Report of the Task Force on Relationships between THE UNIVERSITY AND THE EATING CLUBS

Introduction

For more than a century private eating clubs — founded and operated by students and alumni — have played an integral role in undergraduate life at Princeton University. Today more than two-thirds of all juniors and seniors join the 10 clubs that currently exist, and for members and many non-members alike, the clubs play a central role in the social life of the campus.

In the spring of 2009, Princeton University President Shirley M. Tilghman and Undergraduate Student Government President Connor Diemand-Yauman ’10 began a conversation about the eating clubs and the relationships between the clubs and the University. They agreed that it was healthy to re-examine these relationships periodically to see whether they can be improved, just as the University periodically re-examines other aspects of campus life. Their conversation led them to establish a task force of students, faculty, staff and alumni to review these relationships and to “examine whether there are steps that can and should be taken to strengthen those relationships for the mutual benefit of the clubs and the University, and for the benefit of Princeton students and the undergraduate experience.”

In announcing the creation of the task force, they reaffirmed the important role the clubs play at Princeton and cited a number of positive developments in recent years. They pointed to “the increased size of the undergraduate student body, the financial challenges being faced by both the clubs and the University, and the full implementation of the four-year college system with the completion of the new Butler College dormitories,” as reasons why “this seems an especially appropriate time to ask a broadly constituted task force to conduct a wide-ranging review of relationships between the University and the clubs.”

Charge to the Task Force

The charge to the task force (see page 22) asked it specifically to consider “whether there are ways to improve the club experience for students who are members and the application process for students who wish to become members; whether there are ways to increase engagement with the clubs for students who currently choose not to become members; whether there are ways to strengthen relationships between the clubs and the colleges and between students in the clubs and students who choose not to join the clubs; whether there are additional ‘best practices’ that can and should be identified; and whether we can do a better job of describing the nature of the clubs to potential applicants and admitted students.”

Composition of the Task Force

The 18 members of the task force (see page 23) included eight undergraduates, three faculty members, five staff members (four of whom are alumni), and two alumni who chair the graduate (governing) boards of clubs. The undergraduates included Diemand-Yauman and seven other students whom he appointed following an application process during which he consulted with the chair of the Inter-Club Council (ICC), the coordinating group on which all undergraduate eating club presidents are represented. Since six of the eight students were sophomores or juniors, they will be able to continue as members of the task force if its work continues into a second year. One of the graduate board chairs, Dinesh Maneyapanda ’94 of Quadrangle, is
also the current chair of the Graduate Inter-Club Council (GICC), the coordinating body for the chairs of all 10 club graduate boards. The 18 members of the task force include current or former members of eight of the 10 clubs that currently exist, including all five of the clubs that admit members through a selection process known as bicker and three of the five that admit members on a sign-in basis.

**The Work of the Task Force**

The task force met eight times between October and April, beginning with a meeting that was joined by President Tilghman. At its first meeting working groups were established to prepare a history of the relationship between the University and the eating clubs, create a website for the task force, identify data that the task force wanted to examine, explore issues related to the admission process, and actively seek the views of a broad range of individuals and groups.

The task force learned a great deal in the course of its work, and in issuing its report it hopes to share what it learned with the broader University community (including students, faculty, staff and alumni), while also making a number of observations and recommendations that it hopes will be considered carefully by those in positions of responsibility at the University and at the clubs. As described in this report, the task force believes that the eating clubs will and should continue to play an important role in the life of the University; that there are concerns about the role of the clubs that can and should be addressed; and that a number of opportunities exist to strengthen and improve the relationships between the University and the clubs.

**The Task Force Website**

Shortly after it began meeting, the task force created a website (www.princeton.edu/ectf/) that had two purposes. One was to provide basic information about its charge, its membership and the history of the eating clubs. The second was to invite members of the University community to share their views about the issues that the task force had been asked to consider. The task force called its website “Word on the Street: a conversation on University/eating club relationships” and asked visitors to respond to four questions:

- How have you engaged with the eating clubs and what is your opinion of them?
- If you think the eating club experience can be improved, what are your suggestions?
- What is your opinion of the relationships between the eating clubs and the University? If you think the relationships could be improved, what are your suggestions?
- What topic(s) do you think the task force should focus on?

As of the writing of this report, 653 visitors had submitted comments on the website. Two things were especially striking about these comments. One was that almost all of the comments were exceedingly thoughtful and helpful, and in a later section of this report we will characterize what they had to say. The other was the degree to which they reflected the breadth of the University community. For example:

Of those who indicated class year:

- 580 gave an undergraduate class year, and of these
  - 110 were freshmen or sophomores
  - 287 were juniors or seniors
  - 183 were alumni
- 14 gave a graduate student class year, including 5 current students and 9 alumni
- Others didn’t answer the question or were faculty/staff, parents or other relatives

Of those who indicated gender, ethnicity or financial aid status:

- 51% were male and 49% were female
- 29% were minority students
- 50% received financial aid

Of all respondents, 412 indicated specific club membership. Of those who did not so indicate, most were freshmen or sophomores; some identified as independent or members of residential colleges; and a few indicated they were club members but did not indicate which club. Included in the 412 who indicated specific membership were current and former members of all 10 existing clubs plus four former clubs (Campus, Dial, DEC, Cannon). The full list of club affiliations of those who commented is on page 23.
Other Outreach

In addition to seeking comments through its website, the task force published a letter soliciting comments in the Princeton Alumni Weekly and met with 16 individuals and groups (see page 23), some more than once, to seek their views and guidance. As with the comments on the website, these conversations helped shape the agenda and deliberations of the task force.

History

The history available through the task force website (www.princeton.edu/ectf/) provides helpful context for a discussion about the current status of the clubs and their relationships with the University. We encourage readers of this report to read the full history. Before proceeding to our findings and recommendations, we want to summarize some of the most salient features of this fascinating evolution.

- In the mid-19th century, two developments led to the establishment of eating clubs at Princeton. One was the decision by the University in 1855 to discontinue all on-campus food service. The other was a vote by the trustees and faculty in 1853 to ban fraternities and require all undergraduates to pledge they would not join one. (The first fraternity at Princeton was founded in 1843 and within a few years 12 fraternities had Princeton chapters.) This prohibition remained in effect until the mid-20th century, and the penalty for a student found to be a member of a fraternity was suspension.

- Informal eating clubs began to form in 1855 and by 1876 there were 25 of them. In 1879 a group of students formed a more formal eating club which they incorporated four years later as Ivy Club and for which they built a house on Prospect Avenue. Ivy was followed by Cottage in 1886, and then in the 1890s by Tiger Inn, Cap and Gown, Colonial, Cannon and Elm.

- By the mid-1920s, all freshmen and sophomores were eating in University dining halls and about 75% of juniors and seniors were eating at 18 clubs; in the 1930s this percentage rose to 90%. By 1914 a club selection system known as “bicker” was in place, with “bicker” defined as “any talk, argument or discussion designed to induce any man to join any club,” and with students bickering in late February of sophomore year. The GICC and the ICC were created and a “Gentleman’s Agreement” was negotiated between the clubs and the University to establish expectations for behavior and oversight in the clubs. There were occasional campus protests calling for the abolition of bicker and the creation of University-managed alternatives to the clubs, but the few University initiatives of this era were short-lived.

- Bicker was in the national limelight in the 1950s, first when the Class of 1952 insisted that every sophomore who participated in bicker should receive a bid to at least one club (“100% bicker”), and then in 1958, the year of the so-called “dirty bicker,” when the concept of 100% bicker was violated as 23 students, more than half of whom were Jewish, were not chosen for any club. The commitment to 100% bicker, in an era in which sophomores bickered all the clubs and could receive bids from multiple clubs, continued into the mid-1980s, eventually giving rise to the term “hat bid” to signify the final step of the bicker process when the names of any sophomores not yet invited to join a club were put in a hat and each club took turns selecting a name to add to its list of invitees. (One alumnus in the Class of 1983 commented on the task force website: “I know we had a hat bid procedure senior year because I held the hat.”)
The 1958 dirty bicker brought about renewed calls for alternative dining and social facilities for juniors and seniors who did not join clubs. Woodrow Wilson Lodge was created in Madison Hall in 1957; in 1961 it moved to Wilcox Hall as the Woodrow Wilson Society and by the end of the decade it evolved into Princeton’s first residential college. The Madison Society was created in 1969 to allow juniors and seniors to eat dinner on the top floor of New South building. In 1969 the University reopened the former Court and Key and Seal clubs as Stevenson Hall, a non-selective dining and social facility for juniors and seniors with a faculty master. In 1970 the University established Princeton Inn College (later renamed Forbes College) as its second residential college.

In 1966 a group of student leaders proposed a modified club selection process which would have allowed students to express preferences in a procedure that also had elements of random selection. The proposal was not adopted, but shortly thereafter several clubs, beginning with Terrace in 1967, discontinued bicker and adopted sign-in policies. By the end of the 1970s, there were 13 clubs, five of which continued to bicker and eight of which admitted members on a sign-in basis. By 1970 most clubs had become coed; the three that hadn’t were challenged in a lawsuit in 1979 that led to Cottage becoming coed in 1986 and Ivy and Tiger Inn becoming coed in the early 1990s. Coeducation shifted the dynamic of Prospect Street from one in which women were present only on designated party weekends to one in which women and men ate and socialized together throughout the week. Coeducation also quickly led to the demise of the practice of prohibiting freshmen from being on the Street and in the clubs.

