take 124 credits for graduation. For students in the humanities and social sciences (where laboratory sessions are uncommon and a typical class has three hours of lecture per week), 124 credits amounted to about fifteen to sixteen hours per week in class plus required courses in physical education. For those in the sciences, required laboratory sessions increased the class hour load an additional two hours. During the period 1968 to 1986 the number of class hours per week required for graduation was reduced to about thirteen for those in the humanities and social sciences and to about fifteen for those in the sciences. Since the 1980's it has been very common for students to have two to three courses of advanced placement from high school. So students only need to enroll in twelve hours of class per week in the social sciences and slightly more in the sciences. All in all, student class hours required for graduation have been reduced by about 20 to 25 percent.... In the 1960's, students referred to Duke,...as the "Gothic Rock Pile." Nowadays, students affectionately refer to the university as the "Gothic Wonderland."

Gone for Good: Tales of University Life after the Golden Age, 1999

STUART ROJSTACZER
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF CIVIL AND
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING

alternative social opportunities in the critical 10 p.m. to 2 a.m. time frame. There ought to be a wider range of social options. While it is not for Student Affairs to plan these events, we must encourage, through funding and space allocation, groups that specialize in non-alcohol dominated social life. The Hideaway has a monopoly on late night social space on West. There, alcohol is consumed in an ugly environment without food and with less than careful enforcement of alcohol regulations. Why cannot we create late-night, social and eating alternatives in the Bryan Center? On a campus where, according to Counseling and Psychological Services, eating disorders are a serious problem, involving more of our students in self-destructive behavior even than bingeing on alcohol, the appearance and arrangement of dining and social space is no minor issue.

We have moved our First Year Students to East, but then we make it extremely difficult for groups to find space to hold meetings there. The Catholics, our largest single religious group on campus, have been driven off East not only by a lack of suitable space but also by the refusal of administrators on East to permit them to schedule weekly gatherings there. Groups that are non-residential have a difficult time finding and scheduling space anywhere. Our campus is a conglomeration of tiny fiefdoms in which each department controls the meeting rooms within its area, with a confusing mass of conflicting rules and policies. A group or department's "ownership" over some spaces leads to poorly utilized space. Campus Ministers, in attempting to find meeting space for religious gatherings, report that space location is their greatest difficulty in ministry at Duke. We need a central space scheduling mechanism that would encourage students to have gatherings on campus in safe, attractive, appropriate settings.

Let Duke Be Duke, Again

Students tend to think of the changes that have taken place at Duke in the past eight years as a contest between "Old Duke" and "New Duke," the old, fun Duke and the new politically correct, dry, ridden with rules Duke. Some students feel that the Administration is taking them somewhere new that they do not want to go, recreating Duke into the image of some college in the Northeast that Duke is not.

Two points could be made in response to the "Old Duke," "New Duke" dichotomy. *First*, many of the changes that have occurred have been in response to student demand. I was struck, in working on my first report, how many students were dissatisfied with the social and community life at Duke. The "We work hard, we play hard," mentality so highly touted by some, meant a limited, alcohol, fraternity dominated social scene to others, particularly many women and ethnic minority students. Increasing numbers of our students wanted changes to be made.

I presupposed that I was addressing my first report to faculty and administrators. To my surprise, around two hundred students took the trouble to pick up the report and read and respond to it, most of them with encouraging letters saying, "Duke ought to change." So not every student was content with the social climate at Duke, particularly that ethnically diverse proportion of our student body that was growing in numbers.

The primary influence on students' criticism of the social life at Duke is our Office of Undergraduate Admissions. There is a "New Duke," not just because we got a new President, but also because we are continually refreshed by new students who have different goals and expectations for their years here than a previous generation of students had for theirs.

Students receiving financial aid doubled from 20 to 40 percent during the Brodie years. Our percentage of Latino students increased 42 percent since 1991. Our percentage of Asian students increased 50 percent in the same period, with our percentage of African-Americans rising slightly.¹⁸ The changing ethnic composition of our student body impacts student expectations for their campus life.

I may be wrong, but I have felt, in my contact with students this fall, some distinct differences between the Class of '04 and recent graduating classes. They seemed to me, and to some other observers, less pessimistic about their prospects after Duke, less cynical about the system, not overly troubled by the future, though somewhat disengaged from their world, at times a bit too pleased by the status quo. Whoever they are, they are different from their predecessors. There must always be a “New Duke” if what happens here is to be relevant to the educational needs of a new generation of students.

