

## **INTRODUCTION**

With a clear intent and desire to invest in and enhance the fraternity & sorority experience, the University of Wisconsin partnered with an external review team to conduct a program review of Fraternity & Sorority Life. The goal of this review was to observe current practice, identify areas for improvement, and provide recommendations for future action. The five member review team - Sam Centellas, Kurt Foriska, Jennifer Jones, Laura Osteen and Amy Vojta - offers this document to the University of Wisconsin for their consideration.

The review team observations and recommendations are a result of document review, on-campus interviews, comments submitted through the review website, and additional data collected through the FSL website. During the on-campus portion of the external review (March 31 - April 3), the external review team conducted 20 separate stakeholder meetings with staff members, students, alumni and chapter advisors. More than 200 individuals provided direct feedback during these meetings. The stakeholder meetings were guided by a set of general prompts that allowed participants to share their experiences relative to the FSL community, rather than responding to pre-determined questions. During these meetings, the external review team recorded handwritten notes containing observations, themes, and questions for clarification and/or follow-up.

Following the on-campus portion of the external review, the team reviewed notes, coded data, identified themes and assembled a set of recommendations addressing the fundamental issues identified during the review process. Those recommendations are outlined in this document. The external review team assumes the following regarding this process and the use of the recommendations presented in this document:

- The impetus to create, the resources dedicated, and the intentionality in the execution of this external review all point to an administration dedicated and committed to the existence and enhancement of the University of Wisconsin fraternity and sorority life experience.
- The timing of this review and its resulting transformative decisions are aligned for success given the current national context and focus on the fraternity and sorority experience.
- This report will yield optimal results if shared and discussed widely among all contributing constituencies and implemented collaboratively.
- A focus on the fundamentals of relationship building is more likely to achieve an exemplary FSL culture than a focus on compliance. Active communication and clearly-articulated shared expectations are indispensable in the creation of trust between students, alumni, staff, and administration. The absence of these creates an incubator for misinformation, mistrust and misunderstanding.

- A “best practice” is one that is intentional, clearly connected to other practices, consistently applied and recognizes the unique cultural, structural and political factors of the University of Wisconsin. The recommendations offered in this report build from best practices in the field and are offered for translation and best fit for UW culture.
- There are multiple stakeholders, including but not limited to alumni/chapter advisors and student affairs colleagues who are significant resources to mobilize during the process of advancing this FSL community.
- A values-based FSL community has the potential to provide a student experience difficult to match in terms of familial, social, and leadership development. Conversely, an FSL community not aligned with the core values of member organizations and its host institution provides little lasting benefit to individual members or to the campus community. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that this process yields a strategic and well-executed effort to build an experience that adds value to the Wisconsin Experience for all.

This report is organized into three sections: introduction, strategic areas, closing, and appendix. The appendix contains information found on the external review website: <https://fsl.cfli.wisc.edu/external-review/> - including the Vice Chancellor’s Charge, Purpose and Scope, bios of the external review team, and the schedule of meetings during their visit. The external review team was asked to specifically address six strategic areas: Accountability; Diversity and Inclusion; Institutional Relationship; Membership Experience; Resources and Support; and Student Safety. Each strategic area is organized by its guiding principle, key observations, and recommendations.

## **STRATEGIC AREAS**

### **Accountability:**

#### Guiding Principle

Individual Accountability is “baked into” the experience of all fraternity/sorority members, regardless of their affiliation, because of the oaths taken when we accept an organization’s invitation to join. Organizational accountability must be a shared and transparent function between the undergraduate members, national organization and host institution if our chapters are to be lauded as assets to campus and if they are to be an example to other student organizations.

#### Key Observations

Like many university communities across the country, UW staff and students are concerned about behaviors related to the use/misuse of alcohol, sexual assault, hazing, etc. Many fraternity/sorority participants in our sessions were quick to acknowledge the broader Wisconsin community (e.g. the band, athletic teams, etc.) faces these problems but were at a loss as to how these behaviors could be addressed within their own community.

Concerns about behaviors and accountability for them **varies by Council**. Accountability or concerns about behaviors were not brought up as critical issues during conversations with members of the NPHC and MGC. Interfraternity and Panhellenic Council members didn't speak to the use of their own judicial or standards boards to adjudicate infractions or address risky behaviors. The Interfraternity Council has a Judicial Board but its function was unclear. A Panhellenic Council Judicial Board was mentioned as a tool, but conversation didn't address if this was effective or even operational.

There exists a sort of "**jurisdictional challenge**" within the community that is compounded by the role the Office of Student Conduct and the Committee on Student Organizations. These layers of accountability contribute to an overall sense of judicial bureaucracy and create four different accountability systems: chapter judicial boards, inter/national headquarters based intervention, Governing Council adjudication and CSO which seem to be competing rather than complimentary systems. One student remarked, "It is hard to respect bureaucracy when it does work, and it's even more frustrating when it doesn't work."

**Committee on Student Organizations (CSO)** provoked almost universal negative reaction from chapter members, student officers and alumni/ae advisors. Among the chief complaints - lack of a transparent process, a process that seemed to be inconsistently applied between Greek-letter organizations and other registered student organizations, sanctions that were not appropriate to the violation and confusion over the role (if any) that members of the CfLI and FSL staff members played in the process. Students feel that they cannot ask clarifying questions about policy because in doing so they might raise suspicion of a staff member and will then be scrutinized in the future. Students, especially student officers, thrive best in an environment that allows them to engage in dialogue about the consequences of their choices and the most appropriate intervention if those choices result in behaviors or situations that pose a danger to individual students or others.