In 1969 the University provided funds to renovate Terrace Club and between 1970 and 1972 it assumed management of its operations. Cloister Inn closed in 1972 and reopened in 1977. Cannon Club closed in 1975. In 1988 the Cannon graduate board merged with financially troubled Dial and a year later the merger expanded to include Elm, creating an entity known as Dial-Elm-Cannon (DEC), which folded in 1998. Conversations continue with the DEC graduate board about reopening the club in the former Cannon facility. In 2005 Campus Club closed and its graduate board presented the club to the University to provide recreational, social and meeting space open to all undergraduates and graduate students; after needed renovations, Campus Club reopened in 2009.

There were four major developments in the 1980s that helped reshape the social environment for Princeton students. One was the creation in 1982 of a residential college system for all freshmen and sophomores. This had the effect of housing freshmen and sophomores in dormitories that excluded juniors and seniors (except for a handful of resident advisers). Entering students would still get to know juniors and seniors through academic work, teams and organizations, but were less likely to get to know them through casual interactions in their residences.

Another was the change in the New Jersey drinking age from 18 to 19 in 1980 and then to 21 in 1983. One consequence was the closing of a popular on-campus pub, which meant that essentially all drinking in larger settings ended up at the clubs. The change in the drinking age also seems to have led to more clandestine drinking on campus (including more drinking of hard alcohol), especially when clubs became more restrictive in their admission or serving policies and later when kegs were banned on campus.

A third development was the reintroduction to Princeton of Greek-letter fraternities, and then sororities. By 1993 fraternities and sororities were enrolling about 15% of the student body, a number that has remained fairly constant. While fraternities and sororities were initially thought to be of particular interest to students who were unfamiliar with Princeton’s social structure and traditions, in time it became clear that they were attracting many students who entered Princeton with a desire to join a particular eating club with which a particular fraternity or sorority was associated, thus creating a pipeline relationship between some of the fraternities and sororities and some of the selective clubs.

The fourth development was an evolution in the late 1980s to a bicker process in which sophomores apply to only one club. (We believe this evolution began as bicker clubs sought “evidence” that they were the first choice of their bickerees — a message delivered by bickering at only one club — and then quickly evolved, as things do at Princeton, from a practice to what many students perceive to be a “tradition.”)

In 2000 the University opened the Frist Campus Center, which includes extensive dining, social, performance and meeting spaces, along with such services as mailboxes, parcel shipping and ticket purchases. In 2009 the University completed the creation of a four-year college system in which juniors and seniors can elect to live and eat in one of three four-year colleges (Butler, Mathey, Whitman).
Basic Facts and Figures

We will not have space in this report to present all of the data that can be helpful in understanding the social climate at Princeton, but we do want to provide some of the most salient information about the choices made by juniors and seniors; the characteristics of students who participate in the clubs (and students who choose not to join the clubs); and about two recent developments that we discovered were not as well understood as they could be: changes in the University’s financial aid program to make it more possible for students on financial aid to join eating clubs and the introduction of shared meal plans that allow some juniors and seniors to be members of both a residential college and an eating club.

Student Living and Dining Choices

All freshmen and sophomores at Princeton must live on campus and are assigned to one of six residential colleges. At the beginning of spring semester of sophomore year, students choose where they will live and eat in their junior year, selecting among the following options:

- Live and eat in one of the four-year colleges; this includes students who serve as residential college advisers (RCAs).
- Join an eating club (selective or sign-in) and live in an upperclass dormitory that is not associated with a residential college.
- Live in a residential college as a member of an eating club who has a shared meal plan which allows you to eat meals in both your college and your club.
- Live in the apartment-style suites in Spelman Halls that offer four single bedrooms, a living room, a kitchen and a bathroom. (Students who are not in clubs have higher priority for drawing into Spelman suites.)
- Live in an upperclass dormitory and purchase a University meal plan.
- Live in an upperclass dormitory and join one of three co-ops where students cook for each other.
- Live in an upperclass dormitory as an “independent” with no meal plan.

Under the four-year college system, even juniors and seniors who do not live in the colleges are permitted two meals per week in the colleges at no additional cost and all juniors and seniors receive non-departmental academic advising in their college.

As indicated earlier, since the late 1980s sophomores wanting to bicker have been permitted to apply to only one club at a time. The bicker clubs typically accept 50–70% of their applicants; students who do not receive an invitation to join their desired club have the option to join any club that has not already filled its membership (typically this means a sign-in club), bicker again in the fall, or select another option. The non-selective clubs accept members on a sign-in basis until all spaces are filled and then establish wait lists if there is additional interest. In response to economic pressures, most clubs have increased their section sizes over recent decades; in most years, clubs range in total size (juniors plus seniors) from about 120 members to more than 200.

Chart 1 shows the number of juniors and seniors who in the spring have elected the various options for the years beginning in September 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010. The parenthetical numbers for clubs and shared meal plans show the number in sign-in clubs; the parenthetical number for colleges shows RCAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices for Juniors and Seniors</th>
<th>9/07</th>
<th>9/08</th>
<th>9/09</th>
<th>9/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jrs/srs in clubs (sign-in)</td>
<td>1,738(928)</td>
<td>1,689(884)</td>
<td>1,649(798)</td>
<td>1,651(819)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrs/srs in colleges (RCAs)</td>
<td>360(103)</td>
<td>371(100)</td>
<td>422(97)</td>
<td>471(86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared meal plans (sign-in)</td>
<td>89(61)</td>
<td>89(70)</td>
<td>117(90)</td>
<td>133(106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrs/srs in Spelman</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrs/srs in dorms with meal plan</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrs/srs in co-ops</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jrs/srs independent</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students listed on the chart with shared meal plans are listed both as students in clubs and students in colleges. Some students in Spelman are also listed as students in clubs since some four-person groups in Spelman include a mix of independents and club members. Independents in Spelman and students in co-ops are also included as independents.

The distribution of students seems to be stabilizing at expected levels. The colleges and Spelman are at or close to capacity and no additional co-ops are currently planned. The number of club members seems to be holding steady in both the selective and the sign-in clubs, although since these numbers are derived from selections in the spring rather than actual practice in the fall, we are advised that attrition can and does occur, especially in the sign-in clubs. We know from survey data that while there appears to be little drop off in selective club membership between junior and senior years, there is more significant drop off in sign-in club membership. For the Class of 2009, for example, the percentage of the class in selective clubs in the junior year and the senior year was 33%, while the percentage of the class in sign-in clubs dropped from 31% in the junior year to 26% in the senior year. While a handful of these students purchased University dining contracts, the overwhelming majority either joined co-ops or became independent.

When four-year residential colleges were first proposed, it was anticipated that the number of juniors and seniors in the colleges — not counting RCAs — would roughly equal the additional number of juniors and seniors (roughly 150 per class, or a total of 300) in the larger classes that the University was planning to admit (up to a steady-state size of 1,300 students per class). This meant that the introduction of four-year colleges was not expected to result in a significant reduction in the number of students in the clubs. The number of juniors and seniors in the colleges is now higher than initially expected because of the introduction of shared meal plans, which adds students to the colleges who are also in clubs. As indicated in the chart, the number of juniors and seniors in the colleges next fall after subtracting RCAs and students on shared meal plans is 252.

For the past few years, the clubs have tracked the bicker and sign-in process. This year’s experience for the sophomore Class of 2012 is shown in chart 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sophomore Class of 2012 Club Selection Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of sophomores: 1,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who participated in the selection process: 946 (74.6% of the class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who bickered/were accepted: 642/411 (so 231 were not successful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First round sign-ins: 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second round sign-ins (following bicker): 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in clubs: 869 (68.5% of the class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total who bickered and chose not to join any club: 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shared Meal Plans

Given the relatively recent introduction of shared meal plans (first offered in the fall of 2007), we would like to describe briefly how they work. The plans were developed in response to student interest in having an opportunity both to live in a four-year college and belong to a club, and as part of an effort to reduce the degree of separation between students in the colleges and students in the clubs. (Another initiative designed to achieve this goal is the provision of two meals per week in the colleges for all juniors and seniors at no extra cost; the overwhelming majority of meals have been lunches and dinners — not breakfasts as originally anticipated.)

Students with shared meal plans pay the full cost of membership in their clubs, and the clubs reimburse the University according to an arrangement arrived at by each club with the University. (The reimbursement is currently $616 per student for each club.) A student on a shared meal plan is entitled to 95 meals each semester at any of the colleges, plus the two free meals per week that every junior and senior receives, along with unlimited meals at the student’s club.

Currently all 10 clubs are participating in the shared meal program. The numbers of shared meal plans available to rising juniors and seniors are determined by each club and vary by club and year by year. During the residential college room draw, club members who are interested in shared meal plans can select one of their club’s plans as long as the maximum number of
plans set by their club has not been reached. After a club’s maximum has been reached, members of that club who have not yet drawn rooms do not have the option of a shared plan. They can remove themselves from the college draw and enter regular room draw, or they can remain in the college draw, but then they must purchase at least the minimum college meal plan (95 meals per semester). At this point they may drop their club membership, or they can choose to purchase a club meal plan in addition to their college plan.

