

Interim Report of the Neighborhood Review Committee
October 2009

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to inform the Williams College community of the findings of the Neighborhood Review Committee, formed in April 2009 to evaluate how the Neighborhood system has been working. Central to the evaluation process was a student survey of the system, developed by the Committee and the Director of Institutional Research. The survey was administered in May 2009, and 30% of the on-campus student body responded. The Committee also drew on the 2005 report by the Committee on Undergraduate Life, which provided the essential blueprint for the Neighborhood system; past student surveys; and information from Facilities and Dining Services.

The major findings of the report are the following:

- 70% of the respondents were dissatisfied with the Neighborhood system.
- While overall satisfaction with the Neighborhood system varied considerably by income, sex, and race, no group of students that we identified produced a majority that were satisfied with the Neighborhood system.
- Many students embraced the values undergirding the Neighborhood system but relegated these values to secondary status compared to their desire for more choice in housing.
- Among racial, ethnic, and LGBTQ minorities on campus, there is the feeling that the Neighborhoods force them into isolation.
- While there was no consensus among students on how successfully the Neighborhoods fostered a wide range of social events, many students did note that they appreciated this aspect of the Neighborhood system.
- Data for dining use indicate that students are consistently drawn to Paresky and further suggest that students choose other dining locations for a variety of reasons, not simply because of proximity to their residence.

The Committee was also drawn to survey data suggesting that criticisms of the Neighborhood system may, in fact, involve larger concerns about how different groups of students interact with each other on campus. These concerns will likely remain no matter what residential system the College puts into place.

The Committee now seeks feedback on the report and will work with College Council and the Committee on Undergraduate Life to structure public discussions of the report. In addition, individuals on campus are encouraged to post their comments on the Neighborhood Review Committee's website, which can be found on the homepage of the Dean's Office under "News" at www.williams.edu/dean.

Outline of the Committee's Work, April-September, 2009

The Neighborhood Review Committee was formed in April 2009 for several reasons. In the fall semester 2008, President Schapiro and Dean Merrill agreed that there should be a formal review of the Neighborhood system during the 2009-2010 academic year, following three full years of the system's being in place. It was no secret that student dissatisfaction with the system ran high when the Neighborhoods were first introduced; while perhaps the intensity of that dissatisfaction had softened somewhat in the third year, there was nonetheless evidence that a review could help determine the ways in which the system could be improved. It was also increasingly clear that the Neighborhood system structured long-range planning on the operational side of residential life in ways that the College needed to spell out more specifically. It was hoped that a review through an entire academic year would be sufficient time to evaluate the Neighborhood system's programmatic and operational aspects.

However, as the general fiscal crisis grew throughout the fall and early winter, and as the College began instituting and projecting budget cuts, concerns were raised that cuts might have to occur in housing and/or dining without the benefit of a program review of the Neighborhood system. With those concerns in mind, Vice President for Operations Steve Klass and Dean Merrill proposed to the College's senior staff that the review be accelerated. Senior Staff agreed that the review should begin as soon as possible.

Serving as the ex-officio chairs of the Committee, Vice President Klass and Dean Merrill appointed the following members at the end of March (student appointees were made by College Council, based on self-nominations):

Colin Adams, Mathematics
 Maria Elena Cepeda, Latino/a Studies
 Sulgi Lim, Admission
 Christina Liu, '10
 Lisa Melendy, Athletics
 Diana Prideaux-Brune, Facilities
 Doug Schiazza, Campus Life
 Eiko Maruko Siniawer, History and Asian Studies
 Joya Sonnefeldt, '10
 Robert Volpi, Dining Services
 Fiona Wilkes, '12

The make-up of the Committee has changed slightly since its inception. An additional student was appointed to the Committee in the spring but was unable to continue his participation. College Council Co-Presidents Lizzy Brickley and Mike Tcheyan then appointed a new student representative, Jonathan Carroll '11, who began in the fall 2009. Sulgi Lim and Maria Elena Cepeda were not able to continue on the Committee through the fall semester due to other commitments. Visiting Assistant Professor of History, Joel Revill, joined the Committee in the summer and provided particular support in helping to analyze data we had accumulated.