The lack of **transparency** throughout CSO process is a core issue for many students and advisors. Transparency issues are rooted in a fundamental lack of knowledge about how the process works and in a systemic lack of communication provided to those participating in the process. A few examples:

- The president of an PHA sorority shared her experience CSO was very stressful because of the length of the time it took for her case to be resolved. At each step of the process she was informed on the last day of the stated timelines of the next step. She didn't feel that her case was important to CSO.
- Many students and advisors perceived that FSL Staff were very involved in the day to day workings of the CSO.
- Communication to students and alumni advisors about how sanctioning decisions are made is lacking, leaving those participating in the process to speculate on the motives of the CSO.

- Advisors stated that because CSO doesn't share outcomes, even those regarding the suspension of a chapter's university recognition, they never know if their chapter should sponsor/co-sponsor events with others in the community.

The perceived sanctioning power of the CSO contributes to a culture of fear among many members of the Interfraternity Council. Many IFC fraternity presidents spoke at length about how the "ultimate demise" of the fraternity community will be chapters going "underground" or losing university recognition. Presidents believe that losing a connection to the university makes it easy for a chapter to fall further away from any type of compliance with community standards. Without the fear of losing the "value-add" that should come from university recognition they believe it becomes easier for organizations to walk away from the community. The end result, they believe, is that chapters losing university recognition will continue to function without it, will do what they want and will thrive in doing so.

As the fraternity/sorority community moves forward, the student leaders and chapter advisors must develop an **honest ownership** of the community's behaviors. A few examples:

- A Health Education staff member said fraternity/sorority students (and chapter advisors) refuse to accept the university's data on alcohol use/abuse which hampers any opportunity to change that behavior.
- Sentiments expressed by the IFC/PHA Chapter Advisors and House Directors focused on complaints ("We have a lot of alumni donors who give to the university but we don't get recognized for it") finger pointing ("If someone drinks in the residence hall do they hold the entire hall responsible?") and a sense of learned helplessness (none had taken any initiative to reach out to the FSL staff themselves). Conversations and sentiments like these will hinder effective accountability and forward momentum.
- The lack of broad, community communication on organizational sanctioning and what offenses led to particular sanctions created rumors within the community, often with community members feeling that the "crime didn't fit the punishment" in other chapter sanctioning or even their own chapters judicial results.
- Many students also held similar beliefs: using philanthropic earnings as a counterbalance to risk management issues, voicing concern about off campus safety yet not mobilizing as a community in response and abdicating their responsibility for self-governance to university entities. These sentiments create doubt that they can hold themselves to the higher standard incumbent among fraternity/sorority members.

This is not to say that the failings of the accountability process are the sole responsibility of the students and/or chapter advisors. As was stated earlier, organizational accountability must be a shared and transparent function between the local chapter, national organization and host institution. The underpinning of that function is trust.

Without **trust** in a process, or trust between parties, accountability measures will not work. A few alumni/ae advisors cited how mistrust developed over time with the university (due to a lack of relationship with the Dean of Students, the CSO approach to conduct, a lack of understanding about the university's expectations for fraternities and sororities). If the institution

wants to create significant behavioral change within the fraternity/sorority community it must do a better job of building trust and improve the relationships currently in existence within the fraternity/sorority community. A few examples:

- The University Police have a poor, almost non-existent relationship with housed IFC/PHA chapters due to being off campus. One university staff member asked, “What power do we have as a university to tell them what to do?”
- The situation with the Madison Police is better and Officer Figueroa was cited by students and alumni advisors as having a positive attitude and consistently making himself available to work with the students to keep people safe.
- Among many student affairs staff members there exists a sense that the fraternity/sorority students “belong” to FSL alone. One staff member problematically referred to them as “their (FSL) students” - specifically implying they were not hers.
- A staff member from Health Education explained that her frustration level was so high with the fraternities that she was going to ask her supervisor if she could be exempt from having to facilitate programs for them.
- Staff members were uncertain if risk management violations/violations of the Code of Conduct would be addressed if reported. Residence Life staff members shared that their lack of training (to identifying hazing behaviors, to address the impact of chapter alcohol use/abuse among residents) created barriers to them intervening in risky situations. This uncertainty, combined with a lack of professional knowledge about fraternity/sorority life in general, leads staff to not report or address violations and/or concerns.
- It would appear that the FSL staff is not communicating enough with the chapter advisors. Very few of the chapter advisors we spoke with had ever had a conversation with a member of the FSL staff. It was remarkable to hear chapter advisors and house directors make statements like, “I don’t know what the office does.” or “Who is this Maggie person?” There was consensus that the staff was “busy” and that their workload contributed to lack of time to build relationships and keep chapter advisors informed, yet none of the participants seemed to grasp the duties of the staff.
- The university doesn’t seem to offer any type of training or volunteer development for chapter advisors, house directors or those who serve in any type of advisory board capacity.
- Some alums offered specific examples about the university’s lack of communication with them. In addition to lack of knowledge about the conduct process most admitted they didn’t understand the full nature of the External Review. Some said they didn’t receive the invitation to attend the listening sessions. Chapter advisors shared their displeasure with the lack of communication about pending Council legislation.