Second, from one point of view “New Duke” may be an attempt to recover the best of “Old Duke.” James B. Duke and William Preston Few conceived of Duke as an academic village where there was diverse opportunity for one generation to interact with another, where novice adults and more seasoned adults would be joined in passing on the wisdom of the past and creating insight for the future.

In my last report, I noted the lack of adult presence on campus after dark and on weekends. I am sad to say that this is little improved in the intervening years, despite some modest attempts to encourage more faculty and adults to be on campus.

When adults were removed from the dorms (the either beloved or vilified “house mothers” of the old Women’s Campus), when graduate students and nursing students were moved and Duke became an exclusively undergraduate campus after dark and on weekends, something was lost. This is not the Duke envisioned by our founders, but rather a place where adolescents are abandoned to their own devices during some of the most important hours of the day and everyone else commutes.

Quality faculty-student interaction outside the classroom is a difficult goal to attain. Sometimes our students are not as eager as they claim to have more contact with the faculty. Many of our faculty are hired and promoted with little reference to the quality of their teaching and their ability to facilitate the positive transformation of undergraduates. “Actual teaching ability is an insignificant factor in the promotion and tenure process for Duke faculty,” says more than one observer. Though the Academic Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Provost may vigorously deny this charge, the impression is widely prevalent that teaching and student interaction are poorly rewarded among Duke faculty. We badly need a program of systematic peer evaluation of teaching at Duke, something beyond the current student evaluation forms.¹⁹

Our President, in this year’s address to the faculty, said it well: “A central goal of [the strategic plan] is to reaffirm the deep historic commitment of Duke University to the education of undergraduates.... This requires that we refuse to bring to Duke professors who regard teaching as a burden, or to create an incentive structure that assures promising potential faculty members that they will have little or no teaching of undergraduates.” At the same time the President wants us to honor our commitment to recruit and retain “highly regarded researchers.”²⁰ I believe that, with our resources, and our commitments, it is not unrealistic for us to be the sort of school where research and teaching are combined for the ultimate good of undergraduate education.

During the Brodie years, the faculty was increased, reducing the student to faculty ratio from 13:1 to 11:1. Now it stands at almost 9:1. The interdisciplinary FOCUS program is a rewarding experience for many of our students who participate in its 13 programs, but also leads to disappointment at the significantly lower quality of faculty-student interaction in subsequent years. Academic support services for students have expanded over the last decade and we are doing a better job of advisor training and assessing advisor effectiveness. I noted far fewer complaints about academic advising in my conversations with students for this report than with the last.

On the other hand I heard widespread criticism of the Faculty Associates Program. It functions somewhat on East, but not at all on West. The Faculty-in-Residence Program is also much ridiculed by the students. A few of the fourteen faculty in that program are noted for their student interaction, but not all. We expect too little of that program. The faculty in the program seem to have minimal expectations placed upon them (considering the cost of the apartments that they are given) and, in some cases, demonstrate the real difficulty many of us faculty have in relating to students in contexts outside the classroom. I would almost like to insist that the new Vice President for Student Affairs ought to live on campus. However, I believe that we need more administrative attentiveness to the direction, coordination, and oversight of Student Affairs by this person, oversight that could be weakened if the Vice President is too enmeshed in student residential life.²¹

What we must admit is that far too much responsibility for student life is placed upon the shoulders of the Residence Advisors and the Area Coordinators. Women students seem to have too few role models in our residential life leadership in the dorms. Funding ought to be found now to implement the long discussed proposal to place adults in the dormitories, though my primary concern would be to get more faculty on campus, not just Student Affairs personnel. Furthermore, we must find ways to reward faculty who have the gifts and the inclination to interact with our students outside the classroom.

We continue to live with the sad results of the poor decision, made during the Seventies, to make the faculty and staff homes along Campus Drive into offices. These houses are not only poorly suited for offices but are also the major, central, historic means of insuring adult presence on campus at Duke. Restoring faculty and administrators to the houses on campus and recovering these houses as homes would send a strong message to our students and to administrators that Duke values student residential life. It is sad that we are currently building yet another new dorm with only a small apartment attached for one person rather than a facility for a faculty family to live in the dorm.