The Committee met five times before the end of the semester in May and began its work by reviewing the 2005 report of the Committee on Undergraduate Life, which outlined the underlying goals of the Neighborhood system, then called “cluster housing” [Appendix A]. After reviewing the history of residential life at Williams, and noting the ways in which the current “free agency system” did not support a sense of community life among students, the 2005 CUL report proposed that cluster housing would help

- Create a diverse house/dorm population
- Encourage students of different class years to mix
- Create new friendships and attachments based on a student’s place of residence, which was especially important for those students who had not made strong attachments through athletic teams or extracurricular activities
- Provide opportunities for students to interact with faculty and staff outside the classroom
- Provide more diverse programs and activities for students than what was currently offered through largely centralized student event planning

Undergirding these goals was a foundational principle that, since Williams is a residential college, the institution should conceive of students’ residential life as an integral part of the educational experience.

Once the Neighborhood Review Committee felt it understood the goals of the system, Committee members spent several meetings developing a survey tool for students that could help evaluate the degree to which students believed the Neighborhood system was achieving these goals. Director of Institutional Research Chris Winters provided a great deal of help in developing this tool, which would provide the Committee with both quantitative data and qualitative information (the quantitative data are available in Appendix B). Every student in residence received the survey on May 20, 2009, and a reminder was also sent out via Daily Messages. We received 561 valid responses for a response rate of ~30%.

The Committee also had access to several other student surveys: the “Perceptions of Undergraduate Life and Student Experiences” (PULSE) survey of students administered in March 2009, which asked students a broad range of questions about their experiences at Williams; and senior exit surveys administered in 2007 and 2008, the first two years of the Neighborhood system. All these surveys were administered as part of Williams membership in the Consortium of Financing Higher Education (COFHE).

Finally, the Committee sought to understand some of the operational features of the Neighborhood system, in particular the relationship between dining and residential life. An evident feature of the 2005 CUL Report was the hope that the decentralized dining halls could help support a sense of community within the Neighborhoods. However, the CUL report was written before the Paresky Student Center was built, and anecdotally, Committee members believed that this centralized dining facility had had a significant impact on the dining experience of students, especially since students could use

“equivalency” to eat their meals at Paresky. Director of Dining Services Robert Volpi produced data that showed, first, how often students dine in Paresky – all the eating venues in Paresky are popular with students – and how often students eat in dining halls other than the one associated with their own Neighborhood [Appendix C]. Associate Vice President for Facilities Diana Prideaux-Brune also produced a map that helped the Committee to understand how distant geographically some houses are from the dining facility associated with their Neighborhood [Appendix D].

The appendices of this report include material gathered by the Neighborhood Review Committee in the first stage of its work in the spring and early summer of 2009. The purpose of this report, then, is to provide the community with what the Committee believes are the most salient points that have emerged from this information.

How the Neighborhood System Works

The Neighborhood system, which began in the 2006-07 academic year, must be understood in light of the evolution of residential life at Williams. The 2005 CUL Report in Appendix A does an excellent job describing this history in which the “strong house era” followed the end of fraternities; the “weak house era” emerged in the wake of shifting student dining from houses to dining halls; and the so-called “free agency era” developed out of some student dissatisfaction with upperclass housing assignments. In the “free agency” model, upperclass students would choose rooms, through a lottery that favored seniority, from all the available rooms on campus. Concerned that the campus had developed residential enclaves in which students interacted only with peers like themselves – in other words, de facto “theme housing” – and that the College was not doing enough to foster residential community-building among upperclass students as it did with first-year students, the Committee on Undergraduate Life developed a system in which upperclass housing would be structured around four residential “Neighborhoods.” These Neighborhoods are the following:

Currier Neighborhood, consisting of Currier, East, Fayerweather, Fitch, and Prospect (Driscoll Dining)

Dodd Neighborhood, consisting of Dodd, Goodrich House, Hubbell, Lehman, Thompson, Tyler, Tyler Annex, Sewall, and Parsons (Dodd Dining)

Spencer Neighborhood, consisting of Brooks, Bryant, Mark Hopkins, Morgan, Spencer, West (Greylock Dining)

Wood Neighborhood, consisting of Agard, Carter, Garfield, Gladden, Perry, Wood (Greylock Dining)

Each first-year entry is affiliated with one of the four Neighborhoods (an entry is a group of approximately twenty first-year students who live together, along with two Junior

Advisors). Originally, entries were randomly assigned to Neighborhoods. But starting with the Class of 2013, entries are affiliated with Neighborhoods by first-year building.