### Recommendations

The following broad recommendations are offered with responsibility for specific details to be determined by various stakeholders:

1. Led by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the Division of Student Affairs must build a culture that embraces fraternity/sorority members as “our” students. This culture must be built in two distinct ways:
  - Operationally - All student affairs staff members, regardless of their role, are duty bound to administer to the needs of UW students and to address student behavior on the occasions when it is in conflict with the mission of the institution. Any barriers to these duties must be removed.
  - Informationally - Although the fraternity/sorority community can be confusing to non-members, many of the university staff knew almost nothing about the fundamentals of the Greek experience. Time needs to be set aside for members of the Division to meet with the FSL staff for a primer on fraternity/sorority life that can provide context to their work. Identifying methods to allow staff members with content expertise to work with students and chapter advisors on a routine basis should be determined as well.
2. The CSO process of addressing organizational discipline cannot continue in its current form. The complaints and concerns expressed by advisors and students alike must be taken seriously.
3. Improving the quality of life in the Langdon Street Area must be a priority.
  - A working group of stakeholders (i.e. police, EMT, fire, students, FSL Staff, chapter advisors) should be established to specifically address issues facing housed chapters. Although this small percentage of the overall Greek community might be out of geographical jurisdiction, it is still governed by the Code of Student Conduct and city ordinances of Madison. Identification of the most pressing safety issues, educational opportunities and enforcement protocols would all be good topics to consider in an effort to stem the “town/gown” divide.
  - The university must leverage its relationship with the city of Madison to make Officer Figueroa’s work ethic the rule rather than the exception.
  - At all levels (student/chapter advisor/house director) Langdon Street area chapters must take seriously the feedback provided to the Review Team that MGC, NPHC, and non-Greek students do not feel safe in the area.
4. FSL staff, with increased supervision and support from the Dean of Students and Assistant Dean & Director of CfLI, should take active measures to establish credence and credibility with relevant stakeholders.
  - FSL staff should conduct an audit of time spent on typical administrative tasks, programmatic assignments and crisis management during any given week. In collaboration with the Dean of Students & Director of CfLI, FSL staff should critically evaluate the impact of these efforts.
  - Professional members of the FSL staff should be placed on all relevant divisional committees and be involved at appropriate levels when discussing initiatives that impact the fraternity/sorority community. It is imperative FSL professional staff members are seated at the proverbial table.
  - FSL staff can increase year-round communication, face to face meetings and training for fraternity/sorority volunteers. Building capacity into the chapter

advisor corps is essential and can provide chapter advisors and house directors with much needed education, fellowship and opportunities for collaboration.

5. Accountability must be addressed at all levels within the undergraduate community:
  - New Members should be exposed to accountability early on in their process through a clear delineation of standards and expectations.
  - Chapter Executive Boards should spend time educating chapter members about the nexus between the university Code of Student Conduct, City Ordinances/State Law and Fraternity/Sorority Expectations.
  - Trained chapter advisors should be guiding each undergraduate chapter judicial/standards board to utilize self-governance processes as outlined by the national organizations.
  - Undergraduate chapter judicial board training must have an expanded focus, to cover not only a review of policies but to encompass procedures used in a hearing, interviewing witnesses, consensus building among hearing board members, appropriate sanctioning, methods to support chapters as they complete sanctions and communication to the fraternity/sorority community about the process itself.
  - A review of purpose and process of each Council's hearing board should be conducted to ensure it is complementary to the needs of its member chapters

## **Diversity and Inclusion:**

### Guiding Principle

To build a Greek Community, the *community* must encompass diversity and inclusion on all levels, from the Inter/national organization to the local chapters and host institutions. It is important to use language, practices, and policies that ensure every member, every chapter, and every council is centered within that Community. This inclusion is evident in every aspect of the growth, development, and knowledge of that Greek Community.

### Key Observations

Students, chapter advisors, and university stakeholders shared a **lack of understanding** and knowledge across the realities of the four different councils. Starting with individual member's knowledge of the community as a whole, many PHA and IFC members admitted to not knowing their own Council's operations until they became involved as officers. This lack of knowledge extended as they became Council members, sharing that they didn't know about MGC and NPHC Councils or member chapters. Some of the students we talked with spoke of being aware of their "white privilege" but were challenged to identify how to navigate that privilege and work to change their environment. They expressed feelings of being alone in this learning process.

There was consensus among the IFC men that almost all of the university programming - including that on diversity and inclusion - took place only in the **first year** of a student's

enrollment and that more opportunities over the entire 4 years at Wisconsin would be more beneficial. Current programming seemed to be “check a box” programming or limited to online programming, that didn’t allow for or encourage sustained action or interest. The men said that much of the programming is on identifying a problem but not on programming that might create solutions.

Several of the culturally-based groups emphasized that **representation** matters among staff. Many, if not all, found a sense of belonging in the Multicultural Center or Black Cultural Center. One student-of-color described FSL as: “It’s a beautiful place - but there are loopholes and cracks that lead to students of color feeling that they are not being supported.” In addition, a sense of belonging refers to physical space, as described by one staff member in their comment submitted through the review website, “to my knowledge there isn’t a place on campus for those without chapter facilities to call “home base”.”

Students from NPHC and MGC all stated that **Langdon Street** was not a welcoming place for them. In addition to physical locations, NPHC and MGC students shared feeling unwelcome within the broader community. One specific story emerged from the AFLV conference. Students described the possibly well-intentioned, however extremely awkward and uncomfortable impact of sharing rooms with individuals from other councils - a decision made without any other organized or purposeful interactions. Student also shared with the review team that one IFC officer “got in trouble” for drinking. And yet, “in trouble”, seemed to be par for the course and no one actually experienced consequence for their action. This experience was amplified by the traditional pattern that all the Greeks at AFLV got yelled at, although none of the MGC/NPHC Greeks participated in the activity. The students identified a repeated pattern that when IFC/PHA Greeks do something bad they all get blamed, but when they MGC/NPHC do good it never gets recognized. That increases their sense of marginalization when they get the negative eye but rarely a positive one.