We could do more to encourage faculty and staff to be on campus at night and on weekends. The Duke Food Service ought to devise ways whereby faculty could eat more economically on campus. For instance, it takes a flat fee of about ten dollars for one person to eat in the East Campus Marketplace. Why doesn't the Oak Room take reservations in the evenings? The Wilson Center charges faculty a usage fee and prohibits faculty from having lockers to store athletic equipment overnight. To my knowledge, nothing is done to encourage faculty to participate in the intramural recreation program. Professor Ben Ward's interaction with the Pitch Forks and Professor Rodney Wynkoop's travel with the Duke Chorale are models for the rest of us faculty in their intense interaction with students outside the limits of the classroom. The university ought to look for ways to give faculty and staff encouragement to be on campus rather than placing boundaries between them and the

campus. All university personnel, particularly those in food service and housekeeping, ought to be encouraged to interact with our students. The President ought to keep articulating the theme that every adult working on campus, regardless of position, is an educator. Students are the major reason why we are here.

Duke University was founded and designed on the principle that student residential life was essential to the achievement of higher education. We have invested a fortune in this undertaking. But we endanger this vision and this heritage in our creation of a campus where there is minimal adult presence and where increasing numbers of our students are allowed to live off campus.

Duke ought to decide that we want again to be a college where student residential life is considered to be the primary component of a Duke education. A major, relatively new development is the loss of upperclassmen in campus life. The Junior Year Abroad draws many of our students away, for good purposes. But then few desire to return to the dorms their Senior Year and few are active in campus organizations. When campus groups like fraternities and sororities become primarily First Year and Sophomore student organizations, there is a loss to both students and to Duke.

There appears to be no policy, once the new dorms are completed, to encourage, indeed insist, that all students ought to live on campus at Duke except for extenuating circumstances.²² We need that commitment to residential college life.

Ethics

Curriculum 2000 in Trinity College of Arts and Sciences (the only major full-scale curriculum revision in an American research university in recent years) provides much encouragement for students to engage in service and to consider ethical issues. The two-course Ethical Inquiry requirement is portrayed as an opportunity for our students to ponder their own ethical systems and choices, but not to inculcate a specific ethical system or membership in an ethical community, which I find a bit strange.

The First-Year Writing Program has an ethical component designed and guided through the Kenan Ethics Program.²³ The Hart Leadership Program of the Sanford Institute gives our students some excellent experience in civic engagement. The Kenan Ethics Program has now made scores of campus grants for programs, research, and projects on moral deliberation and social responsibility. The new service-learning program is an excellent way for our students to gain practical experience in civic virtue.

At this point efforts have been mostly initiatives with little assessment of effectiveness. However, I am skeptical that our new curriculum's stress upon values, methods of discernment, and ethical reasoning skills will be an adequate substitute for a campus-wide debate over *which* ethics are worth having in the first place. I question the worth of a conception of ethics as principles, values, and rules detached from a community that makes

“I have selected Duke University as one of the principal objects of this trust because I recognize that education, when conducted along sane and practical, as opposed to dogmatic and theoretical lines, is, next to religion, the greatest civilizing influence. I request that.... great care and discrimination be exercised in admitting as students only those whose previous record shows a character, determination and application evincing a wholesome and real ambition for life.”

Indenture establishing The Duke Endowment

JAMES B. DUKE, DECEMBER 11, 1924

our principles, values, and rules make sense. Ethics worthy of the name is more than a method of thought; it is a body of commitment, an attempt to be part of some community that values certain behaviors over others.

It is not enough to stress vague and allegedly universally agreeable “values.” We must decide what we value and what sort of lives we want to have.²⁴ Alcohol abuse and smoking may not indicate a need for better rules or for an abstract discussion of desirable values. These problems call for the development of better character. I am pleased to see that the national debate on these subjects seems to be switching from “values” to “character.”²⁵ Yet here again, it is one thing to admit that we are in the character formation business and quite another to assert, *which* character is worth having.²⁶

I remember vividly a wonderful evening in which, at the invitation of the Honor Council, Stanley Hauerwas, professor in the Divinity School, gave a talk, “Why Cheating Is Worse Than Murder at Duke.”²⁷ Hauerwas asserted that, in an academic community like Duke, we can forgive murder but cheating is an attack upon our whole rationale for being here, an assault upon the trust that is necessary for us to work together as scholars.²⁸ President Keohane made a somewhat similar point in her editorial on “a university bound together by honor.”²⁹ I applaud these efforts to show students that the nature of our academic community is such that a peculiar ethic arises out of who we are as a community and who we hope to be.