The majority of first-year students choose to allow their first-year affiliation to become their upperclass membership, and in the original iteration of the Neighborhood system, students could only switch Neighborhoods through an application and review process. However, due to students' great dissatisfaction with this constraint, they may now opt to change Neighborhoods by entering the annual Neighborhood Lottery early in the spring semester for the following academic year. Students may enter in groups of up to 6, and across class years. Selection order is random, but seniority-based, and with class-caps and gender-caps on each Neighborhood. A student may enter this lottery once without penalty. Entering a second time will incur a penalty at the subsequent room draw. Entering a third time will incur an additional penalty at the subsequent room draw. In the Spring of 2009, 296 students entered the Neighborhood Lottery, 140 of those from the Class of 2012. Neighborhood affiliation was represented roughly equally in the Lottery, although more students from Dodd entered the Lottery than from any of the other Neighborhoods. Since this was the first year of the Lottery, we do not know whether the number of students who entered it should be considered high or low – or somewhere in between – and it is certainly an issue worthy of further review.

Room Draw is then conducted in April each year, to allow students to choose rooms for the following academic year. Students may enter in groups of up to 6 from within their Neighborhood and across class years. Selection order is random, but seniority-based, and with gender-caps on each residence hall. As noted above, a student who has entered the Neighborhood Lottery more than once will incur a penalty that will affect his or her seniority at the subsequent Room Draw.

One of the aims of the Neighborhood system was to create more diverse forms of social activity on campus, in contrast to what was widely perceived as the dominance of All Campus Entertainment (ACE) programming in defining campus social life. Each Neighborhood thus has a Neighborhood Governance Board (NGB) made up of students who are elected in mid- to late spring semester and charged with addressing community issues and building community spirit within the Neighborhoods. The NGBs are allowed to have some variation in their board positions, but they all tend to have a president/vice president or co-presidents, treasurer, and secretary/historian. Most have positions such as social chair, multicultural liaison, and community service coordinator.

The NGBs oversee a total of over \$100,000 in programming funds each academic year. Programming includes social events, faculty/student mixers, scholarly discussions, snacks, etc. NGBs also participate in the Big Three Weekends (Homecoming, Winter Carnival, Spring Fling) by sponsoring or co-sponsoring events for their members and for the campus at large. Finally, NGBs coordinate Neighborhood dinners within their respective dining halls.

Each Neighborhood also has a Faculty Program Director, a Williams faculty member whose role is to advise and support the NGB and the Neighborhood and to find ways to

connect the students in the Neighborhood with the rest of the Neighborhood's affiliated faculty members. The position is paid a stipend of \$1000, and includes a \$1500 programming fund. All faculty have been assigned to one of the four Neighborhoods as faculty affiliates.

Major Findings of Student Surveys

The 2009 survey data on Neighborhood housing make clear that students are dissatisfied. When prompted for positive aspects of the Neighborhood system, approximately 22% of respondents could think of nothing that satisfied them. But the bluntest question – “how satisfied are you with the Neighborhood System” – gave the most telling responses: while 70.5% of students described themselves as overall dissatisfied with the system and another 12.5% felt neutral or had no opinion, only 17% felt somewhat satisfied or very satisfied.

The survey on the Neighborhood system included four quantitative and three qualitative questions. The *quantitative* data suggest that, in general, women, minorities, non-athletes, non-drinkers, and students from low-income backgrounds value the goals of the Neighborhood system more highly than do their peers, but they are not necessarily more satisfied with the results of the Neighborhood system. While overall satisfaction with the Neighborhood system varied considerably by income, sex, and race, no group of students that we identified produced a majority that were satisfied by the Neighborhoods.

It's reasonable to wonder, of course, how reliable the data are, since surveys in general often draw responses from individuals with the most extreme positions. As noted above, the survey had a 30% response rate. On the one hand, this means that, for whatever reasons, 70% of Williams students last May chose not to respond. However, those who did respond were representative of the student body in most respects, with only minor overrepresentation of women and juniors. Also, with a margin of error of +/- 3.5%, the quantitative responses give us solid information about how students have perceived and experience the Neighborhood system.

