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Abstract
From 1990 to 2004, Gettysburg College's Greek system dominated student social life and, due to its prominence (and notoriety), attracted the attention of not only students but also faculty and administration during the era of President Gordon A. Haaland. Although fraternities were often the more influential and problematic Greek organizations on campus, Gettysburg's sororities played a major role in the lives of female students -- offering women a chance to join a community of other women, participate in philanthropy events, and engage in Greek social life. Throughout the Haaland era, Gettysburg's sororities consisted of a combination of Sigma Kappa, Alpha Xi Delta, Alpha Delta Pi, Chi Omega, Delta Gamma, Gamma Phi Beta, and Sigma Sigma Sigma. During the 14 years, some of these sororities were added, some disappeared, and all witnessed a reduction in membership by the end of Haaland's presidency. Some sororities had more problematic reputations than others or hazed new members, but sororities were not often perceived as negatively as fraternities were by college faculty and administration -- primarily due to sororities' lack of chapter houses. Nevertheless, sororities experienced the same administrative changes to Greek life that their male counterparts did, including three shifts in rush/pledge program timing. Beyond these broad changes, other transformations during the Haaland era were more specific to sororities, including the creation of new chapter rooms and the adoption of No Frills Rush.
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When Gordon A. Haaland began his presidency at Gettysburg College, he found himself on a campus with a dominant Greek system embroiled in controversy. Certainly, the prominence (and notoriety) of Greek life at Gettysburg could have been attributed largely to the 11 fraternities present during Haaland’s effective start as president on March 30, 1990. Though perhaps less influential or controversial than their male counterparts, sororities factored significantly into the lives of female Gettysburg students in both positive and problematic ways. Upon Haaland’s arrival, 53.2% of the women at Gettysburg College were involved in Greek life, split between seven sororities. Sigma Kappa, Alpha Xi Delta, Alpha Delta Pi, Chi Omega, Delta Gamma, Gamma Phi Beta, and Sigma Sigma Sigma boasted a combined 534 members, which contributed to the total Greek percentage of the student body, then 57.4%. During the first decade of his presidency, Haaland would see a drastic drop in that percentage, with only 38% of the female population in Greek organizations and 40.4% of the student body as a whole involved in Greek life by the spring of 1999. Throughout his presidency, Haaland and his administration prioritized providing “alternatives” to students as options instead of “going Greek.” Even with these alternatives, however, it is undeniable that the Haaland era was entangled with major transformations of the Greek system. Before Haaland even assumed the presidency, Interim President Anderson predicted the initiation of “a new era of Greek organizations at Gettysburg College.” Indeed, the Haaland era represented a turbulent time

---

1 Spectrum, 1990, 18, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76.
5 Note from Gordon Haaland, “My Position on Greek Life,” Papers of President Gordon A. Haaland, RG 2.0.13, Box 15, GCA.
during which Gettysburg’s sororities were an often attractive, traditional feature of the campus’s tradition and women’s lives, while also undergoing a series of dramatic changes aimed at reinventing Greek life.

**Sororities’ Influence on the Lives of Gettysburg Women During the Haaland Era**

Experiences of Greek women varied vastly depending on which sorority they joined, but their motives for initially joining tended to center around the same thing: wanting a sense of community. An Alpha Xi Delta sister and alumna from the class of 2000 recalled that, regardless of being eligible to rush a sorority during her first year, she waited until her sophomore year to join because she felt “more prepared to jump in and get a firm group of the people that I was hanging out with.”7 Christina Alberto Tryba ‘06, a Gamma Phi Beta sister, share those sentiments adding that, though involved in many extracurriculars her first year, not knowing any upperclassmen who were *not* in Greek life greatly impacted her decision to join.8 Similarly, Suzanna Nam Naylor ‘00, an international student and sister of Delta Gamma, said that she saw “how it was a very big part of Gettysburg College” and many of her “friends were in DG [Delta Gamma], so [she] decided to join as well for the experience.”9

The process of “rushing” a sorority was also a varied experience, though many involved admitted to having certain expectations leading up to their involvement in rush, particularly regarding their perception of the individual sororities. Laura Zinck Covington ‘00, a Chi Omega sister, described formal rush as a “series of events over a couple of days where we went from

---

7 The subject of this interview requested to remain anonymous due to the content of her interview. Anonymous Gettysburg alumna/Alpha Xi Delta sister interview with Elizabeth Hobbs, April 28, 2019.
8 Christina Alberto Tryba interview with Elizabeth Hobbs, April 26, 2019.
9 Suzanna Nam Naylor email to Madeleine Neiman, April 26, 2019.
sorority room to sorority room meeting the members.”

Although many women dressed semi-formally, Covington “went through rush in a baseball hat and overalls.” At this time, it was a widely known (and somewhat accepted) fact that certain sororities tended to attract, and often sought out, certain types of women. Sororities often prioritized which first year women to accept after interacting with them at parties and other events. Lauren Cooney ’00 described her experience as she rushed and received a bid from her top choice, Delta Gamma:

Delta Gamma got their entire "A" list the year I rushed, which is pre-determined pretty much before students rush. The older women would recruit us and invite us to parties, etcetera, and if they liked us you got put onto the “A” list. If you got the “B” list, you likely would get your second sorority choice. I was an “A” list for Delta Gamma, which was great news at the time.