If alcohol is the great shortcut to being the sort of person who is able to create and to enjoy friendship, music, conversation, and sex, then it is fitting for a community of higher education to consider overconsumption of alcohol to be an attack upon the very substance of our life together. If smoking is an act of resolute ignorance in the face of the facts, an arrogant invitation to slow self-destruction of an otherwise talented and gifted mind and body, then we are not being moralistic or prudish to do all in our power to deter our particularly talented students from such practice.

An Academic Issue

We continue to regard alcohol abuse, smoking, eating disorders, race, gender, and religious prejudice and other troubling aspects of student behavior outside the classroom as the exclusive concern of the Division of Student Affairs. In my last report I suggested that alcohol is also an academic issue. “If a student can abuse alcohol and still earn a high GPA,” said one assistant dean of student life, “the student is either a genius or the faculty are wimps.”

In conversation with a student who had been disciplined once for violation of alcohol rules and who readily admitted getting “wasted about every weekend,” the student said, “But, hey, who’s to care? I’ve got a 3.2 in Public Policy.”³⁰

A tiny fraction of our classes meet on Friday afternoons. Our classroom buildings are virtually unused by us faculty from noon on Fridays until noon on Mondays. We have generously structured our financial aid so that few of our students must work in order to pay for Duke. A root cause of alcohol abuse and weekend rowdiness is not difficult to discover. We faculty have created a world for our students where they have too little to do, too much discretionary time, and too little accountability for haphazard academic performance.

“I have learned the hard way,” said a colleague in the basic sciences, “not to give a quiz and not to expect too much from students on a Monday.” Perhaps if we faculty expected more on a Monday, we would have less so-called student life problems on Saturday.

We know that we lose several academically talented students each year who transfer from Duke because of dissatisfaction with the campus climate after five in the evening and on weekends. In conversations with students, one hears widespread dissatisfaction with the campus social scene from African-American and Asian-American students, many of whom Duke has gone to great effort to recruit. In all these ways, our campus social life is working at cross purposes with many of our academic goals.

We have become a university that prides itself on the high and rigorous academic and intellectual demands that we make upon applicants for admission. Do those demands continue throughout the student's career? The gap between the expectations for say, students in Engineering and some students in Trinity College can be wide.

"I fear that we are in danger of making American universities like those in Japan," said a colleague in Engineering. "Hell to get in but, once you're in, you are left alone to have one hell of a good time!"

Furthermore, we faculty say that we believe that it is important to place academic and intellectual demands upon our students, but we have been reluctant and ambivalent about making rigorous behavioral demands upon them. We changed the title to Office of Student *Development* in order to recognize that we are busy moving our students, at a crucial point in their young lives, from one point to another. We are not just providing them expensive information. Duke has a higher vision for itself than that of the new "click university."³¹ We are developing them into better persons than they would have been if they had not come to Duke. The Interim Vice President for Student Affairs has done an admirable job in stressing to his staff that everyone in Student Affairs is an educator, that education is the main thing we do at Duke, and that we are called to more than merely the skillful administration of student desires. We are called to transform incredibly talented young people into better adults than they would be if they had not been here among us.

The new emphasis upon the Honor Code is but one step, albeit a significant one, in the right direction. We must do more. Many of us faculty and administrators are children of the Sixties, those whose undergraduate slogans were, "Do your own thing," and "Never trust anyone over thirty," and "Stay out of our lives." We may therefore be reluctant to acknowledge that a new generation of students requires a new pedagogy. Our current generation of students, in my estimation, yearns for more adult interaction, is engaged in a quest for family, parents, mentors, and other experiences that they feel that our generation has neglected.

Furthermore, our competitive academic environment encourages a culture in which "my responsibilities never extend beyond my own life." As research on our Honor Code indicates, our students may feel high honor standards themselves, but have little sense of responsibility for judging or improving the behavior of others. This leads to a climate of moral isolation in which my sole concern is my life with little attention to any common good.

A number of Student Development personnel, who have had experience at other institutions, claim that we are a decade behind other schools in setting clearly articulated, evenly enforced standards for student behavior on campus. Perhaps we have been slow to assume appropriate responsibility for the social and moral development of our students.