Questions have been raised about whether there are students who enter the residential college room draw and select shared meal plans not because they really want to participate in the shared meal program, but because they are seeking to obtain the best possible room. College room draw and regular room draw are based on separate lists, so students can enter both draws and then choose the one that offers them the better ranking, knowing that if they choose the college draw and obtain a shared meal plan they can maintain their club membership at no additional cost. Since each club offers a finite number of shared plans, if some plans are claimed by students who don’t truly want them, this can prevent students who truly want them from obtaining them. The sign-in clubs, in particular, are concerned that a result may be that a student who lost out on a shared plan will elect to live in the college and withdraw from the club. We believe it would be helpful for the University to collect data on the reasons why students elect shared meal plans, and on the degree to which there is unmet demand for them.

Characteristics of Students in the Eating Clubs

The University and the Undergraduate Student Government have collected data in recent years that shed light on the views of students about the eating clubs and the characteristics of students who choose to join, or not to join, them. One significant finding is that the clubs, the bicker process and fraternities/sororities are among the very few aspects of Princeton about which students hold highly disparate views. In all three cases, there are students for whom these are among their most positive Princeton experiences, and students for whom they are among their most negative.

**Chart 3**, from the Class of 2009 senior survey, illustrates that the clubs, in general, are less diverse than the University as a whole with respect to ethnicity and nationality, although it is important to note that many clubs have memberships that more closely reflect the overall distribution of the student body. White students are overrepresented in selective and sign-in clubs; black and international students are underrepresented in both kinds of clubs; and Asian students are underrepresented in selective clubs and overrepresented in sign-in clubs.

**Chart 4**, from the USG’s COMBO survey, shows that in 2007 more than half of black students were not in clubs and more than half of Asian students were in sign-in clubs.

**Graph 5**, from the USG’s COMBO survey, illustrates that students in the eating clubs, and especially the selective clubs, are significantly more affluent than Princeton students overall. The findings in both graph 5 and graph 6 are supported by the University’s senior surveys of recent years.
The 2009 senior survey found that 16% of the class participated in a fraternity or sorority. Among selective club members, 34% participated, while among sign-in club members the percentage was 6%. No sign-in club had more than 10% of its members in fraternities or sororities, while Chart 7 shows the percentages of club members at selective clubs participating in the Greek organizations.

While some fraternities and sororities have clearly become pipelines to some of the selective clubs, there are also pipeline relationships between some clubs and selected athletic teams and between some clubs and selected student organizations. In the Class of 2009, 54% of varsity athletes were in selective clubs, as compared to 33% of the class as a whole; as a result, 29% of all students in selective clubs were varsity athletes, even though they represented only 17% of the class.

While recent University surveys and the COMBO surveys found overall student satisfaction at Princeton very high, there appears to be a higher degree of satisfaction among members of clubs. In the 2009 senior survey, 53% of selective club members and 48% of sign-in club members were “very satisfied” with their undergraduate experiences, as compared to 39% of non-club members. (In addition, 42% of selective club members, 45% of sign-in club members and 47% of non-club members were “generally satisfied.”) At the same time, when asked about the contribution of the clubs to their Princeton experience, 96% of selective club members said it was positive or very positive, as did 94% of sign-in club members, but only 27% of non-club members.

There are significant differences between club members and non-club members with respect to their use of alcohol and their perceptions of the role of alcohol at Princeton. While 88% of selective club members and 73% of sign-in club members in the Class of 2009 believed alcohol made a positive contribution to Princeton’s social culture, this view was shared by only 32% of classmates in the residential colleges, 35% with no dining contracts, and 27% in co-ops.

Financial Aid

Princeton University admits undergraduates without regard to financial need and then meets the full assessed need of every student who qualifies for financial aid without requiring loans. (In recent years the percentage of the class qualifying for aid has exceeded 60%.) In assessing need, the Financial Aid Office makes allowances for tuition, room, board and other expenses. Until recently, the amount included for board was the cost of a University dining contract. While this worked fine for freshman and sophomore years when all undergraduates are required to live in residential colleges, many students pointed out that in junior and senior years it made it difficult for students on financial aid to afford to join eating clubs, whose board rates are typically higher than the University rate.

Beginning in the fall of 2007, aid levels for juniors and seniors were increased by assuming a board rate that was set at the average cost of an eating club dining contract. This higher board allowance is included whether or not the student joins an eating club, so juniors and seniors on financial aid who join clubs have sufficient support to allow them to afford club contracts, while non-club members have the same level of support to help them cover their dining and other expenses. The average club
board rate is increased each year by the percentage increase in the University board rate. (Because club board rates have been increasing faster than the University board rate, a modest gap has developed between the Princeton allowance and the actual average club board rate.) While this policy makes provision in the financial aid award for the average club board rate, it does not provide for the social or alcohol fees that clubs charge in addition to their board rates or for the fees that sophomores pay after being admitted to the clubs in February of sophomore year. Students can request loans to help cover these costs, although one unintended consequence of the University’s policy of not requiring loans is that students today seem more reluctant to borrow when there is no loan in their financial aid package than in the past when most aid packages already included a loan and they were simply adding to it.

While the policy is relatively straightforward (substituting a higher board allowance for all juniors and seniors on financial aid), the implementation is relatively complicated because once aid has been calculated and the family contribution determined, the family contribution of a club member in most cases gets paid partly to the University and partly to the club. The Financial Aid Office explains the process in detail to sophomores and their families, provides them with worksheets, and invites them to meet with aid counselors if they have questions, but we heard again and again that many students and families remain unclear about how the process works.

Here’s an example that the Financial Aid Office shared with the task force. Assume a sophomore whose family contribution after accounting for financial aid is $17,200. The student aid budget (which includes allowances for expenses like books and travel that are not paid to Princeton) is $50,600. The difference between the $50,600 budget and the $17,200 family contribution is met with a $30,700 grant and a $2,700 campus job. The charge by Princeton, including a University board contract, is $47,700. After applying the grant and job, the amount the family pays to the University is $14,300. The family still has $2,900 of its expected $17,200 contribution (the difference between $17,200 and $14,300) to apply to non-University expenses (e.g., books and travel).

When this student becomes a junior and joins a club, the family contribution remains unchanged, but the amount due to Princeton drops from $47,700 to $42,000 because there is no longer any University board charge, and the grant amount increases from $30,700 to $32,320 because of the higher board allowance in calculating need. Now after applying the grant and the job, the amount the family pays to the University is only $6,980, as compared to $14,300 in sophomore year. If $2,900 of the family contribution continues to be set aside for other expenses, the family then has $7,320 available from its expected contribution to pay the cost of an eating club, which the family pays directly to the club.

What many students told us is that at this point in the process the family may realize that if the student does not join the club, these funds then are available for other family or student purposes or can represent a de facto reduction in the family contribution. Even though the payment to the University has been reduced to help offset the costs of club membership, the nature of the process requires the families of most students on aid to write sizeable checks to the clubs. (In exceptional cases where the family contribution is less than $7,000, there would instead be a partial credit on the University bill that would be refunded from the University to the club on a semester basis, although in almost all cases the student’s family still needs to make some payment directly to the club.)

The director of the Financial Aid Office estimates that the University policy of assuming higher board costs in junior and senior years costs about $2 million a year. (Covering social fees would add another $1 million or more.) She believes that while the new policy has made it easier for students who would have joined clubs anyway to afford them, it has led to only a one or two point increase in the number of aid students in the clubs, and no increase in the clubs with especially low percentages of students on aid.

Chart 8 gives the 2009–10 board fees and social fees for the clubs. Most clubs also charge an additional fee, ranging from $40 to $300, for alcohol and other items. The University board rate for 2009–10 is $5,340, but its allowance for juniors and seniors is $6,960. Its 2010–11 allowance will be $7,173.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Social Fee*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cap and Gown</td>
<td>$7,640</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$8,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>$7,450</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloister</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$7,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial</td>
<td>$7,080</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>$7,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>$7,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>$7,157</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>$7,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrangle</td>
<td>$7,100</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td>$7,300</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$7,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>$7,420</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$8,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$7,160</td>
<td>$567</td>
<td>$7,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some clubs charge an additional fee for alcohol; at one club this is referred to as “milk money.”
What We Heard

As indicated earlier, more than 650 students, alumni and other members of the University community offered comments through the task force website. Another two dozen alumni e-mailed directly to the task force. There were more than 20 structured conversations about the work of the task force, and countless informal conversations—all of which indicated broad interest in what we had been asked to do. While it is clear that students and alumni have divergent perspectives on the nature of the club experience and about the relationships between the clubs and the University, the similarities in what we heard were much more striking than the differences. To put it most simply, even those who expressed the greatest concerns or disappointments about the clubs recognized their benefits and strengths, and even the strongest proponents of the clubs recognized their shortcomings. Even more striking was the convergence on the issues on which the task force was encouraged to focus, a convergence that shaped our deliberations and the nature of this report. We also were reminded repeatedly that there are significant differences among the clubs; as one person said, the clubs have 10 different “social, financial and operational situations.” In many cases this constrains our ability to think of the clubs “monolithically” or as a “system.”

For the remainder of this section, we want to give some flavor of what we heard from those who commented on our website. But first let us list the eight topics that we were encouraged again and again to focus on in our report:

- Alcohol and safety
- Financial aid and cost (and by extension, the socioeconomic stratification of the clubs)
- Bicker
- Fraternities and sororities
- Issues related to exclusivity, inclusiveness and diversity
- Communications and representations about the clubs
- Club engagement in academic life and community service
- Relationships between the University and the clubs.