However, not all hopeful pledges were as lucky as Cooney, who recalled women crying in the hallway after not receiving bids they wanted, and threatening sororities and college officials that they would inform their parents, particularly if they were rejected from sororities of which they were “legacies.” Cooney recalled that she “couldn't believe at the time that it was that emotional for some people.” Legacies, in the Greek world, referred to a college student whose parent or family member belonged to a Greek organization when they attended college. Though this customarily aided one’s chances of being asked to join the same organization, sororities were under no concrete obligation to follow that tradition. Lisa Rich McIvor ’97, an Alpha Xi Delta sister, is the daughter of a former Delta Gamma sister but went into the rush process knowing she did not want to end up with that organization. Consequently, McIvor was not disappointed when a bid from Delta Gamma never came; she knew that the women “had already gone through

---

10 Laura Zinck Covington email to Madeleine Neiman, April 26, 2019.
11 Covington email.
12 Lauren Cooney email to Madeleine Neiman, April 28, 2019.
13 Ibid.
14 Lisa Rich McIvor interview with Madeleine Neiman, April 26, 2019.
the [first-year] book and decided who they wanted to have and who they didn’t want to have.”\textsuperscript{15} She was, however, frustrated that Delta Gamma had failed to notify her mother that they had cut her, customary protocol at the time, “When you cut a legacy, you have to call….DG did not reach out to my mother.”\textsuperscript{16} This minor disappointment notwithstanding, McIvor found her place in Alpha Xi Delta, though not until she had completed an informal, or more casual and less strictly defined, rushing process during the fall of her sophomore year.\textsuperscript{17}

Although the majority of women who underwent the rush process inevitably received bids from a sorority, not all who received a bid decided to commit to an organization. Stereotypes surrounding the women involved in each of the sororities drove some pledges away, while some salacious details surrounding sororities’ reputations made them even more highly sought-after by potential new members. Each sorority had a string of qualities notoriously associated to them, creating a hierarchy of sorts which caused tensions during the rush process. According to several sorority women of the Haaland era, Delta Gamma was perceived as the “Lilly Pulitzer, pearl earring, pearl necklace, kind of girls,” “wealthy families who occasionally liked to dabble in drugs,” and “had the reputation as being the most elite.”\textsuperscript{18} Gamma Phi Beta was seen as containing “fun party girls...a lot of athletes, a lot of lacrosse girls” and “the girls you wanted to party or sleep with.”\textsuperscript{19} Chi Omega sisters were “the fun girls, really nice girls, smart girls, athletes” and “the girls you end up marrying” – though this last comment came from an admittedly biased Chi Omega sister.\textsuperscript{20} Alpha Delta Pi sisters were seen as “nerdier…more involved in other things on campus, not necessarily the most popular.”\textsuperscript{21} Sigma Kappa, though

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18} Tryba interview; Covington email; Barbara Dickson email to Madeleine Neiman, April 28, 2019.
\textsuperscript{19} Tryba interview; Covington email.
\textsuperscript{20} Tryba interview; Covington email.
\textsuperscript{21} Tryba interview.
only present in the first year of the Haaland era, was described by a former sister as containing “very independently-minded” women “all involved in other things.” Alpha Xi Delta, present on campus only until 1999, were the “down to Earth, girls next door,” who “were the sorority that took everyone and always had issues making quota during rush.” Sigma Sigma Sigma, an organization which recolonized (or reappeared) at Gettysburg College in 2002, took over Alpha Xi Delta’s role and, as one alumni put it, “I saw the Tri Sigmas when I was here [in Gettysburg] recently for an event, and I could tell they attracted the same girls as Alpha Xi.” These very generalized descriptions of the sororities and their members helped to form a hierarchy of which sororities were held in higher regard by students. One Alpha Xi Delta sister explained the “ranking” of the sororities by the student body as such: “Delta Gamma at the top, and then Gamma Phi Beta, Chi Omega, and ADPi… and we were definitely at the bottom, I’ll say that straight out, and we knew that.” Though the order of these rankings shifted slightly based on women’s biases, it is clear that some sororities were more popular or sought-after, while others were sometimes looked down upon by their peers.

After receiving bids from their respective sororities, each woman went through a pledge program, or process of education and familiarization, before being formally inducted into her organization. Treatment of pledges within Greek organizations has been a historically controversial topic, particularly due to hazing incidents, when established members force new members to complete undesirable tasks to achieve full acceptance or membership. Unfortunately, Gettysburg sorority women were not immune from this often humiliating and dangerous

22 Christine DeWerth Stoxen interview with Madeleine Neiman, April 26, 2019.
23 Kelly Medvigy email to Madeleine Neiman, April 27, 2019.
24 Anonymous interview.
25 Ibid.
practice. A recurring anecdote told by alumni of Gettysburg regarding sorority hazing was an event deemed “fat-marking.” A non-Greek woman, Barbara Dickinson ’00, recalled stories of women being marked for “problem areas” on their bodies, and it was rumored that this occurred within Delta Gamma. An article in *The Gettysburgian* confirmed that “certain sororities” pressured pledges to “assemble for a review dressed in only their underwear,” and while standing in a vulnerable position, their sisters “circled [problem areas on their bodies] with black magic marker.” In April 1999, Delta Gamma issued a written apology in *The Gettysburgian* regarding a different incident of hazing—a scavenger hunt involving four new members and three sisters. Though the events that transpired during the hunt are unknown, it was written up as hazing, and Delta Gamma sisters announced their intention to host educational anti-hazing events.