New Duke

Our past teaches us that our university was created to be more than a mere knowledge

factory, or an expensive place for the retrieval of information. Information is a mere commodity; people are more. We must never get beyond being a college, a collection of colleagues who have as a common good our mutual growth in erudition. At our worst, we have allowed the modern research university's definition of itself to corrupt our more noble originating purposes of the liberal education of the young. At our worst, we have degenerated into a very expensive, extremely complex system for the production of and the traffic in knowledge.³² Our great purpose is not the accumulation of knowledge but erudition. We are called as a university to the task of developing people, of increasing the wisdom of a new generation, of pioneering those new forms of community for which our society yearns.

The university is more than a place where people get their needs met or have their desires fulfilled. We are also a community that cultivates needs worth having and that transforms our desires. We were meant to be a locus for transformation, a privileged place where talented young adults become considerably more interesting human beings than they would have been if they had been left to their own devices. Be well assured that we are transforming our students into something during their time here. At our worst we merely affirm their

“The mission of Duke University is.... to provide superior liberal education to undergraduate students, attending not only to their intellectual growth and but also to their development as adults committed to high ethical standards and full participation as leaders in their communities;...to promote a sincere spirit of tolerance, a sense of the obligations and rewards of citizenship, and a commitment to learning, freedom and truth.”

*“The Mission of Duke University”
September 1994*

tendency to be somewhat savvy consumers, or simply give them their ticket to power in a lucrative profession. Surely this is a perversion of the term *higher* education.

A university as good as Duke aspires to be must always be attacking itself, must be forever criticizing itself because it is that place where one generation tells another what it knows in order that the next generation may create a better world than the one in which we presently live. Here in this bucolic setting, a revolution is taking place, in which the best and the brightest are given what they need to lead a society with great resources and with large needs.

We may attempt to avoid having a debate over what sort of persons our students are becoming, but debate or not, our campus life is contributing to and confirming of certain sorts of behavior, certain traits

of character. Will the transformation worked here be worthy of the resources we have committed to this enterprise? Certain faculty may be uneasy with talk of ethical formation and character development, but they must admit that ethical inculcation occurs here whether we want to take responsibility for it or not. What are the basic expectations for student behavior on campus? When has a student, through his or her actions, earned removal from our community? What behavior is rewarded and confirmed by our administration of campus policies? What models of adult life are given to our students to emulate? These are deeply academic, intellectual questions that ought to be put before the faculty.

Reporting on twenty years of research into how college transforms, or fails to transform students, Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini noted that those factors that the university advertises as significant — selective admissions, institutional reputation, technological resources — help people get good jobs but do little to improve a student's character or ability to think. Student development tends to be relational. It is not a solo enterprise. Real

transformation requires personal faculty attention to the student, heavy student involvement in campus groups, learning to work together with other students to achieve common goals, and other factors that are the concern of this report and typify Duke at its best.³³

I wonder if student life administrators focus too much upon that minority of our students who abuse alcohol or otherwise misbehave. More effort ought to be spent in supporting that majority of students, perhaps growing in number, whose behavior is congruent with the noble purposes of higher education. Some of our students act in ways that are irresponsible and dangerous. Far more of them give thousands of hours of community service, celebrate exuberantly and creatively at parties, enjoy membership in fraternities, make wondrous music, participate in the more than seventy campus Bible study groups, make friendships that will last a lifetime, and, in impressive ways, are beginning to make the world a better place than they found it.³⁴

The move to place the Student Affairs budget under the Office of the Provost seemed to me like a step in the right direction of better linking student life and academic life. However, some in Student Affairs wonder if the Provost has the resources truly to lead in the area of student residential life. There is a plan to continue to increase the Provost's budget over time. I am told that studies with other institutions indicate that, comparatively, our Student Affairs offices are fairly well funded. Perhaps more consideration needs to be given, not to an increase in funds, but to different allocation of funds. Available funds have been used to fund administrators of rules rather than adult presence with the students on campus.

Budget allocation issues are just one of the concerns that come to the forefront as we move toward the appointment of a new Vice President for Student Affairs. I have found widespread agreement, within Student Affairs and without, that we suffer, in student life, from a lack of leadership in Student Affairs. Too often, policy is made on the basis of consensus, assuming that everyone must agree on a policy before it can be implemented. I also found that those who make decisions and who implement policy on student life do not feel that they have the support of the university administration.