Excerpts of Comments Submitted through the Website

The first excerpt is from an alumnus who did not give his class. The others are from alumni/ae and students whose classes are indicated.

The clubs were one of my most treasured experiences at Princeton and are a jewel in the University’s crown. I’ve been thoroughly impressed with the diversity, leadership opportunities, tradition, safety and social mixing that the clubs enable. They provide a safe party atmosphere (no driving to bars, underage drinking monitoring programs, personally responsible, accountable, and caring leaders). They provide a useful re-mixing of the social scene halfway through Princeton (I met a whole set of new friends from other residential colleges).

Class of 2010: They create a safer atmosphere for drinking … and create cohesive communities on campus that are supportive of their members. Eating clubs encourage a “mixing” type of atmosphere. Sitting with people you do not know and meeting new people over meals is much more common here than in the dining hall.

Class of 2000: My eating club introduced me to a whole new group of friends whom I would not have met otherwise. … More than any other place, it is my “home” at Princeton. I think each of the clubs is different, but on the whole I value the system tremendously. I value their independence from the school as it gives students a true feeling of ownership. The smaller environments of the eating clubs create more personal communities within the larger institution, which will be increasingly important as the student body grows.

Class of 1976: I feel that the high cost and culture of the clubs tend to make the clubs less diverse economically and racially.

Class of 2012: I think the class divide in the eating clubs is one of the biggest problems.

Class of 2010: If I have learned one thing as a club member, it is that the eating experience far outweighs the nights out. Though I still love formals, theme nights, bands and DJs, what I will remember most is the experience of eating at round tables, studying at the club with my friends, and sampling the food and cultures at other clubs with meal exchanges. … I don’t think the University realizes what variety there is in the clubs and the way in which they can be a place for students to find a social niche (in whichever club it may be). … I think much concern centers on the bicker process. Perhaps the process could be somehow adjusted so that students would be able to bicker more than one club — some sort of mutual selection? I have plenty of friends who have been “hosed” and agree that not only is it a terrible term, it is not a fun experience.
Class of 1973: I think bicker as it is now is horrible — so hurtful and unnecessarily so. Should go back to the system of ranking which clubs you want and a “match” like in medical internships between your ranking and the club’s ranking of you is so much better. … Every student who bickers should be guaranteed a spot at some club.

Class of 1957: I believe strongly in the eating club experience for undergraduates, the opportunities gained from this experience (intramural sports, community volunteer activities) and the separation of social activities from dormitory life which broadens experiences for undergraduates on campus (unlike the fraternal system on most university campuses). … In summary, I believe Princeton has in its eating club “system” the best of any college or university because it provides for small social settings and gives undergraduates the ability to govern themselves.

Class of 2011: I have enjoyed spending time at my club doing all sorts of things: eating, studying, partying or just hanging out. I think the eating clubs are an excellent way for upperclassmen to take some ownership over their Princeton experience.

Class of 1977: In my experience talking to high school students, the eating clubs are a real deterrent to attracting some of the most academically curious and interesting high school students to Princeton.

Class of 1990: The University must actively acknowledge the existence of the clubs in admissions. … The University must deal with the issue of on campus fraternities, which create unfair advantages for their members in the bicker process. These fraternities also create cliques beginning in freshman year which takes away from the Princeton experience and is counter to all of the reasons why the clubs select members in sophomore year.

Class of 2011: I think the task force should focus on keeping the eating clubs a safe environment for students and making them financially accessible for all students.

Class of 1959: I would suggest that the task force look at how the clubs could be better integrated into the entire Princeton experience. They can remain independent and yet be an integral part of the University.

---

Findings and Recommendations

As a task force, we find that the eating clubs are an integral part of Princeton’s history and distinctiveness. They make positive contributions to the Princeton experiences of many students (and thus alumni), and they shape the Princeton social scene even for students who are not members. There are clear strengths that derive from the relatively small size of the clubs, which allow members to feel at home and get to know each other through a variety of shared experiences that include meals, intramural competitions, recreational and social activities of many kinds, service activities, networking with alumni members of the clubs, and just hanging out. There are also strengths that derive from the degree of responsibility that students are given to participate in the management and programming of the clubs. We value the fact that each club has a distinctive identity, which presents students with a diversity of options regarding club membership. The clubs are an asset to the University: although independent of the University and thus privately financed, they feed two-thirds of the University’s juniors and seniors, provide a center of social life for all students, and generate lifelong connections to the clubs and the University for many alumni. We believe that the University and its students are well served by the positive contributions that the clubs make to Princeton.

We are encouraged by the degree to which the continuing operation of the clubs has been incorporated into the University’s planning for the residential colleges and other social and dining options. One distinctive aspect of the Princeton social dynamic is the opportunity students have in the middle of sophomore year to make decisions about where and how they want to live, eat and socialize for their final two years at Princeton. Many commented positively on the chance this provides to decide whether to remain with the friends of freshman and sophomore year or to set out to make new friends (or some combination of both), and many commended the separation of living spaces from social and dining spaces which allows students to have both “dorm friends” and “club friends.” The University has developed attractive options in the four-year colleges, in the co-ops, and otherwise for students who wish to elect these options. But it has done so in ways that anticipate that eating clubs will continue to play a central role in the lives of most juniors and seniors, and in ways that seek to increase interaction between the campus and the clubs. We believe students are best served by a social climate in which choices are available to them and in which all choices are seen as parts of a larger totality, rather than as competing or mutually exclusive domains.

We are also encouraged by a number of developments in recent years that seem to have improved the experiences of students in the clubs and the relationships between the clubs and the University. A number of these developments are mentioned elsewhere in our report, but they include the identification of “best practices” governing several aspects of club operations, including the provision of alcohol; improvements in the process by which the bicker clubs notify their new members; modifications in the University’s financial aid policies to recognize the costs of club meal contracts; the introduction
of shared meal plans; and even the appointment of this task force to encourage conversation about the clubs and their relationships with the University.

**At the same time, as one member of the task force said at one of our meetings, there is “a dark side.”** There are concerns that derive from the “culture of alcohol” that seems to characterize much of club life; a selection process that many describe as hurtful; and the development of pipeline relationships into a number of the selective clubs that help sustain Greek organizations that many feel are incompatible with the Princeton residential experience. The clubs also continue to be a polarizing force, for reasons that seem to derive in part from a social stratification that persists despite a number of efforts to ameliorate it, with students from lower-income families and minority groups participating less fully in the clubs than other students.

**Finally, concerns have been expressed about the continuing financial viability of the clubs, and especially the sign-in clubs, particularly in the current financial climate.** Financial soundness varies among the clubs, with some well capitalized and others not. Given the age and nature of their buildings, the clubs can incur significant costs for major maintenance, and extensive renovations can trigger requirements to bring the buildings into compliance with more stringent building codes. As a task force we believe it is important to sustain both a critical mass of clubs and a significant number of spaces available on a sign-in basis. Further erosion in either the number of clubs or the availability of sign-in spaces would make it more difficult for the clubs increasingly to reflect the full diversity of the Princeton student body. We recognize that to achieve these goals actions may be necessary to secure the financial underpinnings of the clubs (especially the sign-in clubs).

**In the remaining sections of this report, we bring forward observations and recommendations that we hope will serve to reaffirm the strengths of Princeton’s eating clubs while also addressing concerns and challenges that even supporters of the clubs acknowledge, and that will strengthen relationships between the clubs and the University.** We hope and believe that these concerns and challenges can be addressed and these relationships can be improved.

### Alcohol and Safety

Many older alumni remember a time when alcohol was much less central to social life at the clubs than it appears to be today. They remember limits on the number of party nights that could occur each year and the amount of time a club could spend “on tap.” Now most clubs treat every Thursday and Saturday night as a party night, and beer may be on tap most if not all nights of the week. One alumnus characterized the change as one from “eating clubs” to “night clubs,” and many asked whether it was possible to scale back the centrality of alcohol in the life of the clubs. The concern was not about the responsible consumption of alcohol, but its pervasiveness, especially in settings where most club members are likely to be below the legal drinking age. There were also concerns that a number of students are deterred from joining clubs because of this alcohol culture; that emphasis on alcohol detracts from other positive aspects of club membership; and that emphasis on alcohol can encourage excessive drinking and may contribute to the practice of “pre-gaming” (drinking hard alcohol in the privacy of one’s room in a short period of time before going out to socialize).

Both alumni and students point to aspects of club life that offer a “safe” environment for students who drink. As a result of “best practices” that have been adopted by many of the clubs in recent years, there are safeguards in place to control who is admitted and who can be served, water and other alternative beverages are available, and training is provided to those who dispense alcohol. Drinking at the clubs takes place in settings where students look out for each other’s well-being; the alcohol served, for the most part, is “weak beer”; and because of the location of the clubs, Princeton students don’t “drink and drive.”