Despite the problematic aspects of stereotypes and hazing occurring within Gettysburg’s sororities, the women involved often saw their experience as a positive one overall. Events hosted by Greek organizations to support their philanthropies were prominent on campus at the time, including events like Delta Gamma’s Anchor Splash, a swimming contest fundraiser, and Greek Week, hosted in the spring by the Panhellenic Council, the student group which governed sororities on campus, and Interfraternity Council, the equivalent for fraternities. Greek Week, “an annual week-long celebration of pride, unity, and philanthropy by the fraternities and sororities on campus,” included events such as Greek Olympics, Bed Races, and Alpha Delta Pi’s immensely popular Airbands, a lip-sync and dance showdown. The prominence of philanthropic and social events on campus shaped and solidified the importance of Greek life in

---

26 Ibid.
27 Barbara Dickinson email to Madeleine Neiman, April 28, 2019.
30 Ibid.
the lives of those involved, while also encouraging members of sororities to strengthen their personal connection with their sisters. Though many sorority members were involved in other areas of campus (including the WZBT radio station, swimming, lacrosse, the Women’s Center, and multiple academic honor societies), the amount of time spent with members of their sororities formed bonds which were unparalleled in their other activities. Membership in sorority was often seen as a point of pride for women. Alpha Xi Delta sister, Lisa Rich McIvor recalled that most of her wardrobe in college had either “sorority letters on it or the name Gettysburg College on it.” It was commonplace to see women proudly displaying their Greek letters on clothing or colorful tote bags, which McIvor referred to as “bitch bags.” The bags featured sorority letters, though Delta Gamma’s featured their symbol, an anchor, which McIvor says earned them the name “anchor bitches.” Though these nicknames seem somewhat rude, many sorority women embraced their identifiability and found something comparable to family in their organization. One Alpha Xi Delta sister remarked, “You know we call ourselves ‘sisters,’ but those girls really became like my family while I was at school.” Though the era of Haaland’s presidency witnessed dramatic changes in Greek life and the overall decreasing of membership, the effects of sororities were felt very deeply by those personally involved. Sororities’ presence and influence (positive or negative) on campus was indisputable.

---

32 Spectrum, 1990, 82, 84, 86; Tryba interview.  
33 McIvor interview.  
34 Ibid.  
35 Ibid.  
36 Anonymous interview.
The Lead-up to and Beginning of the Haaland Era, Regarding Sororities: 1988-91

To understand what stimulated the major transformations in Greek life, the prominence of the Greek system on campus in the late 1980s and the problems associated with it must be stated. According to the Office of Greek Organizations, Greek life made up approximately 61.3% of the student body in the spring of 1988.37 Haaland remembered it as being roughly 70% when he arrived.38 Sororities, specifically, encompassed about 54.9% of the women on campus in 1988.39 With nearly two-thirds of students, and over half of Gettysburg’s women, involved in the Greek system, fraternities and sororities were a major presence on campus, but fraternities even more so than sororities. Christine DeWerth Stoxen ’88, a sister of Sigma Kappa, remembered, “Our whole social life was revolved around the fraternities and parties, especially freshman and sophomore year.”40 She recalled “free-flowing alcohol” and emphasized that “fraternities were a big part of that.”41 This aligns with the assessment made by Thomas Dombrowsky, Director of Greek Life from 1991 to 1998, who described the Greek system in the 1980s as being “out of control.”42 Dombrowsky cited the major problems of the time as the “very poor maintenance” of fraternity houses, the “deleterious effect” of Greek life on academics, and the “rampant underage drinking” occurring at fraternity parties.43 Clearly, for the bulk of these concerns, fraternities were implicated more than sororities, yet, in the years preceding Haaland’s presidency, sororities were still perceived as problematic for the social and academic well-being of students.

37 Office of Greek Organizations, “Greek Organization Membership History, 1988-1999,” Appendix I: Data on Greek Life at Gettysburg College, Papers of President Gordon A. Haaland, RG 2.0.13, Box 15, GCA.
38 Michael Birkner oral history of Gordon Holland, Part 2, September 19, 2014, Oral History Collection, Special Collections, Musselman Library, 34.
40 Christine DeWerth Stoxen interview with Madeleine Neiman, April 26, 2019.
41 Ibid.
43 Thomas Dombrowsky email to Madeleine Neiman, April 29, 2019.
During the year before Haaland began his tenure, concerns about the Greek system prompted Gettysburg College’s faculty to act, leading to a proposal for the complete eradication of fraternities and sororities on campus. On January 14, 1988, Professor Kenneth F. Mott of the Political Science Department spoke at a meeting of the faculty and called for the abolishment of Gettysburg’s fraternities. Mott qualified that he had chosen not to address sororities because he knew less about them, but he added, “If they are guilty of the same litany of sins, I would not oppose an amendment adding them to the motion.” Indeed, this amendment was made, and the faculty approved a motion to abolish both fraternities and sororities at Gettysburg on March 17, 1988 with a vote of 63 to 23. The majority of the faculty, led by Mott, found the Greek system to be guilty of threatening academics and individuality, perpetuating sexism, and degrading women and pledges. While the motion was amended to include sororities, the proposal mainly targeted fraternities and the problems associated with their houses. Dombrowsky clarified that sororities were involved because “they often supported [fraternities’] behaviors by their attendance and co-sponsorship” of fraternity parties. Although the faculty’s motion intended to correct the fraternities’ negative effect on students, especially first years, the sororities’ existence on campus was similarly threatened.