NPHC Chapter Advisors characterized the “**peer-led nature** of the community” that “students usually figure things out on their own.” This assessment of students of color figuring things out on their own was echoed by university staff members. NPHC chapter advisors described their frustration with the lack of consistency and qualified experience of university staff and desired significantly more communication with FSL.

### Recommendations

The following broad recommendations are offered with responsibility for specific details to be determined by various stakeholders:

1. In the process of hiring new staff in the FSL office, the institution should seek samples of job descriptions and qualifications from other institutions that include knowledge, skills, and capacity across all four councils, in addition to diversity and inclusion training to ensure all candidates meet the needs of the community, department, and the institution. The students of color do not feel supported, nor do they see themselves in UW

administrative positions of power. This recommendation also supports IFC and PHA students request for training and outreach on privilege and inclusion and is an opportunity to diversify the demographics, experiences, and skills of the team.

2. There is a need for culturally-grounded intentional and consistent advising for the NPHC and MGC councils. Consideration to a different advising model needs to be explored. An example would be someone from a different area within the division have a part-time role as the advisor of NPHC and a part-time advisor for MGC. Both of these individuals must have some sort of background with these councils to legitimize them in the eyes of the students.
3. Before intake/recruitment season begins, hold All-Greek Council Information sessions at the beginning of the school year to inform all students of the many ways to be Greek at UW. In addition, there should be individual sessions for each council, in order to avoid NPHC and MGC being drowned out by IFC and PHA during these events.
4. Create and/or strengthen the partnership between the FSL and the Multicultural Office in providing ongoing cultural competence training for all of the councils. These trainings should be interactive, purposeful, and progressive. The training for new members would be more introductory and as the students matriculate into the university, the training would become more intense. The trainings should be cross council.
5. Develop a FSL class for all new members providing education about all of the councils and speaking to the history of fraternity/sorority organizations and the UW Greek Community specifically.
6. Increase opportunities for chapter and community engagement in civic and institutional partnerships that benefit both individual member development and service in the surrounding community. The philanthropic work by IFC and PHA was highlighted and praised, but the sense of giving back to the community through service was not expressed. Hands on service opportunities allow for the four councils to work together, get to know one another, and grow both individually and collectively, as the perception of fraternity/sorority life moves towards the positive in the eyes of the community.
7. Form a Greek Council that can serve as an All-Greek Programming Board, providing community-wide learning and engagement opportunities. More than providing updates and announcements, this gathering can be intentionally designed and student led. This creates an opportunity to increase cross-council communication and to build ownership for their community's existence as a diverse collective.
8. If there currently isn't a shared four council letter day, identify a weekday that all members of fraternities and sororities wear their letters. This is a form of showing Greek pride, unity within the system, and increasing awareness of the diverse councils, chapters, and members - maybe even alumni!
9. If students desire a Greek Week - encourage council leaders to develop and implement a program based on models and best practices from peer institutions. Such a program should be inclusive of all chapters regardless of size, it should be timed appropriately to encourage participation, and should be focused on both fostering healthy competition and promoting the fraternity/sorority experience to the campus. Events could include community service, sporting events, a recognition program, and an event that includes affiliated faculty/staff.

10. Continue to provide opportunities for council and chapter leaders and general members to attend regional and national programs as a collective, and design intentional interaction, team building, and cross-council relationships in advance of their attendance. This preparation can include meetings to share expectations, co-create opportunities to learn together, and build UW FSL unity at the conference. Its design is to replace forced integrated activities that result in awkwardness rather than inclusion.
11. The team recommends seeking full or significant funding for NPHC and MGC councils to attend national conferences and conventions outside of AFLV. It is important that these councils are afforded the opportunity to participate in events that are created particularly for their councils and their member chapters. We would also recommend programs such as UIFI and the NIC's IMPACT program, which is an excellent on-campus option for chapters and council leaders to work together as a community to deal with community issues and develop action-oriented goals for collaboration and improvement.
12. There needs to be a formal pronouncement and acknowledgement of the NPHC and MGC chapters on the campus. IFC and PHA chapters have their houses and their presence at the university is amplified through multiple measures; this is not the case for NPHC and MGC chapters. This acknowledgement can take the form of an area on the campus - a garden, benches, trees, flags in the union - something that acknowledges their presence.
13. Speaking to the broader experience of students of color of UW campus, the review team heard many remarks that student felt like visitors on campus. They need to be made to feel a "part of" instead of in "addition to", this feeling extends to their chapter advisors. We recommend a meeting with the University Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and these groups and their chapter advisors to give them an opportunity to share their perspective of their experience within the FSL community, and the institution as a whole. These students need the opportunity to tell administrators their needs and concerns and how they as students can assist with recruitment and retention on the campus.

## **Institutional Relationship:**

### Guiding Principle

An institution will receive in return what they invest into the community relationship. For there to be a true partnership between the fraternities and sororities and the institution, BOTH parties must be willing and able to be flexible, understand and respond to the needs of the other and move forward in a trusting relationship.