On the other hand, the fact that the alcohol is “free” can encourage excessive consumption, and unfortunately there continue to be occasions when hard alcohol is consumed and dangerous drinking is encouraged, or at least condoned, especially during initiations. Students express concerns about pressures they feel to drink at the clubs or as part of the selection process, and about drinking contests and other organized incentives to drink to excess. On the Saturday of initiations at one of the clubs this spring, hard alcohol was served to newly admitted members at various stations within the club, and the club set up a “sick room” with tarps on the floor, buckets for vomiting, and other preparations in expectation that students would drink to excess. Even if excessive drinking was not “encouraged,” it certainly was expected, and the presence of hard alcohol increased the risk that students would in fact need to make use of the room. While this may have been an isolated instance of bad judgment on the part of this particular club, there are many examples of similar occurrences at other clubs, as well as recurring incidents like one club’s annual “Viking night,” which is characterized by excessive drinking and occasional property damage at other clubs. Excessive drinking has serious health and safety implications not only for the students who drink, but for others who may be affected by their actions, including students who become victims of sexual harassment and assault.

As a task force, we call upon the clubs and the University to:

- Continue to take steps to reduce the pervasiveness of alcohol in the clubs, and especially the risks of excessive drinking. One constructive step this year was an initiative by the bicker clubs to require sophomores to pledge that they would refrain from excessive use of alcohol during the selection process. Steps at the clubs need to be part of a larger strategy to encourage responsible drinking at Princeton — on-campus and off — as well as to reduce the incidence and risks of “pre-gaming.” In
this respect, club-based initiatives to encourage responsible use of alcohol should be coordinated with on-campus initiatives and the work of the Alcohol Coalition Committee (a largely student-led group that is seeking to reduce the incidence of high-risk drinking on campus). We believe that one element of a larger strategy could be the reintroduction of a campus pub.

- Take steps to create a more diversified social infrastructure at Princeton. Whether by design or default, most social life at Princeton revolves around the clubs, and the clubs frequently point out that the burden of providing students with social life falls on them and their members, even though the participants in their parties and activities include many non-members, including freshmen, sophomores, and juniors and seniors who are not in the clubs. One step might be the expansion and improvement of on-campus activities of real interest to students that do not involve alcohol (the Wilson College Black Box is frequently cited). Survey data confirm that students who drink as well as students who don’t drink would like to see more such activities. Another step might involve the reinstatement of a former program under which the clubs collectively agreed to offer at least one major alcohol-free event each week that would be subsidized by the University. A third step might include some increase in on-campus events with alcohol for of-age students and perhaps faculty and staff, such as wine and cheese parties, and here again one element of such a plan could be the reintroduction of a campus pub.

- Reaffirm the importance of steps taken by the clubs in recent years to better control excessive consumption of alcohol, including better security, wrist-banding, the provision of water and other alternative beverages, and better training of bartenders and club officers. The clubs should consider whether further steps along these lines could be taken, and whether they can take steps to reduce the time on tap and the number of party nights, and to discourage drinking games, dangerous initiation or other “hazing-type” rituals, and other incentives to drink to excess.

- Reaffirm the importance of being attentive to those who have consumed excessive amounts of alcohol and calling for help when necessary.

Many comments on our website expressed concern about recent interactions between the clubs and the Princeton Borough police and asked whether there would be merit in returning to a time when the University’s public safety department served as first responders at the clubs, with support from the borough only as needed. The University’s new director of public safety and his senior staff have expressed interest in exploring this possibility, along with encouraging greater and more constructive engagement between the clubs and public safety and better training in the clubs. We believe that this is an idea worthy of active consideration.

### Financial Aid and Cost

While many expressed gratitude for the University’s modification of its financial aid policy to reflect the average cost of club meal contracts in calculating the financial need of juniors and seniors, many also commented on the extent to which students continue to feel they can’t afford to join or remain in clubs because of costs. Some focused their comments on club fees, and made specific suggestions about ways clubs might reduce their costs, while others asked about options like less-than-full meal plans or reduced social fees for students who don’t drink. Others focused on the financial aid package, noting that some club meal charges exceed the average, and social fees and sophomore charges are not covered. Some pointed to the price sensitivity of students whose families feel financial strain even if they don’t qualify for aid, and some called for greater and earlier transparency by the clubs in making students aware of what they will be charged, in part so the students and their families can prepare to meet the charges, especially in the spring of sophomore year. Some asked whether the mechanics of the aid process could be changed, either to include the club rate in the financial aid calculation only for juniors and seniors who join clubs, or to have families on aid remit their club fees through the University so as not to have to write separate checks to the club and to the University. Some proposed that the University consider capital contributions to support dining and study areas in the clubs (or at least the sign-in clubs).

The task force was persuaded that there are students who choose not to join the clubs, or leave them, for financial reasons. By changing the aid calculation and making low-cost loans available, the University has made it possible for students to join the clubs if they wish to do so, and even if students need to borrow, they will still graduate with less debt than students at schools that have not removed required loans from their aid packages. At the same time, it is clear that students are reluctant to borrow for this purpose; that the charges for social fees and sophomore year present insurmountable financial challenges for some students and families; that applying the higher board rate to all juniors and seniors (not just club members) does create financial disincentives for club membership in the minds of some students; and that the mechanics of the aid process can also serve as a disincentive to join a club. As the University continues to seek out and attract students from a broad range of socioeconomic backgrounds, it is likely that there will be some students and families who will choose not to join the clubs for financial reasons, even with further improvements in financial aid, and we believe it is important for the University to continue to provide attractive social and dining options for those students, while also doing as much as it can to remove financial barriers to membership whenever possible.
As a task force we recognize that some students will elect not to join eating clubs for reasons that are not financial in nature, but we hope that the University and the clubs will do all they can to reduce the remaining financial impediments to club membership, partly to ensure true equity of opportunity for all students, and partly to contribute further to a reduction in socioeconomic stratification in the clubs. To these ends:

- We call upon the University to consider whether further improvements can be made in the financial aid program to address the concerns that have been expressed about costs that are not covered (social fees and sophomore charges) and the mechanics of the aid distribution/bill-paying process.

- We call upon the clubs to provide greater transparency about costs, especially in sophomore year, so students and families will know earlier what they will be charged and when. A number of clubs make their own resources available for financial aid and offer extended payment plans for students who need assistance, and we commend these efforts. In some clubs, students who seek financial aid from their club or wish to negotiate an extended payment plan must have these conversations with fellow students, which can be awkward to the point of making students reluctant to come forward. We encourage the clubs to make it possible for students to have these conversations with either a member of the graduate board or a member of the club’s professional staff.

- We encourage both the clubs and the University to consider whether there are ways to increase the level of scholarship aid available through the clubs, especially if the University concludes that it cannot cover social fees and sophomore charges in its financial aid calculations. One of the purposes of the Princeton Prospect Foundation, a charitable organization encompassing all 10 clubs to which we will refer later in our report, is to establish and contribute to scholarships for members of the clubs and, more generally, to support educational initiatives at the clubs. We encourage the foundation to consider initiatives that might increase socioeconomic diversity in the clubs. We also encourage the University and the clubs to better publicize the availability of financial aid to help meet the costs of the clubs.

- We believe there is merit in considering actions that may reduce the costs of operating the clubs, which in turn may reduce or slow the rate of increase in the prices they charge. Some of these are actions the clubs themselves may take, such as considering collective action regarding purchasing and waste removal. In recent years, the University has wired the clubs for Internet access, provided free wireless in the clubs, and taken responsibility for snow removal along Prospect Avenue. We encourage continuation of such initiatives and the exploration of other ways in which the University might help reduce club costs.

- One specific suggestion is to encourage the clubs to call upon the University’s Office of Risk Management for assistance in obtaining insurance coverage at the lowest possible cost. This office has significant expertise and many years of experience in negotiating insurance contracts, and would be delighted to help the clubs either individually or collectively.

- There may be merit in considering whether some modification in club meal plans could produce both savings (in staffing and purchasing) and potential benefits for students. One possibility would be for one or more clubs to eliminate breakfast, with the University accommodating the club’s members at breakfast in the residential colleges. Another possibility would be for one or more clubs to close for dinner one night per week with the understanding that its members all would use one of their two college meals that evening. If more than one or two clubs decided to explore this possibility, presumably a plan could be devised to prevent all club members from taking their meals in the colleges on a single night. We recognize that this is an idea that would need to be considered carefully, both to be sure that it would result in real savings, but also to be sure that it didn’t have the unintended consequence of reducing the attractiveness to students of the clubs that might elect it.

### Bicker

Calls for the task force to focus attention on bicker came from many students and alumni, including students and alumni with affiliations at the bicker clubs. Many expressed concern about the impact of bicker on those who are unsuccessful (in Princeton jargon, are “hosed”). A significant number of alumni noted the extent to which a negative bicker experience detracted from their overall Princeton experience and left scars that lasted a lifetime, including one alumus who wrote: “The process of bicker was one of the worst experiences of my life. I am in my seventies and that is quite a statement, isn’t it?” It was pointed out that the likelihood of being rejected is much greater now when students bicker at only one club and face the prospect of a simple up-or-down vote than it was in the multi-club processes of earlier times when bickerees were guaranteed admission to at least one club.