Six main issues emerged from the *qualitative* responses to the Neighborhood survey, issues that were amplified when taken in conjunction with the quantitative data, the qualitative responses from the COFHE senior surveys, and the PULSE survey data from 2007-2009:

(1) A perceived lack of freedom to live with friends or to live near classes or academic resources. Connected to this was a concern that the Neighborhoods break an already small campus into smaller groups and that they fail to replace the communities (sports dorms, “Odd Quad”) that they dispersed.

- No demographic groups felt that the Neighborhoods had achieved the goal of creating new friendships; low-income students and African American students expressed particularly strong negative opinions on this issue, despite the fact that

they valued residential friendships disproportionately highly. Latino/a students were markedly more sanguine about the friendships they had made through their Neighborhoods, though they did not value residential friendships as a goal any more strongly than average. Perhaps because of their apparent success at making friends in their residences, Latino/a students were the demographic with the most positive attitude toward the Neighborhood system as a whole (with a 31% positive rating).

- Although students were generally in favor of a return to the “free agent” system, a significant number of respondents expressed an at least grudging acceptance of gender capping.

(2) A sense that the College should foster diversity broadly defined, but that the Neighborhoods do not always achieve this goal as well as they might; many students questioned whether housing was the appropriate arena for the College’s efforts to mix students of diverse backgrounds.

- Opinions on the *desirability* of diversifying dorms varied widely and were strongly predicted by demographic group, with heavier drinkers, athletes, men, and white students much less likely to value diverse dorm life than women, non-drinkers, non-athletes, and minority students. On the whole, qualitative responses stressed the value of diversity in the abstract, but relegated it to secondary status when faced with the choice between diversity and free choice in housing. Qualitative responses suggested that all students resented their inability to live with their friends, and many minority students felt particularly isolated by the practical effects of diversifying dorms. Indeed, overall, more than three times as many students raised their inability to live with friends as a problem than raised issues of diversity or inter-group friendships.
- Opinions on the *effectiveness* of the Neighborhoods in integrating dorms did not much vary by demographic category, with students split roughly evenly between positive and negative responses.
- The 2005 CUL report noted student concerns about the “social engineering” of residential life: “This critique [of “social engineering”] is correct in at least one important respect: increased residential diversity... is not by itself an effective response to the fundamental problem of giving the well-mixed people any greater incentive than they currently have to get to know and interact with their neighbors in meaningful ways.”

Qualitative responses to the 2009 survey suggest that the CUL’s fears were well founded, and that the Neighborhood system has not fostered new communities to replace those created by self-selecting dorm groups; nor, students feel, has it fostered diversity beyond mere enforced proximity.

(3) A feeling on the part of racial, ethnic, and LGBTQ minorities that the Neighborhoods forced them into isolation.

- Some students linked the pervasive sense (see #4, below) that the Neighborhoods have made all of the dorms louder and more raucous to a claim that there are no longer residence halls safe from bigotry or fear of bias-based behavior against women and LGBTQ students.
- Many minority students suggested in their qualitative responses that the Neighborhood system forced them into the uncomfortable position of being the only student, or one of a small handful of students of color in their dorm.
- Across the board, students see the (generally desired) goal of integrating housing as incompatible with the (even more desired) goal of giving students the choice of where to live and who to live with.

(4) A sense that the Neighborhoods forced quiet students to live with obtrusive noise or behavior.

- One unintended effect of the Neighborhood system was the perception that, in breaking up “party dorms,” the College did not change the behavior of heavy drinkers so much as spread it more evenly across campus.

(5) A lack of consensus over the success of Neighborhoods in fostering events, combined with a pervasive belief that some Neighborhoods have been better in this area than others.

- Women were much more convinced than men that the Neighborhoods have provided a wide array of quality events, as were international students and Asian American students compared to other racial or ethnic groups. Drinkers were much less convinced of the Neighborhoods’ success in this area than their non-drinking peers.
- More than any other racial or ethnic group, Asian American students and international students believed that an important goal of the Neighborhood system was “to provide opportunities for interaction with faculty and staff.”
- Some students appreciated the diversity of events that Neighborhood control allowed, and Dodd was singled out for high praise in qualitative responses for the quality and quantity of its events.
- Dissatisfaction with ACE ran high in older COFHE surveys and was a major rhetorical trope in the CUL report, suggesting, at least, that Neighborhood-based event planning may be no worse than the old system.

(6) A feeling that the Neighborhoods allocate housing unfairly.