"We need *leadership* in this area more than agreement," said one assistant dean for student development. There is definitely the feeling that we have been over managed and under led in our student affairs administration. Furthermore, there is the impression that student life administrators have not had the confidence and the full support of the university administration.

In visits to other campuses, I frequently hear this complaint. Administrators in student life seem, nearly everywhere, to feel under appreciated, understaffed, and misunderstood. Too often, presidents, provosts, and other university administrators have little real knowledge of and interest in student residential life issues. Therefore, I believe that a major priority in our search for a new Vice President for Student Affairs is to find someone who is a leader and someone in whom the university administration can have the greatest confidence.³⁵ That person must be an educator, a person who not only leads student life, but also who motivates the faculty to be active in student life.

Eight years ago I spoke about a university that tends to focus on "means without ends," a university without a clear sense of its mission, its ultimate end for its existence. We must be clear about our core values. Those values must be clearly articulated by our leaders and administrative policy must confirm those values. There is a great gap between Duke today, as articulated on the bronze plaque at the main West Campus bus stop, and our current

confusion about who we are. It is a gap not only of seventy-five years but also of conviction. James B. Duke clearly had a vision of our university as having a mission to transform the lives of society's future leaders. I appeal for a renewed sense of confidence in our mission to inculcate and to encourage those traits of character that are part of being a community of scholars who feel an obligation to contribute to the betterment of humanity. The issue is not if our students are worse or better in their behavior than students on other campuses. The issue is, how can Duke be true to its originating purpose of leadership in undergraduate residential, liberal education?

Let Duke be Duke, let the New Duke be the best of Old Duke: young, brash, outrageously ambitious, bold to lead, forever renewing, ceaselessly committed to the high vocation that is given to us in our time and place.

Endnotes

¹ See the vivid and disturbing depictions of campus life after dark in pp. 45-108 in Anne Matthews, *Bright College Years* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997).

² In this decade we have experienced a virtual revolution in student life on American campuses. We have moved from a *laissez faire* approach to student life to one in which we student life administrators have reassumed some of our responsibility for the life of students outside the classroom. Interestingly, a recent major study of the popular "U.S. News" college rankings faults the rankings for not attempting to measure the main thing that matters to students — student experience of campus life. See Leo Reisberg, "Independent Report in 1997 Assailed Substance of 'U.S. News' College Rankings," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (August 28, 2000).

³ I distributed at least two hundred copies of "We Work Hard, We Play Hard," in addition to articles on the report in *About Campus* (October 1997), *The Christian Century* (September 1996) and *Omega: The Magazine of Sigma Chi* (Winter, 1996–97). During the past decade, five Duke Professors published books on students in higher education: William H. Willimon and Thomas Naylor, *The Abandoned Generation: Rethinking Higher Education* (Grand Rapids: Erdmanns, 1995); Stuart Rojstaczer, *Gone for Good* (New York: Oxford, 1999); and P. Aarne Vesilind, *So You Want to Be a Professor? A Handbook for Graduate Students* (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2000); Jane P. Tompkins, *A Life in School: What the Teacher Learned* (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1996).

⁴ I agree with those who question the value of Wechsler's definition of "binge drinking," because it implies uncontrollable, excessive episodes, and because Wechsler's definition fails to take account of the weight of the student and whether or not the student had eaten, and so forth. However, arriving at a precise definition of how much alcohol is too much is not as important as admitting that we have a problem with too many students who drink too much too often. Henry Wechsler, Jae Eun Lee, Meichun Kuo, Hang Lee, "College Binge Drinking in the 1990s: A Continuing Problem," *Journal of American College Health*, vol. 48 (March 2000), pp. 199–210.

⁵ A 1999 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study of 128 schools in 39 states showed that the number of binge drinkers rose from 19.3 percent in 1993 to 22.7 percent in 1999. Yet there was also an increase in the number of abstainers from 15.4 percent to 19.2 percent. Moderate drinkers appear to have declined from 40.1 percent to 36.6 percent. What do these numbers say to a campus that has a policy, as best I can understand our policy, of encouraging moderate, sensible, informed, safe alcohol consumption?

⁶ “Alcohol Still Plays a Big Role in Campus Social Scene,” *The Chronicle* (August 25, 2000), p. 8.