Some who had experiences as juniors and seniors making decisions about which sophomores to admit to their clubs wrote to express distress about the procedures and criteria that were applied in making these decisions. Others expressed concern about the development of feeder relationships between certain clubs and fraternities/sororities, athletic teams and student organizations which skew the bicker process by reducing the number of spaces available to students without affiliations. Others expressed distress about the extent to which bicker and the club initiation process can lead to inappropriate sexual interactions or peer pressure to drink excessively or engage in other dangerous or demeaning behavior. Still others expressed concern about what one member of the task force described as the “conspicuous cruelty” of some of the procedures that have been followed in recent years to notify bickerees whether or not they have been successful.
The comments summarized in the preceding paragraphs focus primarily on the ways in which bicker operates, without necessarily challenging the concept of selectivity. There were other, but fewer, comments that expressed concern about the basic concept, and specifically about the extent to which selectivity contributes to a climate of exclusiveness, social hierarchy and entitlement that conflicts with Princeton’s overall commitment to inclusiveness and fair access to all aspects of the Princeton experience. As a task force we respect the right of private organizations to establish their own membership procedures (as long as they comply with the law) and to make their own decisions about which of their applicants will best contribute to the sense of community they wish to create. We recognize that the purpose of such selectivity can be to create strong communities, and we hope that the members of selective clubs, in creating their communities, will reach out to students from a broad range of backgrounds and interests, will take full advantage of the remarkable diversity that characterizes the Princeton student body, and will be sensitive to the impact of their decisions on applicants who are not selected. At the same time, we believe it is essential that the overall club system continue to include non-selective alternatives for students who do not wish to participate in a bicker process and who wish to create communities on a sign-in basis.

In the senior survey for the Class of 2009, students were asked about the contribution of bicker to their Princeton experience. Interestingly, the percentage of students in the selective clubs who said it was negative (12%) was roughly equal to the result for students overall (15%). Some alumni said that while bicker may have positive attributes for some students, they were concerned that its net overall impact on Princeton was negative.

The task force focused its attention on whether an alternative selection process could be developed that would permit clubs to retain aspects of selectivity if they so wished, while also addressing some of the negative aspects of the bicker process as it has evolved in recent years. We believe this is possible and would like to propose the following alternative method that is roughly modeled on the process used to place students in medical schools (“medical match”).

An Alternative Selection Process

In this process, each sophomore interested in joining a club would submit a ranked list of preferences. Students could submit their preferences either individually or as members of a group up to some agreed-upon size. Each club that wished to do so could submit a ranked list of sophomores it would most like to admit. (As is the case now, some clubs might choose to “be selective,” while others might choose not to submit a list.) A computer program would then make matches based on the preferences submitted by students and any preferences submitted by clubs, and each student would be assigned to his or her highest-ranking available choice. Such a process would not in any way preclude clubs (open or selective) from engaging in recruitment efforts to encourage students to list them as preferences or from efforts by the selective clubs to identify students they would most like to add to their ranks.

While this process would not address all concerns about bicker, it would address a number of them. It would permit clubs to retain aspects of selectivity, but it would not require them to do so. By placing every student who participates in his or her highest possible choice as part of a single process, this method evokes a central feature of multi-club bicker, and by integrating into one process the decision-making for selective and non-selective clubs, it could make it easier to accept assignment to a non-selective club for a student who would have preferred a selective club. Since no one other than the individual student would know which preferences he or she expressed, this method provides for much more privacy in the selection process than the current system in which every unsuccessful bickereree is known to have been rejected by his or her first-choice club. This approach allows clubs to cultivate the interest of sophomores and spend time getting to know them, but without requiring them to engage in a highly pressured process, thereby creating a system that potentially reduces the potential for mistreatment, stress and sleep deprivation of the current selection process. This process also has the virtue of being much easier to describe to potential applicants and admitted students than the current system, since every student interested in a club gets to submit a list of preferences and every student gets placed. The details of a plan of this kind would of course need to be worked out by all of the relevant stakeholders, but we hope the clubs and the campus community will carefully consider whether an alternative along these lines would preserve the most positive aspects of existing practice while also eliminating some of the negatives.

Expanding Best Practices

The task force was very pleased that this spring two of the bicker clubs, Cottage and Cap and Gown, shifted the site at which they picked up new members from the dormitories to 1879 Arch (where Prospect Avenue begins) and by doing so conducted the pick-up process in a venue where it would be less conspicuous to those not accepted. We encourage all of the bicker clubs in future years to adopt a similar venue or simply invite admitted students to come to the clubs rather than have an on-campus pick-up. (Campus pick-ups are a relatively recent practice, and while they may be well received by students who have just been admitted, they can be very distressing for students who feel excluded.) We also were pleased by the heightened attention to safety by all of the clubs during this year’s pick-up and initiation process, which seemed to reduce the incidence of excessive drinking. In 2004, a group representing the eating clubs and the University began to develop a Best Practices Handbook.
that includes sections on officer training, alcohol, fire safety, the signing of contracts, and pick-ups (among other topics). We commend the clubs for these initiatives in all of these areas, and we encourage a careful review of the Best Practices section on pick-ups to see if it can be improved further. We also encourage the possible addition of a new section that might address concerns related to the transparency of the bicker process, the criteria used in making decisions, the excessive consumption of alcohol (e.g., this year’s successful sophomore pledge), and the inappropriateness of certain kinds of behavior.

Fraternities and Sororities

Many of the comments we received expressed concern about the role of fraternities and sororities at Princeton and about the connections between these organizations and the clubs. Many alumni expressed surprise about the existence of organizations that were explicitly prohibited at Princeton from the mid-19th to the mid-20th century and were not reintroduced until the mid-1980s. They expressed concern that fraternities and sororities jeopardize and alter in fundamental respects the nature of Princeton’s distinctive social system, with its reliance on eating clubs that students join in the middle of sophomore year, by forcing decisions and restricting social interactions very early in a student’s Princeton career (fraternities and sororities solicit members as newly admitted students arrive on campus in the fall of freshman year), and by foregrounding competition for spaces in the selective clubs as older members of fraternities and sororities pave the way for younger members to become known and then admitted to the club with which the particular fraternity or sorority is associated.

Student comments also focused on the role fraternities and sororities have developed as feeder mechanisms to particular selective clubs, to the point where students who enter Princeton with an interest in a particular club may join the fraternity or sorority associated with that club primarily to increase the likelihood that they will be admitted to the club. They also join them because through their membership they gain access to passes at clubs that restrict access. Since, as indicated earlier in this report, fraternity and sorority members are disproportionately white and from higher-income families, these feeder relationships contribute to the social and economic stratification of the clubs. A number of students noted that other feeder relationships exist between certain clubs and athletic teams and/or student organizations. While those relationships exist, students don’t join teams or organizations for the purpose of getting into a particular club; the club relationship is ancillary to the core relationship, which is between the student and the team or organization. By contrast, it appears that for some members of fraternities (and similarly, but less so, for members of sororities), the primary motivation for joining the organization is to get into their preferred club.

We acknowledge that students in fraternities and sororities form strong bonds of friendship; that some of these organizations (especially the sororities) engage in charitable or community service activities; and that some students join fraternities or sororities for reasons other than their role as pipelines to the clubs. But both data and anecdotal evidence strongly suggest that this is a primary motivation for many. A number of students and alumni also expressed concern about the association of fraternities, and to a lesser degree sororities, with excessive, and in some cases coerced, consumption of alcohol.

As a task force, we were asked to look at issues related to the role of the eating clubs and the relationships between the eating clubs and the University. The relationships that have developed between the Greek organizations and some of the eating clubs have an unfortunate impact on several areas that are of concern to us: the pervasiveness of an alcohol culture at Princeton; the socioeconomic stratification of the clubs (and especially the selective clubs); and a sense of exclusivity and privilege that we will discuss in the next section of this report. Because of the University’s concerns about the impact of Greek organizations, especially in the freshman year, the relationships between these organizations and the clubs, and the willingness of some of the clubs to provide meeting and social space for these organizations, create tension in the relationships between the University and the clubs. We hope the clubs will consider actions (as some have) to reduce the advantage associated with fraternity and sorority membership in the club selection process, and we believe students at Princeton would be well served if fraternities and sororities elected to postpone their admission process until sophomore year when students are more knowledgeable about the full range of social and associational options available to them at Princeton.

Exclusivity, Inclusiveness and Diversity

Many students and alumni commented on the strong sense of community they have felt in their clubs, describing a “familial ethos” and referring to them as homes away from home. Clearly this is one of the great strengths of the clubs, and some called upon the University to try to provide similar feelings of belonging for juniors and seniors in the residential colleges, the co-ops and the apartment-style units in Spelman.

Offsetting this powerful sense of inclusiveness within individual clubs is a strong sense of exclusivity by many students outside the clubs. Some students feel excluded because of the bicker process; this feeling is especially keen among students who are not members of the teams, organizations or fraternities/sororities that fill many of the available spaces in the bicker clubs. As many pointed out, the clubs are the center of social life at Princeton for non-club members as well as club members, so students also feel excluded when passes are used to limit access to club parties, and especially when the distribution of passes is to members of the same teams, organizations and fraternities/sororities that dominate membership. For their part, the clubs point out that as the de facto providers of most social life at Princeton, they accommodate a significant number of “free riders”
prospective applicants, admitted students and entering students, and recounted their own difficulties in learning about the
Many students and alumni commented on the inadequacy of information about the clubs that is provided to campus visitors,
Communications and Representations

- More programs, some of which might require University funding, to introduce all freshmen and sophomores, including students of color and international students, to the eating clubs, and especially to the non-party aspects of club life. The University has provided support in the past for non-club members to eat at clubs (“Taste of Prospect”) and for social events at the clubs that are open to all students.