- Because the Neighborhoods' housing stock varies in quality, several students complained of getting doubles or undesirable rooms year after year.

From the qualitative data, we would also note several suggestive and related threads, though they are less conclusive than the data noted above:

- Patterns of student responses from 2007-2009 COFHE surveys suggest that some dissatisfaction with the College's alcohol policies has been progressively transferred to the Neighborhood system in general and to Neighborhood events in particular.
- When students spoke of a lack of community, some of them implied that the system could be reformed, but more argued that the attempt to socially engineer residential communities is itself misguided. Many blamed the Neighborhood system itself (rather than flaws in its implementation) for a lack of communal solidarity. Some pointed out that groups of 400 are too large to form cohesive bonds, while others argued that a group of 2000 is too small to need to be subdivided.

This came through strongly among the students who complained that the system was condescending or that it isolated students. Many students complained that the current system, insofar as it succeeds in breaking up cliques and teams, has created an athlete-dominated culture in *all* housing, increasing the sense of isolation felt by non-athletes. In addition, students linked their inability to room with friends or people of like habits to their sense of anomie.

- A few minority students found the Neighborhood system isolating and disempowering, as it is "nigh impossible to pick a house in which we can be safe and comfortable." In addition, some women and gay students felt that the system forced them into closer proximity with insensitive dorm mates whose behavior, especially when drunk, they found potentially threatening at times. These comments were echoed by quiet students who objected to the rowdy behavior of their dorm mates (and the fees associated with property damage) and wished for a quiet or substance-free dorm option in their Neighborhood.
- However, one potentially important point is that many of the complaints that were raised specifically regarding the Neighborhoods in the housing survey data were brought up in previous student surveys outside the context of housing. Students still spoke of Williams as isolating, cliquish, and providing a social life exclusively based around alcohol, but in the COFHE surveys they did not usually attribute these problems to the Neighborhood system. This is not an argument to avoid reforming the housing system, but it is a warning that student dissatisfaction is overdetermined, and that complaints of isolation, frat-like culture, and discomfort with issues of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, social habits, popularity, and religion are likely to re-emerge in the context of residential life no

matter what the housing system. In the last year, a significant amount of the blame for problems with activities seems to have been transferred from alcohol enforcement to housing policy. This may suggest that there is a growing myth among students of an “Old Williams” in which social life was exciting and satisfying, and that “Old Williams” ended with the implementation of the cluster system.

The Place of Operational Issues in Evaluating the Neighborhood System

In the context of residential life, the term “operations” refers to the people, buildings, grounds, systems, and services that support campus housing and dining functions. The Facilities Department provides maintenance, custodial, and design/renovation services as well as ensuring that the systems providing heat, water, and electricity do so efficiently and cost-effectively. The dining program is comprised of a campus-wide set of board and cash operations that is addressed separately below.

At Williams, as on all college and university campuses, there is a wide disparity in the age, layout, and quality of our residential buildings, and some Neighborhoods are more obviously affected by this than others. Some halls were built to house students in the 18th century, while some were built to house students in the mid-late 20th century. Both sets of residences carry their charms and challenges and require some degree of retrofitting to meet the needs of intentional housing programs. Some of our housing stock was not designed for student living and bring their own sets of challenges as well as some positive attributes as they’ve been adapted to their current usage.

While the diversity of our housing-style options can be a benefit, that same quality also presents an array of programmatic challenges due to the perceived inequitable distribution of singles, community space, and population density. For example, the residential geography of the Neighborhoods presents just this kind of challenge in the case of the Wood Neighborhood’s ability to support one of the goals of the system, namely to build community among its members; there are some dorms and houses that are simply too distant from the core spaces of the Neighborhood and, to a lesser degree, from the center of campus. What is apparent in all of these cases is that it’s important to focus on the interdependence of whatever housing program is developed and the quality, location, and design of the facilities in which the program exists.

Finally, it is important to underscore the critical intersection of residential life systems and long-range strategic planning for the institution. In this context, the operations group would be responsible for facilitating program-driven, collaborative conversations regarding the adaptive reuse of existing facilities and/or the design and construction of new buildings. That is, planning for dorm renovations and/or future new construction of student residential buildings will have to be done in light of the Neighborhood structure and with the goal of providing equitable housing stock in each Neighborhood.