### Key Observations

Throughout this review it was evident that FSL staff are working extremely hard to positively impact the lives of the students they serve. The observations and findings shared here are not in reference to their dedication, skill, or efficiency, these reflections are a systemic result of how

the community is impacted by the larger system of UW policies, practices, and procedures. One result of the current administrative and **staffing** system, is the feeling expressed by students and chapter advisors of the FSL office as a clear bottleneck. Over 4,000 students and alumni are communicating up to FSL, and the entire campus administration is communicating down - there is not enough bandwidth to cover all the needs. This reality forces FSL staff into a constant firefighting mode and only the items with the most immediate priority are addressed promptly.

There is significant opportunity to enhance FSL's **relationship with other departments**. At several times it was clear colleagues who engage with FSL are not sure what they do, or what their role may be. From Residential Life handling potential hazing issues to Health Services challenging alcohol behaviors; departments feel it is all on FSL to initiate and make change.

One complicating factor of this relationship with colleagues, stakeholders, and students is the FSL office - from both student and alumni perspective - is not seen as having **authority**. The office has a perception of being purely administrative or for planning events like recruitment and trainings. The students especially must see the office as content experts with authority from university administration to make key strategic decisions and who can help them with serious issues; and alumni must see the office as helping them engage in meaningful ways with upper administration.

In regards to alcohol, the institution appears to have well researched and tracked significant data regarding alcohol issues in the community. However, it does not appear that the data is being used in creating effective **intervention** strategies. Most departments admit that current programs are not impacting the FSL community to encourage the needed changes in behavior. This is where the expertise of the FSL staff must be put to work in crafting these programs so they have the intended outcomes.

Beyond alcohol, the general agreed-upon public knowledge about the sexual assault and safety challenges happening in the off campus fraternity homes was alarming. While the homes are off campus, the residents are University of Wisconsin students and the institution must do more to create a **safer environments** for students. The institution cannot put its head in the sand concerning proactive, prevention risk management issues, and then hold students accountable when things go wrong. It sends a mixed message, like the institution only cares about what goes wrong there, but is not working with the groups to create a safer environment. The alumni and students mentioned wanting institutional help in curbing issues, so the table has been set for collaboration.

Opportunities abound for **alumni/ae engagement**. While meeting with chapter advisors it was clear they need and desire more intentional communication, and regular communication will prevent the only occasion for communication being during a crisis. The institution must be intentional in separating the needs of housed chapters and non-housed chapters. While good relationships with housing corporation boards will be critical in creating positive change, often alumni roles spiral into the needs and challenges of fraternity/sorority housing. Intentionality

here will ensure all chapters and all councils will be included in the conversations and will engage in chapter and council relevant opportunities.

### Recommendations

The following broad recommendations are offered with responsibility for specific details to be determined by various stakeholders:

1. More FSL staff, or distributed contacts in other departments. The type of increased engagement, accountability and connection cannot happen in the current structure. This can be done through a larger FSL office structure or through creative partnerships and staff sharing with other departments but there must be more staff empowered to influence and impact the student experience, alumni relationship and chapter support structures.
2. Start giving or hosting annual reports or meeting about the state of fraternity and sorority life. The suggestion is not try to over communicate, but to start with an annual concise focus to engage and update alums and the campus in general. This will start to bridge the information divide that is present. Then as those meetings happen other communication needs will change or be espoused and then adjusted for in future meetings and forums.
3. Spur the creation of an alumni board. This could be an opportunity to create one per council, as a way to ensure engagement across councils as well and each board could address unique needs and then allow cross council communication at the alumni level.
4. Plan specific training and communication plans with housing corporations/boards. This was a clear missing piece, several thousand students are being housed in fraternity and sorority homes and there needs to be an intentional and focused relationship throughout the year, not just when a crisis or problem arises.

### **Membership Experience:**

#### Guiding Principle

The reciprocal relationship of fraternity and sorority chapters and their host campus results in seamless, intentional, educational opportunities that enhance the academic experience of FSL students. Greek chapters constantly evolve to forecast and evolve in order to become the most trusted organizations in men and women's development.

#### Key Observations

Across all four councils, students describe a joy and gratitude for their chapter experience. Developing bonds of friendship, networks of resources and support, culturally-relevant spaces within a PWI, academic support structures, philanthropic events and fun, and support in times of

crisis, students described many points of pride as a result of their membership. At their best, UW fraternity and sorority membership experience meets its promise.

The review team also heard specific frustrations and strategies to enhance the membership experience. For example, while Panhellenic Council members felt encouraged to create friendships with other PHA women's organizations, this support was often found only in times of crisis or competition through each other's philanthropic events. Students across all councils and chapters mentioned the desire and need for **interaction** with each other. Successful interactions are often designed with a low bar for entry (i.e. not based on significant financial or numeric resources) and tied to opportunities valued or prioritized for students (i.e. academic courses that count toward graduation). This interaction is critical as is evident in the student quote, "we are a highly segregated community." Another strategy is evident in the powerful student quote, "we don't have a space or place to run into each other."

Across the FSL membership experience two **distinctions** were often made: 1) appreciation of FSL as individuals, and that significantly more resources were necessary to support the fraternity and sorority member experience; 2) appreciation for FSL as individuals, and that university "administration" was literally absent in support of the community. Many of the students we spoke with had never met, interacted with, or sought guidance anyone they would identify as university administrators and almost unanimously spoke not feeling supported by "the university."

An example which informs one of our recommendations: none of the students or chapter advisors could point to opportunities or occasions where FSL or the university is helping to **tell the story** of fraternity and sorority life. Information about recruitment is limited to the office website and there is very little/no information about Membership Intake for the NPHC or MGC groups shared with interested students. They wondered why FSL or the university doesn't publish info about service hours, philanthropic events, graduation rates, etc. that would highlight the benefits of fraternity and sorority membership.