Fraternity and sorority members responded strongly to Professor Mott and the faculty’s decision. Mott saw students’ reaction as “resentful” and predicted a “protracted and costly battle with college authorities.” Some students protested the faculty’s motion through demonstration,

---

45 Mott, “Mott’s Faculty Proposal.”
47 Ibid.
48 Dombrowsky email.
49 Ibid.
50 Ken Mott, “Mott clarifies his proposal to eliminate the Greek system,” *The Gettysburgian*, September 27, 1988, 3.
such as holding up a sign that declared “Faculty just don’t understand” during the 1989 Greek Week or by taking to The Gettysburgian to argue that the faculty’s decision was “rash” and that they ought to consider the positive aspects of Greek life.\footnote{Spectrum, 1989, 181; Michael Sievers, “Faculty should not condemn what they do not understand,” The Gettysburgian, April 19, 1988, 3.} Indeed, during the 1989-90 school year, sororities made a concentrated effort to improve the relationship between the faculty and students. Delta Gamma sisters held “Faculty Teas” and welcomed the first-ever faculty team to participate in their philanthropy fundraiser, Anchor Splash.\footnote{Spectrum, 1990, 86.} Gamma Phi Beta sisters similarly held a tea party for female faculty members, and Sigma Kappa hosted a faculty breakfast.\footnote{Ibid., 88, 90.} Thus, Haaland’s presidency began with a fragile, tense relationship between the faculty and Greek life, with many sororities attempting to convince faculty of the bright side to their organizations.

In response to the controversial faculty motion, the Board of Trustees formed committees to evaluate the fraternities and sororities on campus and establish regulations as needed. These committees were the Campus Life Task Force – made up of faculty, students, alumni, and the Associate Dean of Student Life, Debbie Heida – and the Greek Life Steering Committee – made up of trustees, faculty, and the Dean of Student Life, Mary Gutting.\footnote{Spectrum, 1989, 105; Spectrum, 1990, 18.} In May 1989, the committees’ reports advised that Greek life remain on campus but recommended the development of the Expectations and Standards Document, a set of guidelines defining the college’s relationship with Greek life and establishing rules to govern them.\footnote{Office of Public Relations, “Expectations and Standards Document”; Spectrum, 1990, 18.} President-Elect Haaland contributed to the Board of Trustees’ discussion of the document and “endorsed the…decision to retain Greek organizations,” though he supported changes to the Greek system that would improve the “first-year experience.”\footnote{Office of Public Relations, “Expectations and Standards Document.”} In December 1989, the document was approved
by the Board of Trustees, followed by revisions and input from Greek alumni, national representatives, and student officers. Finally, on February 11, 1991, Gordon Haaland, who had assumed the presidency in March 1990, and Dean Mary Gutting announced that all fraternities and sororities on Gettysburg’s campus had ratified the document, “initiating a new era in the life of our campus” – an echo of Interim President Anderson’s words from nearly a year earlier.

With this implementation of the Expectations and Standards document at the outset of the Haaland presidency, Gettysburg’s sororities witnessed the beginning of a series of major changes in sorority life and operations – the most immediate of these being a shift in the rush schedule.

Transformations in Sorority Life and Operations, 1990-2004

During the 1990-1991 school year, President Haaland’s first full year in office, Gettysburg College’s sororities underwent the first of three major shifts in the timing of rush and pledging to occur in the Haaland era. As outlined in the Expectations and Standards Document, eligibility for fraternity and sorority rush was moved from the first-year fall semester to the first-year spring semester. Rush would occur during the first three days of an extended spring break, followed by a three week and 15 hour-long pledge program, which was required to end three weeks before final exams began. Moving from the fall to spring semester followed the reasoning that a spring break rush would allow first-year students to “establish themselves in the curricular and co-curricular life” at Gettysburg and would “eliminate conflict with the academic

---

60 Ibid., 1.
Although the sorority presidents and Panhellenic Council worked with the administration to implement and evaluate the spring rush process, they found the adjustment difficult. On April 3, 1991, the sororities gathered in Plank Gym for a celebration of a successful completion of their first spring rush, and, as Molly McConnell ’91, the co-head rush counselor explained in a *Gettysburgian* article, the sororities wanted to prove to the administration that they were actively working to strengthen the Greek system under these new policies.

Of the sororities present on campus at the time (Sigma Kappa, Alpha Xi Delta, Gamma Phi Beta, Delta Gamma, Chi Omega, and Alpha Delta Pi), Sigma Kappa and Alpha Xi Delta seemed to be the most negatively impacted by the switch. Sigma Kappa, already dwindling in numbers and with only 20 members in the spring of 1991, declared themselves “dormant” on March 4. Though they announced plans to recolonize, or become reinstated, in 1992, the sorority never rematerialized on Gettysburg’s campus. Unlike Sigma Kappa, Alpha Xi Delta survived the switch, but they had an unusually small yield of potential new members. In the fall of 1991, the sororities were told not to “dirty rush,” or sway first-year women to join a particular sorority before the spring rush period, according to Alpha Xi Delta sister Lisa Rich McIvor ’97, who heard the story from older members of her sorority present in 1991. From her sisters, McIvor was told that, although Alpha Xi Delta did not participate in dirty rushing, other sororities did. This led to a perception of Alpha Xi Delta as “a bunch of snobs,” and when the sisters extended bids to first-year women, they received very few acceptances. McIvor explained that this was “the first bad rush that Alpha Xi had,” and the sorority never recovered.

---

61 Greek Life Steering Committee report, 12.
64 Ibid.
65 McIvor interview.
66 Ibid.
67 Ibid.
its numbers.68 Although the switch to spring rush impacted Sigma Kappa and Alpha Xi Delta the most negatively, all sororities felt the challenge of recruiting new members under the new policy.