The Role and Impact of Dining Services on the Neighborhood System

Dining venues can play a central role in supporting the success of residential systems, particularly on liberal arts campuses where housing is driven by a program with strong philosophical underpinnings and a focus on building healthy, diverse, respectful communities. In support of the Neighborhood System, the configuration of Williams' dining system provides an abundance of geographically distributed dining options.

The decentralized nature of dining at Williams was loosely seen by the 2005 Committee on Undergraduate Life as a support to the Neighborhood system; that is, while the Committee saw that having a dining hall geographically associated with a Neighborhood was important, that association was not highlighted as a central feature of the system. One of the reasons clearly is that some residences are quite distant from the dining hall associated with their Neighborhood. The Facilities map in Appendix C indicates which residences are within 500 feet of the dining hall associated with their Neighborhoods, and one can see that there are clearly some outliers, such as Agard and Garfield in the Wood Neighborhood, and Tyler and Tyler Annex in the Dodd Neighborhood.

The opening of the Paresky Student Center, which contains four highly popular dining venues, took place in February 2007, approximately five months after the implementation of the Neighborhood system. The successful launch of the Paresky dining options immediately created an inherent tension between the historically distributed, traditionally formatted dining halls and the centrally located, à la carte venues within Paresky. An unintended consequence of this programmatic tension is the primacy of the centrality, convenience, and perceived high quality that accrued to Paresky over the more geographically decentralized, traditional service in the dining halls. In addition, the use of meal equivalency, allowing students to substitute meals taken at Paresky for their dining hall meal, has exacerbated this systemic friction. To some extent, this situation tends to undermine the hoped-for use of the dining halls as social gathering anchors assigned to specific Neighborhoods.

There is still a lot we don't know about this important programmatic interrelationship. Dining Services has excellent data collection tools at its disposal and the department has provided substantial details regarding student usage of its various venues and services. At this early stage in the program review process, however, the usage data don't yet provide a comprehensive picture of the evolving interdependence of housing and dining as the campus community adjusts to its new environment.

We can make some relatively clear observations and assumptions about the connections between our residential life and dining programs, but a number of questions remain that will require further study and student input:

- Williams provides a very large number of dining venues and meal plans for our small population: in addition to the four dining venues in Paresky, we have four traditional dining halls (Greylock, Driscoll, Dodd, and Mission Park), along with the Eco-Café and breakfast and lunch equivalency options at Goodrich. Of these,

Paresky is clearly the most popular place for students to dine: more meals are served at the combined Paresky venues than anywhere else on campus, and lunch is especially popular. Its central location is a clear factor in its popularity, along with its convenience (for instance, see the data for Grab 'n' Go). Also, as supported in the literature over the past decade or so, Paresky's à la carte style of service and public, just-in-time style of food preparation generates much higher *perceptions* of quality than the more cafeteria-style, all-you-care-to-eat orientation of our four older dining halls.

- More generally, geography plays a very big role in venue choice, with the possible exception of Dodd. Taken together, the combination of location, academic pursuits, and co-curricular activities may well be the strongest composite driver of dining venue choice. This leaves us with a couple questions: What does this say about the use of dining halls as anchored social space for the Neighborhoods? What does this say about the use of dining halls as a component of the broader, unstructured (i.e., non-event-driven) social context of the Neighborhood System?
- Other trends are evident. Mission Park appears to be particularly popular with first-year students, no matter where they're assigned to eat. Also, the quality of the facility doesn't seem to be a factor; Driscoll is arguably the most worn, most awkwardly designed venue in the system, yet it's remarkably popular. Is this popularity because of its location (near athletic facilities), trumping facility conditions? And/or is this a factor of perceived quality (Driscoll has won top student votes for food quality over the past few years), trumping facility conditions?

Next Steps

With the public circulation of its report, the Neighborhood Review Committee now seeks feedback from the Williams College community, especially current students. We are eager to work with College Council and the Committee on Undergraduate Life to organize public forums around the issues raised in this report and to identify specific constituencies with whom members of the Neighborhood Review Committee should meet for discussion. In addition, the website for the Neighborhood Review Committee will provide an opportunity for students, faculty, and staff to respond to the report in concrete and, we hope, productive ways.

The Committee anticipates spending the next four to six weeks in this phase of seeking public comment, after which it will reconvene to consider the community's responses and to write a final report with recommendations.