- More University-sponsored social programming that is attractive to students who do not socialize at the clubs, to be sure that they are provided with opportunities that appeal to them, but also that is attractive to students who do socialize at the clubs as a way of taking some of the pressure off the clubs to be the principal providers of social life at Princeton. The University has taken steps in this direction in recent years, not only in the residential colleges, but at the Carl A. Fields Center and Campus Club, among other venues. Many students told us that Princeton would have a healthier social atmosphere if more social life occurred on campus, including social life that involved live music. It is recognized that University-sponsored events would have to be stringent about under-age consumption of alcohol, but it was also suggested that there could be some on-campus events (such as wine and cheese parties at the colleges) where alcohol is available for of-age students.

- In our discussion of the importance of cultivating a more extensive social life on campus, we noted that one of the largest University funds supporting social programming is limited to activities that take place on Thursday and Saturday nights. We believe that a more holistic approach to social programming by the University would be appropriate. We also noted that not all social life on campus is or needs to be directly sponsored by the University. Historically, student organizations have sponsored major dances and other activities, such as the USG-sponsored free movie nights at the Garden Theater, and we believe these kinds of initiatives should continue to be encouraged. We were informed that it can be cumbersome and difficult to get permission for such events or to obtain access to appropriate venues.

- Related to the last point, more occasions that increase interaction between the campus and the clubs, with movement in both directions. Shared meal plans and the provision of two meals per week in the colleges for all juniors and seniors are steps in this direction, but we could imagine more joint programming and additional and improved meal exchanges between the clubs and the colleges, with activities occurring both on campus and at the clubs. There may be merit in establishing relationships on multiple levels between some of the colleges and some of the clubs, and, as we will discuss later, in scheduling more academic activities in the clubs.

- Candid conversation within the individual clubs and across the full range of clubs about whether they are doing everything they can to reach out and be as welcoming as possible to students from a full range of backgrounds. This might include a review of the policies that determine which students obtain passes, and a commitment to continue to offer some events that are open to all students.

Communications and Representations

Many students and alumni commented on the inadequacy of information about the clubs that is provided to campus visitors, prospective applicants, admitted students and entering students, and recounted their own difficulties in learning about the
clubs. We have already discussed the importance of introducing freshmen and first-semester sophomores to the non-party aspects of the clubs (meals, pool playing, and “just hanging around and shooting the breeze”) and “demystifying” both the clubs and the selection process. This can begin at orientation and continue throughout the year and can be addressed through printed and electronic communications and through time spent at the clubs.

In this section of our report we want to focus on communications and representations of the clubs in the admission process. Members of the task force met twice with admission staff, and one of our members, Donielle Wright ’01, is an assistant director of that office. We know that the clubs are a mystery to most potential applicants, and that they have a polarizing effect as admitted students make decisions about whether to accept Princeton’s offers. Data from a questionnaire that the Admission Office distributes each year to all admitted students show that among enrolling students, 39% say the clubs had a positive or strong positive influence on their decision to enroll and 15% say they had a negative or strong negative influence. Among non-enrolling students, 16% say the clubs had a positive or strong positive influence and 49% say it had a negative or strong negative influence. This is the only response on the questionnaire that has such a large discrepancy between enrolling and non-enrolling students.

One of the challenges facing the admission staff is that potential applicants and admitted students (and especially those without friends or family members who have been to Princeton) have difficulty understanding how the social system at Princeton works and are unable to visualize where they will live, eat and socialize in their junior and senior years, especially when they come to understand that the choices are not entirely in their hands. This confusion and uncertainty can dissuade students from applying or attending, as can information based on hearsay and outmoded impressions. Princeton’s website and other Princeton materials have been greatly improved in recent years and generally describe the clubs well, but both we and the senior leadership of the Admission Office believe that a better job can be done to introduce potential applicants and admitted students to the real nature of the clubs. We also believe that the modified selection process we proposed earlier would help reduce the level of anxiety that applicants and admitted students may feel about the way in which choices get made at Princeton.

Elements of an improved communications strategy could include the following:

- More informative descriptions of the clubs and the role of the clubs at Princeton in written materials and on the University and admission websites. These materials should include pictures of the insides as well as the exteriors of the clubs. We believe there is also merit in providing links to a video tour of the clubs which would bring them more to life than can be done in more static representations.

- Better and more detailed information for admission staff to use in describing the clubs as part of the residential and social environment at Princeton and in responding to questions about them; similarly, better information for Orange Key guides for the same purposes. One theme we heard again and again is that it is important to describe the clubs thoroughly, not try to gloss over them.

- Most applicants don’t pay close attention to the nature and role of the clubs until they have to make decisions about whether to accept Princeton’s offer of admission, which makes it especially important to present the clubs fully and effectively as part of the Princeton Preview programs that the Admission Office offers to admitted students. These programs are offered over two separate Thursday-to-Saturday periods in April, and we are delighted that this year four of the clubs were open for tours during the first period, and four other clubs offered tours during the second period. These kinds of outreach efforts and active participation by the clubs in panel presentations during Princeton Preview programs and orientation are essential to effective communication and representation, and we encourage continuing collaboration between the Admission Office and the clubs in developing additional strategies to help applicants, admitted students and entering students to make informed choices.

**Academic Life and Community Service**

One of the recurring themes in our conversations was the desirability of integrating the clubs more fully into the overall life of the University. One way to do this is to expand connections between the clubs and the University’s educational activities and to increase their commitment to community service.

In 1961 the Princeton Tower Foundation, later renamed the Princeton Prospect Foundation, was established for the purpose of raising funds to support study, library and other educational facilities in the clubs; to sponsor lectures, courses and other educational activities in the clubs; and to encourage interchange between club members and members of the faculty and administration. Currently all clubs participate in the foundation. With its help, the clubs have hosted precepts and seminars; have sponsored lectures and discussions by members of the faculty and other guest speakers; have hosted language tables; and have expanded their computer and study facilities. In our view, even more engagement in the academic life of the University would be desirable, and we call upon both the University and the clubs to consider ways to bring more classroom activity and faculty presence into the clubs.
Similarly, the clubs have sponsored and supported a number of community service activities. Being of service to others is a central value of this University and a high priority for many students, and we encourage the clubs to identify additional opportunities for themselves and their members to participate in charitable activities and community service.

**Relationships between the University and the Clubs**

We received many comments about the relationships between the University and the clubs. Some were concerned that relationships were not as good as they could or should be, while others observed that they seemed to be better in recent years than at earlier times. Both statements appear to be true. Many commented on the desirability of maintaining the autonomy of the clubs in a context in which the clubs are “independent but integral,” the relationship between the clubs and the University is clarified, and the roles of the clubs and the University are clearly delineated. Some recalled the “Gentleman’s Agreement” that once delineated these roles and wondered whether it would be helpful to develop a modern-day equivalent. One person said that the University and the clubs should work together to keep the clubs “open, welcoming, distinctive and safe.”

Many called for the University to describe the clubs more fully and fairly to prospective students and applicants, a suggestion we endorsed in an earlier section of this report. Other suggestions discussed elsewhere in our report include further improvements in financial aid; additional use of the club buildings for academic and charitable purposes; cost savings initiatives such as joint purchasing and/or waste removal, free wireless service, reduced insurance rates and possible reductions in meal service; and the exploration of a closer relationship between the clubs and the Department of Public Safety, both with respect to additional “community policing” on Prospect Avenue and as first responder on calls for assistance. All of these are steps that could strengthen relationships for the mutual benefit of the clubs and the University, and for the benefit of Princeton students and the undergraduate experience.

Beyond these steps, we want to say another word about the importance of preserving critical mass and ensuring that there continue to be clubs that operate on a non-selective basis. We didn’t seek financial information about individual clubs, but we believe some additional University investment may be required over future years to help some of the less financially secure clubs to get on a firmer financial footing. While some clubs (and especially the selective clubs) have done an excellent job of sustaining the loyalty and engagement of their alumni in the ongoing life of the club and have been very successful in fundraising, other clubs (and especially the sign-in clubs) might benefit from assistance from the University in strengthening their programs of cultivation and solicitation of their alumni.

We want to close our report with a brief discussion of governance, coordination and communication. It remains important that the clubs elect capable undergraduate leaders and that they take full advantage of the opportunities for coordination that are available through the ICC, and through liaison with both the University representative (currently Maria Flores-Mills from the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Students) and the inter-club coordinator, a recent alumnus who is hired by the clubs but whose housing is provided free of charge by the University — a contribution currently valued at over $1,000 a month. It also remains important that the graduate boards of the clubs continue to take an active interest in the management and oversight of the clubs. (They too are well supported by the coordinator.) As noted earlier, we were reminded again and again that each club is independent not only from the University but from the other clubs and each club is distinctive in various ways. But we would encourage the clubs to consider whether on some matters it might be helpful to empower the GICC to serve as a point of collective decision-making and collective negotiation on matters like shared purchasing. One possible short-term project could be the expansion and enhancement of the Best Practices Handbook to strengthen the sections on alcohol usage and safety policy and develop additional sections on the selection of club members and governance.

Finally, we think there is merit in making sure improved mechanisms are in place for regular communication and shared planning between the University and the clubs. We were not able in our deliberations and in this report to consider all the suggestions for improvement that were submitted through our website or mentioned in our outreach sessions, and we hope our report will stimulate additional suggestions to be considered by the University and the clubs. Both the University and the clubs have a great stake in preserving the viability, vitality and value of the eating clubs, and as in a crew race, the best outcome is going to be achieved if everyone is pulling on the oars in the same direction, and together.
Summary of Major Recommendations

The report of the Task Force on Relationships between the University and the Eating Clubs begins with an introductory section that presents the charge to the task force and information about the more than 650 visitors who submitted comments through its website. The report then provides a brief history of the eating clubs and some basic facts and figures that provide background and context for its findings and recommendations, which are summarized below.