Directly tied to the observations and recommendations identified in the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Area, NPHC and MGC student membership experiences in their chapter and council are directly and inextricably tied to their experience as students of color on a **predominantly white campus**. In celebrating their membership experience they specifically stated the reality that their chapter created the environment that they literally could "still be here". Students in NPHC and MGC chapters described the heavy burden to carry as marginalized students on UW campus. As they struggle to find place, students asked for FSL, CfLI, and other student affairs departments to understand the different reality and resulting different strategies to serve the "haves and have nots" represented in the fraternity and sorority membership experience.

A final challenge to the fraternity and sorority life membership experience is UW's opportunity to **study abroad** as a junior. While everyone noted its beneficial intent and impact, it still created a leadership vacuum within chapters. With the possibility of losing a chapter's cohort of juniors, chapters faced challenges of officer recruitment, consistency and transition, and membership

numbers. Many chapters also noted this absence resulted in sophomores serving as chapter presidents and seniors returning from abroad and shifting their focus to the job search, resulting in very young inexperienced executive boards without a lot of knowledge or a track record of peer mentoring. Students expressed an interest in training that would help them be more effective in these chapter roles.

### Recommendations

The following broad recommendations are offered with responsibility for specific details to be determined by various stakeholders:

1. Develop and invest in university resources to tell the UW fraternity and sorority membership experience story. Through press releases, information during campus tours and orientation, via university marketing materials, websites and social media, and broad statements from the university on the role of sorority and fraternity life in the “Wisconsin Experience” - the institution must celebrate and share the story of FSL.
2. Examine CfLI and other points of contact offering student services and/or resources to create opportunities for a “yes”. In response to NPHC and MGC students who shared a feeling of being repeatedly turned down for funding, space, resources, etc. find and innovate ways to know the needs and develop support relevant to each chapter/council.
3. Develop a university staff, faculty, student group to examine and create innovative responses to the junior absence on campus. FSL chapters cannot be the only student organizations or clubs challenged by this well-intentional policy. How might UW respond in a way that actually enhances everyone’s co-curricular experience?
4. Develop meaningful cross council opportunities to develop authentic relationships and learn together. One recommendation to do so is to create a for-credit leadership course for fraternity and sorority members. As resources build, they could be offered cross-councils by age or officer role, or interest in civic leadership, political leadership, etc. A second strategy would be a FSL resource office with council offices, lounge space, power charging stations, a place students - council officers and chapter members - would stop by in between class and “run into” each other.
5. Place singular focus and attention on UW’s history, structures, policy, and practices and how they lead to or inhibit the recruitment, retention, and belonging of students, faculty, and staff of color.
6. Evaluate, streamline, and eradicate unnecessary reporting and expectation documents. The membership experience, specifically for officers, can often boil down to reports. Reading, responding, writing, and navigating the nuanced differences in FSL, UW, national offices, and/or national councils’ expectations is cumbersome for student leaders. In addition to not receiving relevant action-oriented feedback from the reports, they also don’t have an understanding of “why”, what is the purpose of these technical tasks that may or may not be relevant to their chapter/council experience.
7. Re-evaluate Panhellenic’s recruitment rules, creating a more balanced guiding document allowing chapters to celebrate and share the PHA story without fines and fear of “normal friendly contact”. Consult with your NPC Area Advisor on better strategies.

Currently, students are so concerned about influencing PNMs that they've created rules of silence that constrict conversation (videos, publicity, etc.) to the point where a chapter sharing any information about itself to PNMs is challenging at best.

## **Resources and Support:**

### Guiding Principle

A university's commitment to strategic priorities is reflected in how it chooses to distribute resources. Staff, visible space, and resources allocated to fraternity and sorority life all signal institutional support in furthering the founding principles of Greek letter organization in support of the university's mission.

### Key Observations

Overall, the Wisconsin community felt everyone was doing the best they could with the resources that were provided. All stakeholders expressed a desire for change, even if it meant increased expectations, but noted that a lack of staff, funding, and institutional commitment prevented progress. It is important to note that across meetings and diverse constituencies, there is a shared belief that the FSL staff continuously go beyond the call of duty doing their work considering their limited resources and direction. Their desire and motivation to make a difference within the community is very apparent to stakeholders and this external team.

Understandably, stakeholders with connections and contact with the FSL staff generally knew the role of the office and the office's relationship to CfLI. Across all constituency groups, including students, the overall impression was that FSL is **understaffed and underfunded**, which left the impression that the current model is preventing system-wide failure rather than proactively building the membership experience, fostering community among councils, sharing information with various constituency groups, and providing positive programming.

The current staffing model results in:

- Student leaders competing for staff time, with a perceived hierarchy that Panhellenic Council and Interfraternity Council officers receive the most attention followed by NPHC and MGC officers, then IFC chapter presidents, PHA chapter presidents, and MGC and NPHC chapter presidents; it was not apparent that the relationship with the FSL staff extended to general members of the sorority and fraternity community.
- A lack of understanding of what staff does, leading students to "figure it out on their own."
- Professionals who are reactive (e.g. "putting out fires") and seek to resolve whatever issue is currently in front of them. This reactionary approach prevented any chance for staff to proactively create change towards bettering the community.
- Stakeholders appreciating the willingness of staff to help, but that assistance requires outreach on their part, even in emergency situations.