As with Ken Mott’s proposal, the move to spring break rush represented only the beginnings of major transformations in sorority life and operations during the era of Haaland’s presidency. Between 1990 and 1992, the next significant change, the discussion and institution of new chapter rooms, occurred. Sororities on Gettysburg’s campus never had houses like the fraternities did, and it influenced their presence on campus. Without housing, according to Delta Gamma sister Suzanna Nam Naylor ’00, “even if [sororities] wanted to be more present and impactful, the full effects were not that apparent,” compared to fraternities.69 Chi Omega sister Laura Zinck Covington ’02 felt that sororities did have a major influence on campus, “but having the fraternity houses made a difference in the physical presence of fraternities.”70 Contrary to popular rumor, an archaic Pennsylvania law restricting more than eight women from living together on the grounds that the house became a brothel was not the reason that sororities lacked houses on Gettysburg’s campus.71 Rather, as Thomas Dombrowsky explained, the lack of consideration for sorority houses most likely derived from the matter of cost and “the lack of alumna pressure to build and fund them.”72 Instead of houses, Gettysburg’s sororities had chapter rooms, or meeting spaces, in the basement of Hanson Hall, with the exception of the sisters of Alpha Delta Pi, who met in the basement of Huber Hall.73 When the college administration decided to renovate Hanson and Huber Halls to expand on-campus residences, the sorority
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68 Ibid.  
69 Naylor email.  
70 Covington email.  
71 Susan C. Halpin, “Why are there no sorority houses on campus?” The Gettysburgian, March 9, 1992, 8.  
72 Dombrowsky email.  
73 Ann Marie Schropp, “Ice House Complex will be used to house sororities,” The Gettysburgian, October 10, 1990, 2, 5.
chapter rooms were to be moved to the Ice House Complex, located between Race Horse Alley and the railroad tracks in downtown Gettysburg.\textsuperscript{74}

Initially, sorority sisters expressed their unhappiness at the decision. They felt that President Haaland and the administration excluded them from the discussion surrounding their own chapter rooms, and many of the sisters had concerns about the safety of Ice House Complex, describing it as off-campus and having a “somewhat questionable appearance.”\textsuperscript{75} On October 15, 1990, when the Panhellenic Council and sorority presidents met to discuss the Ice House move with President Haaland, Jodi Kaiser ’92, Panhellenic Representative for Gamma Phi Beta, argued that the complex would create a “target” for crime and put the women in danger by grouping them together.\textsuperscript{76} Other sisters, including the president of Panhellenic Council and Alpha Xi Delta sister, Molly McConnell ’91, felt that meeting with Haaland was “successful” and that he seemed receptive to their ideas.\textsuperscript{77} By the fall of 1991, the former chapter rooms in Hanson Hall “had been gutted and renovated” over the summer, but the Ice House complex was delayed, leaving the “new sorority rooms non-existent.”\textsuperscript{78} Finally, in 1992, sisters of the five sororities present on campus (Alpha Xi Delta, Gamma Phi Beta, Delta Gamma, Chi Omega, and Alpha Delta Pi) moved into their new meeting places in the Ice House complex.\textsuperscript{79} During the initial years of Haaland’s presidency, sororities experienced a change concerning not only the recruitment of new members but also where on (or off) campus they would exist.

Additionally, a recommendation from the National Panhellenic Council altered how Gettysburg’s five sororities conducted their rush. In 1994, Gettysburg’s Panhellenic Council

\textsuperscript{74} Dombrowsky email; Linda M. Chesson, “Panhel leaders discuss ‘Ice House’ proposal,” October 25, 1990, 5, 8.
\textsuperscript{75} Schropp, “Ice House Complex will be used.”
\textsuperscript{76} Chesson, “Panhel leaders discuss.”
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{79} Dombrowsky email.
adopted a policy of “No Frills Rush,” as per the recommendation of the National Council.\textsuperscript{80} This policy, implemented with the spring rush of 1995, required sororities to “no longer perform lengthy skits” and to “eliminate elaborate decorations from the formal rush period.”\textsuperscript{81} Rather than the “frills” or performative nature of past rushes, the spring 1995 rush was meant to emphasize “direct personal contact” and “genuine conversation” to help sisters form a closer relationship with potential new members.\textsuperscript{82} According to the Panhellenic Council’s announcement in \textit{The Gettysburgian}, this new rush policy addressed the major concerns associated with rushing.\textsuperscript{83} Less time devoted to rush meant more time for academics, especially midterms which occurred near spring break, and less money needed to be spent on decorations and costumes for rush.\textsuperscript{84} Although the Panhellenic Council’s announcement noted that the spring 1995 rush would be “the finest Rush for everyone involved,” Thomas Dombrowsky recalled that the switch to No Frills Rush “required some real commitment and adaptation by the sororities.”\textsuperscript{85} Thus, though this seemed to be a major policy change for the sororities on campus in 1995, it may have taken some time for the women to entirely remove all the “frills” from their process.