⁷ “Numbers Show Drop in Campus Crime,” *The Chronicle*, August 25, 2000, p. 12. In the past couple of years, nationwide, campus alcohol and drug violations have soared. Alcohol arrests increased 24.3 percent in 1998, the largest increase in seven years. Many alcohol critics say this confirms their data that alcohol abuse continues to rise, though many campus law enforcement officials say the rise is due to more strict enforcement and different reporting procedures. See “Arrests at Colleges Surge for Alcohol and Drug Violations,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 6, 2000).

⁸ “Alcohol Numbers Remain Significant,” *The Chronicle*, October 18, 2000, p. 1.

⁹ The book, *Buzzed*, written by Kuhn, Swartzwelder, and Wilson of the Duke Medical Center is an excellent resource on substance abuse. It was distributed this year to all Area Coordinators and Resident Advisors. The training of fraternity event monitors, the dramatic film “Wasted Youth,” as well as the extensive Residence Hall Alcohol Awareness Program are all evidence that the Office of Student Development has a strong commitment to changing the campus culture of alcohol abuse. I feel that the need now is not for more programs but for a transformed social climate on campus where there is adequate space and appropriate encouragement for social events that are not dominated by alcohol. Of course, the programs may be useful in changing that climate. On increasing numbers of campuses, there are a number of initiatives that attempt to change students’ “social norms” in regard to alcohol, smoking, and sexual safety. See “Colleges Use Peer Pressure to Encourage Healthy Behavior,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 28, 2000). I am suspicious of some of the “social norms” approaches to alcohol abuse. Any program related to student alcohol consumption and funded by Anheuser-Busch ought to be suspect. See “On Many Campuses, Big Brewers Play a Role in New Alcohol Policies,” *The Wall Street Journal*, November 2, 2000.

¹⁰ For instance, I understand that Southern Methodist University punishes a first alcohol offense with a \$100 fine plus mandatory alcohol education. If there is a second offense, the student is prohibited from participating in fraternity or sorority rush.

¹¹ Where, by the way, they must clean up after themselves, obey city laws, and have other demands that we tend to protect them from in campus housing.

¹² I consider the *Chronicle* editorial, “The Greeks Must Go,” to be misguided, simplistic, and poorly reasoned, though motivated by the best intentions. By the way, in the *Chronicle* we have a publication that, under the plea of freedom of the press, functions with virtually no accountability or responsibility to the institution in which it is housed. Who oversees the *Chronicle*’s budget? Duke organizations and departments are forced to pay thousands of dollars every year to buy advertising space, often because of the *Chronicle*’s refusal to cover their events and concerns. While fraternities ought to be more accountable and could contribute more to student life, so could the vast resources of the *Chronicle*.

¹³ Fraternities by no means have a monopoly on unproductive, poorly led groups.

¹⁴ I agree with those observers who predict continued difficulties in the matriculation, graduation, and participation of men on campus. In their book on the present student generation, *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), Neil Howe and William Strauss say that the problems of male students adapting and thriving in campus life are “the biggest change I’ve seen on campuses in 33 years.”

¹⁵ See the recommendations in Thomas J. Balistreri, “Young Men, Hazing, Fraternities and What Universities Can Do,” from tom@passagetransformation.com.

¹⁶ During the past decade there has been a rather dramatic move off campus for social events at many colleges and universities. This move is documented and discussed by Arthur Levine and Jeanette S. Cureton, *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today’s College Student* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998), pp. 101–103.

¹⁷ I am pleased that Dean Wasiolek is chairing a Task Force on Social Space. I am also pleased to note that a stack of floors in the new Tower between the new dorms and Edens will be student activity space. The dormitory and fraternity common rooms are mostly unused except for a few times a week when they are often used for purposes (parties with large groups) for which they are poorly suited. We do not simply need more activity space; we need space that is appropriate for the activity.

¹⁸ At about 10 percent, our percentage of African Americans is among the highest of America's elite universities.

¹⁹ Lawrence Evans, "Monsters I Helped Create: The Green Forms," *Faculty Forum*, Vol. 12, No. 1, Sept. 15, 2000, pp. 2–3.

²⁰ "Keohane on University's Strategic Plan," *Dialogue*, October 27, 2000.