- Multiple audiences mentioning how “busy” the staff was, which risks constituents turning to others for guidance, help, or consult because they do not want to add to the current staff’s plate.
- Informal relationships with chapter advisors and alumni. While alumni and chapter advisors had relationships with their respective chapters, little formalized structures existed to communicate regularly between FSL and alumni and chapter advisors.
- A lack of training for community partners, including other Wisconsin staff, house directors, and volunteers working with chapters.

Several constituency groups noted the **multiple levels of authority**, which resulted in the lack of decision-making autonomy and authority for the FSL staff. Staff mentioned operational legacies, but could not always articulate their origin or purpose, or whether they were real or perceived, resulting in staff reluctance to try new approaches for fear of “getting in trouble.”

This observation was most evident in comments about the conflicting position of the university to help the fraternity and sorority community while maintaining at an arm’s length relationship with them. One person commented, “Greek Life is independently operating on campus, whereas athletics is treated as a part of the university, so Maggie and Sarah act like traffic coordinators rather than advising” and “seemed like they were working *around* a community rather than *with* them.”

This sentiment echoed in broader concerns among the community for the university’s relationship with sorority and fraternity life. For example:

- Lack of inclusion in university-wide publications
- Lack of involvement in university-wide programming, like orientation
- Lack of input into decision that affect sorority and fraternity life, like timing of Panhellenic recruitment
- Lack of education to incoming students about sorority and fraternity life, including an explanation of culturally based chapters. Several members of culturally-based groups discussed the burden of having to repeatedly explain their history, role and mission.

As with many public institutions, departments are increasingly competing for **limited funding** and resources. An overwhelming desire to improve communication, programming, and the relationship between the university and the fraternity and sorority community was evident, but not reflective in how the office was resourced. As one stakeholder said, “a \$0 budget produces a \$0 outcome.” Overall, the staff stated they were doing the best they could with the resources they had.

NPHC and MGC students discussed how the institutional funding policies inadvertently affect their organizations in negative ways. For example, minimum membership requirements disqualify them for certain recognition and funding. Due to their size, groups also rely on alternative sources of funds. These funds seem limited and those available through ASM appear cumbersome and lengthy to obtain, making them less desirable. This group also

mentioned that large campuses spaces and equipment are cost prohibitive, which results in much of their programming being done in the Red Gym.

For the undergraduates, **space** is problematic for unhoused groups, especially NPHC and MGC groups. NPHC and MGC recognized the Red Gym as their campus “safe space,” but desired to have a physical representation on campus (e.g. plot, markers, trees, etc.). Unhoused groups discussed the additional cost of being unhoused, requiring them to pay rental fees for space and equipment. NPHC and MGC students were grateful for the resources provided in the Red Gym, but desired to have events and programs across campus.

Staff offices serve multiple purposes, including work stations, meeting spaces, and storage. Medium and small conference spaces were generally lacking as is a sense of confidentiality if a student leader wanted to meet to discuss something of a private nature.

Minimum standards help establish group expectations. Reports intend to help the university track group achievements, membership, and critical information that assess the health of individual groups and identify those who could use additional support. Several chapter leaders expressed confusion about the **multiple layers of reporting** and how the reports were used and differentiated. For example, chapter leaders stated that roster information, in addition to other information, was collected separately by the councils (IFC and PHA), FSL, CfLI, and their national organizations. This was especially taxing on smaller chapters, especially in MGC and NPHC, where administrative tasks could not be delegated. Broadly, students had little understanding of what happened with the submitted information, how it was used, or how a chapter was identified as being in ‘Good Standing’ with the university. The staff saw the benefits of the reports, but felt that they had “all sticks, and no carrots,” and were thus, meeting with groups who did not meet the standard and had no way of rewarding those that did.

Several groups expressed a desire for **increased training**. It was clear that members of the community were eager to be a partner with the university to make a better community, but lacked skills. One member captured this sentiment stating, “We know that there are some things that need to be fixed. We just need to know *how* and given the skills to do so.”

### Recommendations

The following broad recommendations are offered with responsibility for specific details to be determined by various stakeholders:

1. It is often the tendency for organizations to add staff to confront challenges. The result is often more people doing the same work (e.g. “more staff putting out fires”). While the review panel strongly advocates for additional staff, we emphasize strategic appointments that allow for community growth while acknowledging the need for addressing current challenges. Mistrust between the university and the community stems from the lack of proactive and regular communication and visibility of the broader

university staff (e.g. sorority and fraternity life staff, university police, student affairs staff, etc.) in the community.