Near the middle of Gordon Haaland’s presidency, the timing of rush underwent its second shift of the era; after having adjusted to a first-year spring break rush, sororities needed to adapt once again to a new, earlier first-year spring rush. As with the initial change from first-year fall to spring rush, Greek life’s impact on academics, especially for first-year students, was a key impetus in the shift. In September 1994, Thomas Dombrowsky presented requested statistics on Greek organizations to President Haaland and Julie Ramsey, Dean of the College. Of these

\textsuperscript{80} Rush/Pledging Review Committee Report, 5.
\textsuperscript{81} The Panhellenic Council, “All Greek to me: This Week’s Focus: Panhellenic Council,” \textit{The Gettysburgian}, September 15, 1994, 6.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid.; Dombrowsky email.
statistics, one data set compared Greek and non-Greek first-year students’ GPAs from the fall semester, when they were ineligible to join Greek life, to those of spring semester, allowing for an evaluation of the success of spring break rush.\textsuperscript{86} According to this data, independent women’s GPAs decreased only 3\% in the spring, whereas sorority women’s GPAs decreased 20.5\%.\textsuperscript{87} Every sorority experienced a decline; Chi Omega was the “least affected,” while Alpha Xi Delta and Gamma Phi Beta had the “largest semester to semester decline,” although Alpha Xi Delta’s small sample size may have caused misleading results.\textsuperscript{88} Clearly, the administration’s efforts to improve first-year academics by delaying rush eligibility to the spring in 1990-91 had not completely resolved the negative impact that Greek life had on the grades of first-year women.

Leading up to the spring of 1996, an evaluation to determine the best timing for rush and pledging occurred, although a miscommunication in the reasoning for this evaluation suggests tension between the faculty and administration regarding Greek life. In February 1996, Dean Ramsey reported that the Faculty Executive Committee, concerned that spring break rush negatively affected first-year students’ grades due to its proximity to midterms and finals, had requested a review of the timing of fraternity and sorority rush.\textsuperscript{89} Though many faculty members most likely had concerns for first-year students’ grades, a letter from the Faculty Executive Committee to Dean Ramsey explained that the shift in rush timing occurred because the faculty shortened spring break in the academic calendar for 1996-97 and following years.\textsuperscript{90}

\textsuperscript{86} Thomas Dombrowsky memorandum to Gordon Haaland and Julie Ramsey, “Requested Statistical Information on Greek Organizations,” September 1, 1994, Papers of President Gordon A. Haaland, RG 2.0.13, Box 15, GCA.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{90} The Executive Committee of the Faculty letter to Julie Ramsey, Dean of College, March 6, 1996, Papers of President Gordon A. Haaland, RG 2.0.13, Box 15, GCA.
Gettysburgian article from April 1996 similarly reported that the change in the academic calendar was the force that moved the Greek rush schedule.91 In the Faculty Executive Committee’s letter to Dean Ramsey, their disappointed tone implies that Greek life remained a contentious subject for some faculty members. While the faculty understood that limiting spring break to a single week would create challenges for Greek rush, they “believe[ed] that the College’s academic calendar should be driven by concerns that are pertinent to the College’s mission.”92 This, the Executive Committee stressed, did not mean that the faculty did not care about rush timing; rather, they maintained that rush, “if it must be held at all,” should occur after final exams, and they regretted not being included in the deliberation regarding the move to spring rush.93 Thus, the miscommunication regarding the impetus for the move to earlier spring rush perhaps reveals that the tension between faculty and the Greek system, present in the late 1980s, had not yet disappeared.

Regardless, Dean Ramsey commissioned the Rush/Pledging Review Committee, made up of students and faculty including Thomas Dombrowsky, and used their recommendations to conclude when to hold fraternity and sorority rush and pledge programs.94 After considering potential rush/pledge periods, the committee recommended that, to improve Greek GPAs, the schedule ought to move away from exams and occur during the first two weekends of the first-year spring semester (in January/February) with three weeks of pledging following.95 Ultimately, however, the committee warned that “the problem lies not so much on the placement of formal rush and pledging but the distraction the whole process…is to both upper class and first year
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92 The Executive Committee of the Faculty letter to Julie Ramsey.
93 Ibid.
94 Julie L. Ramsey memorandum to Fraternity Presidents, Members of the Interfraternity Council, Sorority Presidents, and Members of the Panhellenic Council.
95 Rush/Pledging Review Committee Report, 7.
students.” For sororities, the committee found that “the anticipation and the stress of the rush process” caused the decline in sisters’ academic performance, though they believed that a firm adoption of the No Frills Rush policy would help lessen the stress for upper-class women, who would no longer need to prepare elaborate rush themes and events. In the hopes of positively transforming fraternity and sorority members’ GPAs and/or in reaction to the changing academic calendar, the administration implemented a move to an early spring rush and pledging schedule.

Still dwindling in numbers, Alpha Xi Delta survived through a second change in the Greek rush schedule, but after a series of events decimated the sorority’s membership, Alpha Xi Delta disappeared from Gettysburg College in 1999. In the spring of 1997, with the new early rush policy in place, Alpha Xi Delta was comprised of 29 women. To place this in context, Alpha Delta Pi had 83 members, Chi Omega had 84, Delta Gamma had 79, and Gamma Phi Beta had 78. Already the smallest sorority on campus, Alpha Xi Delta’s numbers would continue to shrink, especially after the tragedy that struck in the fall of 1997. On November 1, Alpha Xi Delta sister and Gettysburg College sophomore, Casey Dunn was found to have committed suicide by “self-strangulation” in her room. As conveyed by her memorial in The Gettysburgian on November 6, 1997, Dunn was a “huge force” on campus and “her infectious smile and laughter” were dearly missed by those who knew her, including her sisters in Alpha Xi Delta. During the spring of 1996, Dunn was Alpha Xi Delta’s only formal rush pledge and, being so enthusiastic about her sorority, helped to recruit four informal pledges a week after completing the formal process herself. One of these informal pledges, Miranda Fegley, was
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96 Ibid.
97 Ibid., 7-8.
98 Spectrum, 1997, 100.
99 Ibid., 99, 101-3.
102 Ibid.
quoted in the memorial as saying, “Casey always pulled Alpha Xi together – she really wanted us to bond as a sisterhood.”\textsuperscript{103} Her loss caused several other Alpha Xi Delta sisters to abandon the sorority. One sister from the Class of 2000, who joined Alpha Xi Delta in the aftermath of Dunn’s suicide, recalled, “Not only did we lose her at that point, but we lost other people, too…Her very closest friend…would never come to an Alpha Xi event again. She was in so much grief…We had such small numbers, so when you lose one person, it’s like cutting off your foot.”\textsuperscript{104} Indeed, months after Dunn’s death, in the spring of 1998, the sorority had only 18 members, a significant decrease from the 29 it had the previous spring.\textsuperscript{105} Clearly shaken and hurt by Dunn’s suicide, Alpha Xi Delta existed on campus for only about two more years.