Overview

- The eating clubs are an integral part of Princeton’s history and distinctiveness. They make positive contributions to the experience of many students and shape the Princeton social scene even for students who are not members.
- The University has developed attractive options for students who choose not to join the clubs, while anticipating that the clubs will continue to play a central role in the lives of most students and encouraging interaction between the campus and the clubs.
- A number of developments in recent years have improved the experiences of students in the clubs and the relationships between the clubs and the University.
- Concerns have been expressed about lower participation in the clubs by students from lower income and minority backgrounds; a “culture of alcohol” that characterizes much of club life; a selection process at some of the clubs that many describe as hurtful; and pipeline relationships between fraternities/sororities and some clubs.
- There are concerns about the continuing financial viability of the clubs, and especially the sign-in clubs. As a task force we believe it is important to sustain both a critical mass of clubs and a significant number of spaces available on a sign-in basis.

Alcohol and Safety

- Consider whether additional steps should be taken, beyond those already instituted in recent years, to better control excessive consumption of alcohol and discourage drinking games, dangerous initiation rituals and other incentives to drink to excess. These steps should be part of a larger strategy on campus and at the clubs to encourage responsible use of alcohol. One element of this strategy could be the reintroduction of a campus pub.
- Create a more diversified social infrastructure at Princeton, including the expansion and improvement of on-campus social activities of real interest to students that do not involve alcohol; the reinstatement of a University-subsidized program to encourage at least one major alcohol-free event each week at a club; and some increase in on-campus events with alcohol for of-age students and perhaps faculty and staff.
- Explore the possibility of reinstating the Department of Public Safety as the first responder at the clubs, with support from the borough police only as needed, in a context of better training in the clubs and more constructive engagement between the clubs and public safety.

Financial Aid and Cost

- Consider further improvements in the University’s financial aid program to address concerns about costs not covered (social fees and sophomore charges) and the mechanics of the aid process. Better publicize the availability of financial aid to help meet the costs of the clubs.
- Increase transparency about the costs of clubs, and improve the process by which club members can request aid or extended payment plans from the clubs.
- Consider whether there are ways to increase scholarship aid available through the clubs, perhaps with the engagement of the Princeton Prospect Foundation.
- Sustain current University support for wireless access and snow removal and encourage the clubs to consider further actions to reduce the costs of operating the clubs, including collective purchasing and waste removal; working with the University’s Office of Risk Management to reduce the cost of insurance; and possible modifications in club meals plans such as eliminating breakfasts (giving club members access to the residential colleges for breakfast) or closing for one dinner per week (with club members using one of their free meals at the colleges for dinner on that night).
Bicker

- Consider an alternative club selection process in which each sophomore interested in joining a club would submit a ranked list of preferences and each club that wished to do so could submit a ranked list of sophomores it would most like to admit. A computer program would make matches based on the preferences submitted by students and any preferences submitted by the clubs. The process would not preclude clubs (open or selective) from encouraging students to get to know them and list them as preferences.

- This process would permit clubs to retain aspects of selectivity but would not require them to do so. By placing every student in his or her highest possible choice as part of a single process, it evokes a central feature of multi-club bicker. This method provides for greater privacy in the selection process and is much easier to describe to potential applicants and admitted students.

- Encourage all bicker clubs to pick up new members at 1879 Arch (as Cottage and Cap and Gown did this year) or at the clubs, and to consider new or improved sections related to pick-ups and bicker in the clubs’ Best Practices Handbook.

Fraternities and Sororities

- Relationships between fraternities/sororities and some of the eating clubs have an unfortunate impact on several areas of concern: the pervasiveness of an alcohol culture at Princeton; the socioeconomic stratification of the clubs (and especially the selective clubs); and a sense of exclusivity and privilege. Relationships between these organizations and the clubs, and the willingness of some clubs to provide space for them, create tension in the relationship between the University and the clubs.

- Consider actions by the clubs to reduce the advantage associated with fraternity and sorority membership in the club selection process and access to passes, and action by the fraternities and sororities to postpone their admission process to sophomore year.

Exclusivity, Inclusiveness and Diversity

- Steps should be taken by the clubs and the University to remove as many barriers as possible to inclusion and to socioeconomic and ethnic diversity; to make sure that all students have as accurate and complete an understanding as possible of the benefits and attractions of the clubs; and to reduce the sense of separation between students in the clubs and students not in the clubs. The clubs should consider whether they are doing everything they can to reach out and be as welcoming as possible to students from a full range of backgrounds.

- More programs should be created to introduce all freshmen and sophomores, including students of color and international students, to the eating clubs, and especially to the non-party aspects of club life.

- There should be more University-sponsored social programming that is attractive to students who do not socialize at the clubs and to students who do. Such programming should not be limited to Thursday and Saturday nights. Student organizations should be supported in sponsoring social activities on campus with broad appeal.

- Activities that increase interaction between the campus and the clubs should be encouraged, with movement in both directions. There may be merit in more joint programming and additional and improved meal exchanges between some of the colleges and some of the clubs.

Communications and Representations

- The clubs should be described more fully and fairly to prospective students and applicants in written materials and on University websites. There should be photos of the interiors as well as the exteriors of the clubs and perhaps a video tour.

- Admission staff and Orange Key guides should have better and more detailed information to use in describing the clubs and answering questions about them. Collaboration between the Admission Office and the clubs is critical to effective communication to applicants and admitted students, especially during Princeton Preview.

Academic Life and Community Service

- The clubs should increase their connections to the University’s educational activities and their commitment to charitable activity and community service. The Princeton Prospect Foundation can help bring more classroom activity and faculty presence into the clubs.
Relationships between the University and the Clubs

- The relationships between the University and the clubs can be strengthened by a number of the suggestions made in earlier sections of the report.
- It is important to preserve a critical mass of clubs and to ensure that there continue to be clubs that operate on a non-selective basis. Some University investment may be required over future years to help some of the less financially secure clubs get on a firmer footing.
- The inter-club coordinator hired by the clubs with housing provided by the University plays a critical role in supporting the undergraduate officers of the clubs and the graduate boards, who need to take an active interest in the management and oversight of the clubs. The University liaison to the clubs also plays a critical role in coordinating between the clubs and the University.
- The Best Practices Handbook sections on alcohol usage and safety policy should be strengthened and additional sections should be developed on the selection of club members and governance.
- Improved mechanisms should be put in place to ensure regular communication and shared planning between the University and the clubs.

Charge to the Task Force on the Relationships between the University and the Eating Clubs

For more than a century, private eating clubs have played an integral role in undergraduate student life at Princeton University. While alternative dining and social options have been available, especially in recent decades, most juniors and seniors join a club early in the spring semester of their sophomore years and many develop strong attachments to their clubs. Over time, the nature of the club system has evolved as the number and demographics of clubs have changed, as have the forms of meal service, the processes for selecting members, and the guidelines governing social activities. There has also been an evolution in the relationships between the clubs and the University; there have been times of closer and more supportive relationships, as well as times of more distant and even antagonistic relationships.

Over recent years there have been a number of initiatives by the clubs and the University that have led to more mutually beneficial relationships. These have included, among others, the Prospect Initiative, which provided alcohol-free events on Prospect Avenue that were open to all undergraduates; A Taste of Prospect, which provided opportunities for freshmen to get to know the clubs by having dinner in them; a club-University working group that developed a Best Practices Handbook for club officers and has continued to update the handbook; a change in the University’s financial aid policies to increase the meal allowance for junior and senior years so all students who wish to join clubs can afford to do so; and the development of shared meal plans with the four-year residential colleges to allow some students to take meals both in the colleges and in the clubs. There have also been efforts to more accurately and fully describe the role of the eating clubs in admission materials and other University publications and websites.

Given these recent developments, the increase in the size of the undergraduate student body, the financial challenges being faced by both the clubs and the University, and the full implementation of the four-year college system with the completion of the new Butler College dormitories, this seems an appropriate time to ask a task force of students, faculty, staff and alumni to review the relationships between the University and the eating clubs and to examine whether there are steps that can and should be taken to strengthen those relationships for the mutual benefit of the clubs and the University, and for the benefit of Princeton students and the undergraduate experience. We are asking the task force to spend this year consulting widely, thinking creatively, and deliberating thoughtfully, and then to bring forward its observations and recommendations by the end of the spring semester.

Among the issues that we hope the task force will consider are whether there are ways to improve the club experience for students who are members and the application process for students who wish to become members; whether there are ways to increase engagement with the clubs for students who currently choose not to become members; whether there are ways to strengthen relationships between the clubs and the colleges and between students in the clubs and students who choose not to join the clubs; whether there are additional “best practices” that can and should be identified; and whether we can do a better job of describing the nature of the clubs to potential applicants and admitted students.
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Website Submissions by Club

Of all who commented through the website, 412 indicated specific club membership. Of those who did not so indicate, most were freshmen or sophomores; some indicated as independent or members of residential colleges; and a few indicated they were club members but did not indicate which club.

Club Membership of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Club</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tower</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap and Gown</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloister</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger Inn</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadrangle</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>