²¹ Some years ago Warren Bennis noted how university administrators sometimes become so enmeshed in the life of the institution, so thoroughly in touch with the students, that they become engulfed by the day-to-day problems and fail to rise above the present situation long enough to change it. We need not only knowledge of and involvement in student life. We need leadership. *Why Leaders Can't Lead: The Unconscious Conspiracy Continues* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989), pp. 59–67.

²² About 86 percent of our students currently live on campus.

²³ *Deliberations*, a magazine of student writing on ethics, funded by a grant from the Hewlett Foundation, and distributed to Duke First Year Students, is an example of the good ethical deliberation that some of our students are acquiring in the ethics writing program.

²⁴ Considering a phenomenon like the rise of student smoking on campus, one must ask whether or not our toughest task is to devise and administer new rules, or to promote more discussion of values. Rather our greatest challenge may be to ask, "Who are you and who do you hope to be?" Here is a generation that has received all of the correct information on the evils of tobacco addiction, yet increasing numbers of them (particularly women, though men still slightly outrank women as campus smokers) would rather risk addiction than not. "Tobacco Use Among American College Students Is More Prevalent Than Previously Reported," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, (August 18, 2000). See the excellent, but disturbing study of smoking among Duke women students, "Smoking Sisters: The Motivations Behind College Sorority Women's Smoking Habits." A thesis submitted by Laura Rooklin to the Department of Cultural Anthropology for Honors, Duke University, 1999.

²⁵ See Arthur J. Schwartz, "It's Not Too Late to Teach Students About Values," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 9, 2000).

²⁶ For an example of some superficial thinking on the subject of ethics in the college curriculum, see the article by Princeton's President Harold T. Shapiro, "Liberal Education, Moral Education," *Princeton Alumni Weekly* (January 27, 1999), pp. 17–21. For Shapiro, morality is a matter of "free" people making "free choices," regardless of the ends of those choices, without consideration of the communities that make those free choices make moral sense.

²⁷ The survey on academic integrity showed that, while cheating is not as bad at Duke as elsewhere, it is an issue. Forty-five percent of our students have reportedly engaged in unauthorized collaboration, thirty-seven percent have falsified lab or research data, and twenty-four percent have received help on a test from others. "Academic Integrity at Duke University," A Report on the 1999–2000 Academic Integrity Survey and Recommendations for Action. Duke University Academic Integrity Assessment Committee, 2000. Available from the Kenan Ethics Program, Duke University.

²⁸ In the subsequent discussion that night I asserted that cheating students are no worse than deceitful, under prepared faculty who deceive students into thinking that they have carefully read and graded their exams and have conscientiously prepared for their lectures.

²⁹ Nannerl Keohane, “Creating A University Bound Together By Honor,” *The Chronicle*, April 11, 2000, pg. 13. All of this honor code activity at Duke is a good beginning, but we still have a long way to go before our climate of honor will be close to that engendered by my observations of the honor codes in place at Davidson and the University of Virginia.

³⁰ See Professor Stuart Rojstaczer’s anguished reflection on grade inflation and the decline of academic rigor at Duke and elsewhere in his *Gone for Good*, Ch. 2.

³¹ This is the term given by Arthur E. Levine to the new technology dominated universities where the student’s presence on campus is irrelevant to the process of education. “The Future of Colleges: Nine Inevitable Changes,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 27, 2000). The rise of distant learning and technology dominated learning raise a basic question, says Levine, *the* basic question, “What is the purpose of higher education?”

³² See Edward Tingley, “Technicians of Learning,” *First Things* (August/September 2000), pp. 29–35.

³³ Ernest Pascarella and Patrick Terenzini, *How College Affects Students: Findings and Insights from Twenty Years of Research* (San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1991).

³⁴ For instance, the annual review process for fraternities tends to be mostly filling out forms and demonstrating that the fraternity has obeyed a list of rules. It ought to be a process of saying, “This is who we hope that your group will be and here is how we want to work with you to make that happen.”

³⁵ To the outside observer, and surely to our students who must negotiate the maze of offices, deans, and assistant deans in the Office of Student Affairs, the whole operation seems incredibly complex. There is the impression that Student Affairs has been engaged in constant reorganization for the last decade. Sometimes one wonders if the effect of all this student affairs organization and extensive office space is to impress the university and the students with the necessity for a large number of administrators whose net result is the over management of our students. While I find a minimum of faculty-student interaction I find a maximum of student-administrator interaction. In fact, the latter becomes a substitute for the former.