Another contributing factor to their disappearance was Alpha Xi Delta’s decision to withdraw from formal rush in the spring of 1998, hoping that an informal process would better recruit members. Proposed by the sorority’s National Headquarters in November, Alpha Xi Delta’s withdrawal from the formal Panhellenic Rush represented an effort to rebuild their chapter.\textsuperscript{106} Having had little success with formal rushes in the past, the sorority attempted a more relaxed process, including such events as “Xi My Valentine: Choose Children,” a philanthropy event at which potential new members could help make Valentine’s Day door signs for local hospitalized children, and “Xi Café and Coffeehouse,” a chance to relax, study, and drink coffee with Alpha Xi Delta sisters.\textsuperscript{107} From this informal rush, Alpha Xi Delta gained five new members.\textsuperscript{108} Comparatively, 88 women completed formal Panhellenic rush and were split amongst Alpha Delta Pi (19 pledges), Chi Omega (20), Delta Gamma (22), and Gamma Phi Beta

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{104} Anonymous interview.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid.
Ironically, Alpha Xi Delta’s withdrawal allowed the other four sororities to take more pledges in the spring due to the quota system, which divided the number of potential pledges by the number of participating sororities. With only four of the five sororities participating in formal rush, these four could take a larger number of women into their sororities, distancing Alpha Xi Delta even more in terms of membership. Thus, although the informal rush process yielded a few new members of Alpha Xi Delta, their overall membership remained far below the other sororities at Gettysburg College during the Haaland era.

Finally, after the loss of Casey Dunn and the failure to make significant membership changes through informal rush, Alpha Xi Delta at Gettysburg College closed in the fall of 1999, contributing to the perceived destruction of Greek life during Haaland’s presidency. According to an announcement of its decolonization in *The Gettysburgian*, the sorority’s “sharp decline in membership over the past few years” was the cause of their disappearance from campus – not any scandal or forced removal by the college. Although they were disappointed, the sisters considered the possibility of recolonizing on campus after several years, but, to date, this has not occurred. Following Sigma Kappa, Alpha Xi Delta became the second sorority to close during President Gordon Haaland’s time in office. By the summer of 1999, nearly a decade after Haaland’s arrival, the campus witnessed its percentage of Greek life decrease from roughly 70% to 40.4% of the entire student body. Sororities contained approximately 38% of women or 443 members by the summer of 1999 – a decrease from the 54.9% recorded on campus by the
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Office of Greek Organizations in 1988. Although the sisters of Alpha Xi Delta did not protest their decolonization, students, especially Greeks, in the late 1990s perceived Haaland and the administration as actively “weakening” Greek life through all of the “new rules and regulations.” Alpha Xi Delta sister, Lisa Rich McIvor, who graduated in 1997, remembered that “everyone blamed Haaland because he was the president…We certainly felt like Dombrowsky didn’t want Greek life…[B]y extension, Haaland didn’t [either] because, if Haaland wanted Greek life, he wouldn’t let Dombrowsky be giving us such a hard time.”

Thomas Dombrowsky finished his tenure as Director of Greek Life in January 1998 when the administration decided the position no longer worked. He observed that the students were angry at him “because [he] was making them do what they said they would do,” while both the faculty and administration “wanted them [the fraternities] gone,” although the administration also had to appease alumni. Years after Dombrowsky left the position, Gamma Phi Beta sister Christina Alberto Tryba ’06, echoing McIvor and others, still perceived that the administration was “delaying rush so that less people would be able to join.” The animosity surrounding Gettysburg’s Greek system had not entirely faded since Professor Mott’s proposal in the late 1980s, especially with ongoing administrative changes to Greek life.

Having graduated in 2006, Christina Alberto Tryba arrived on Gettysburg’s campus during the third and final major shift in rush and pledge timing under President Haaland: the
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move to sophomore fall rush. Although sophomore rush policy was not implemented until 2002, discussions regarding postponing rush eligibility until students’ sophomore year had begun as early as 1989 with the Greek Life Steering Committee.123 “Heated internal debate” with fraternity alumni ultimately caused the concept to be dismissed as economically unfeasible.124 In 1995-96, before the decision to move spring break rush earlier in the semester, the Rush/Pledging Review Committee considered a separate rush and pledging schedule in which formal rush would occur after first-year spring break and pledging would occur during the sophomore fall semester.125 For Gettysburg women, this was seen as a “good possibility” that would have prevented first-year sorority sisters from paying dues “for essentially a three week semester,” yet a number of concerns with fraternity houses eliminated the idea once again.126 In 1996, Dean Julie Ramsey advised that if the early first-year spring rush did not yield academic improvements, “the Board of Trustees and the administration will need to seriously look at the option of sophomore rush.”127 True to Dean Ramsey’s prediction, the Board of Trustees commissioned the Residential and Social Life Advisory Committee in 1998 to propose recommendations for residential and social life on campus, including some discussion of a proposed sophomore rush.128 In the spring of 2001, the Gettysburg College Alumni Magazine announced that a Sophomore Rush Advisory Committee, comprised of students, faculty, alumni,

123 The Alumni Association of Gettysburg College, “Sophomore Rush Update,” Gettysburg College Alumni Magazine 92, no. 3 (Summer 2001), 2; Rush/Pledging Review Committee Report, 1.
124 Rush/Pledging Review Committee Report, 1.
125 Ibid., 7.
126 Ibid.
127 Julie L. Ramsey memorandum to Fraternity Presidents, Members of the Interfraternity Council, Sorority Presidents, and Members of the Panhellenic Council.
trustees, and college administrators, had been meeting since the previous summer.\textsuperscript{129} By May 2001, President Haaland had received the committee’s final recommendations, which included a rush period beginning in the fall of sophomore year and an extended, four-week pledge period; Haaland endorsed these changes, stressing that they should also be supported by the Greek organizations.\textsuperscript{130} Through the entirety of President Haaland’s time at Gettysburg College, sophomore rush continued to appear in committee deliberations about rush and pledging schedules until it was implemented in 2002.

From the student perspective, the move to sophomore rush received varied reactions from Gettysburg’s fraternities and sororities. After the fact, a 2003 edition of the \textit{Gettysburg College Alumni Magazine} quoted vice president of the Panhellenic Council, Sarah Bergen ’03 as saying, “It’s better that we moved rush to sophomore year, because now the sororities and fraternities will get more dedicated men and women.”\textsuperscript{131} During the years leading up to the switch, however, students were less positive in their assessments. On November 4, 1999, \textit{The Gettysburgian} described Greek students’ fears that sophomore rush would “contribute to the demise of the Greek system at Gettysburg College” and eliminate “an entire year of sisterhood” for sorority women.\textsuperscript{132} Faculty members involved in the Residential and Social Life Advisory Committee, Professors Janet Morgan Riggs, Michael J. Birkner, and Steven W. James, insisted that sophomore rush would “not be the downfall of the Greek system” and that “[a]ny future disappearance of Greek organizations on this campus will be due to decreased student interest in


Greek life, not sophomore rush.”¹³³ This did not prevent students from reaching the conclusion that “a complete elimination of the Greek system does not seem far-fetched.”¹³⁴ As stated earlier, Christina Alberto Tryba, a sister of Gamma Phi Beta and present during the switch, similarly saw sophomore rush as an administrative attack on Greek life membership.¹³⁵ In the years after sophomore rush, however, the controversy surrounding it seemed to dissipate. Meggan Smith ’04, a sister of Sigma Sigma Sigma (TriSigma), the fifth and newest Gettysburg sorority, was less involved with sophomore rush, especially since TriSigma was only established in September 2002.¹³⁶ Smith “heard some murmurings” of sophomore rush but felt that it “wasn’t that big of a debate,” though she admitted that it may have been more of an issue in fraternities, which she did not frequent.¹³⁷ With the exception of TriSigma, the other four sororities witnessed membership numbers remain “relatively the same as past years” after the first semester of sophomore rush.¹³⁸

Approximately 43% of sophomore women, or 142 women, joined sororities in the fall of 2002, and retention rates between first-year to sophomore year increased by 3%, marking a “positive change” for Gettysburg College. Thus, despite the doubts surrounding sophomore rush and the administration’s intentions regarding it, the implementation of this third shift in rush and pledge program timing appeared to be less disastrous than expected.

Conclusions About Sororities During the Haaland Era

Between 1990 and 2004, Gettysburg College had at least four sororities on campus: a combination of Sigma Kappa, Alpha Xi Delta, Alpha Delta Pi, Chi Omega, Delta Gamma,

¹³³ Janet Morgan Riggs, Michael J. Birkner, and Steven W. James, 20.
¹³⁴ “Consider This,” The Gettysburgian, November 4, 1999, 11.
¹³⁵ Tryba interview.
¹³⁶ Meggan Smith email to Madeleine Neiman, April 26, 2019; Spectrum, 2003, 96.
¹³⁷ Smith email.
Gamma Phi Beta, and Sigma Sigma Sigma. Rushing and pledging a sorority offered Gettysburg women a chance to join a community of other women, participate in philanthropy events, and engage in a strong Greek social life. Although each sorority had its own reputation – some more problematic than others – and some hazing occurred, these women were not often perceived as negatively as fraternities were by the college faculty and administration – largely because sororities lacked chapter houses and the prominence (and notoriety) that came with them. Still, associated closely with fraternities, sororities underwent the same major transformations of Greek life, including three shifts in rush/pledge program timing. Other changes occurring over the 14 years were more specific to sororities, such as the creation of new chapter rooms in the Ice House Complex or the adoption of No Frills Rush. On a broad scale, the Haaland era was a tumultuous period for Gettysburg sororities, characterized by new regulations and an overall reduction in membership, yet on an individual level, Gettysburg’s women decided how much or how little they wanted their involvement in a sorority to control their experience at Gettysburg College.
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