2. Based on feedback from the community, the following responsibilities should be considered in any changes to current staff roles and for new hires:
  - a. Alumni and chapter advisors, including training, regular meetings, and communication.
  - b. Training and communication with other university offices.
  - c. Training and communication with house directors, potentially in conjunction with relevant parts of training in residence life for hall staff.
  - d. Chapter President training and mentorship. If the prevalence of sophomore leadership continues, the staff will need to accelerate leadership development and provide mentorship for these leaders.
  - e. Leadership training
  - f. Housing, including establishing a working relationship between the university and groups housed off-campus
3. NPHC and MGC assigned a dedicated staff member, preferably someone affiliated with a culturally based group. The university may consider dual appointments in sorority and fraternity life and the Multicultural Center and/or Black Cultural Center where students currently go for support.
4. An administrative staff professional to handle scheduling, reporting, programmatic logistics, and serving as a frontline ombudsman to help connect various constituencies to the appropriate resources.
5. With new staff, the institution can anticipate two reactions from stakeholders:
  - a. Fear that new/additional staff will change everything, including time honored traditions
  - b. Excitement that the new/additional staff will be different and lead change.The university should be thoughtful in onboarding new staff and communicating roles of these staff members to key constituency groups. Clear communication, especially around staff changes, is vital to rebuilding trust among all stakeholders
6. The graduate student experience offers an apprenticeship into the field and is also a pipeline for future sorority and fraternity life staff at the university. Graduate students benefit from strong mentorship and supervision, which requires specific time from supervisors. The department should consider how graduate students are paid, their assigned tasks, and how they can be best mentored and supervised.
7. How full-time staff are funded should be evaluated. Community fees to fund staff can signal their acknowledgement of the importance of staff positions, but also place the staff member in a precarious position of reporting to a group that the staff member oversees. While some universities use this model, Wisconsin should consider how to signal permanence to a position funded by soft money and to establish clear expectations and annual performance review process that values community input, but is owned by the university.
8. Confront standard practices and how work is done. The student affairs staff should envision and buy-in to a new sorority and fraternity life community and confront the

institutional knowledge of “how things get done” - change will require a new way of doing business.

- a. Any changes to staffing and responsibilities of staff should be broadly communicated within Student Affairs so that everyone shares clear expectations of priorities and the work to be done.
  - b. Look to Student Affairs and campus partners as extensions of the FSL staff and provide opportunities for better partnerships. This may require training and for other offices to adjust common practices to fit the unique needs of fraternity and sorority life. Offices should strive to have policies and procedures that are equitable, not equal, when working sorority and fraternity groups. For example, collection of organizational information from the FSL could also satisfy registration requirements in CfLI.
  - c. An organization-wide commitment to sorority and fraternity life is best facilitated by fewer reporting lines between institutional leadership and the FSL staff. The closer the FSL staff to leadership, the more easily challenges and opportunities are communicated unfiltered and the greater efficiency in advancing any new goals.
9. Supervisors should support staff by setting clear expectations for and focusing staff on work that advances the community. As one respondent said, “we shouldn’t be putting up curtains when the house is on fire.”
- a. Supervisors should encourage staff to make their best decisions given the expectations for the community. Collectively and openly, supervisors and FSL staff should discuss the current culture of fear around making mistakes that paralyzes action. A culture of learning and resilience should be promoted to help make increasingly better, future decisions.
  - b. Supervisors can respond to challenges facing the community with changes to policies and procedures that can increase efficiency and effectiveness.
10. Staff at all levels should be visible. The current state of mistrust can be confronted by increased communication and visibility of institutional leaders with sorority and fraternity life. Special messages to the fraternity and sorority community from institutional leaders throughout the year can signal the willingness of the university to partner with the community. Staff may also consider attending a chapter meeting or chapter programs so that members beyond officers have a baseline knowledge of available staff.
11. The size of the sorority and fraternity community indicates that it fills a need for students and shapes the Wisconsin experience. The university should view the sorority and fraternity community as a partner in that experience and should make funds available that specifically target key initiatives and staff that help accomplish the overall goal. By viewing the community as an asset to advancing university initiatives, budget allocations become investments in the future rather insurance payments to lower risk. Recognizing that the institution may not have extensive, available funds, resources should follow good ideas, even in tight times.
12. Specific programming funding has been recommended throughout the review (e.g. trainings, communication pieces, outreach, retreats, etc.). The department should

prioritize the greatest needs and resource them appropriately. In addition to these, FSL may consider establishing:

- a. A pool of programming funds for unhoused chapters to assist with equipment and space rental fees.
  - b. A rewards program to demonstrate the benefit of being affiliated with the FSL office, including completing necessary paperwork.
13. Space signals permanence and a sense of belonging. For all groups, their “space” varied in their needs:
- a. Resource support programs for those chapters with facilities, which may include house director training or at minimum, regular facilitated meetings with house directors.
  - b. Establish spaces on campus for MGC and NPHC (e.g. plots). At minimum, work with campus partners, such as the union and other program spaces, to help lower costs or create ‘safe spaces’ for MGC and NPHC members.
  - c. Inventory the needs of the FSL staff, including providing storage and conferencing space for larger meetings.
14. Capitalizing on the willingness of the community to partner in change, provide a menu of programming focused on volunteer trainings (e.g. alumni, house directors), training for university staff when working with fraternities and sororities, leadership development for all levels of membership, and additional opportunities for chapters across all four councils to participate with one another.
15. Create a streamlined process for collecting and disseminating chapter information. Ideally, one form would be submitted to the sorority and fraternity life office and shared with the CfLI and the chapter’s respective council to reduce multiple reporting.
16. Expectations for groups should be made clear and collected information should be reviewed at minimum with chapter leadership to discuss opportunities for improvement and to celebrate successes.
17. Reports should be inclusive of all chapters, recognizing the unique aspects of chapters affiliated with the four governing councils.

## **Student Safety:**

### Guiding Principle

As value-based organizations designed to build familial social structures, safety is the preeminent guiding moral compass in all policies, procedures, and practices. Fraternity and sorority members are models of taking care of and improving the community health of a campus.

### Key Observations

Safety is a specific concern shared across the four councils and stakeholders. Information consistently shared throughout our meetings focused on sexual assault and the often referred to

“Langdon Street.” Specifically, through the review website an alumni member submitted the comment, “As the review continues, please evaluate the advising and programming support and resources for mental health and well-being of all students and FSL.”

Women and men within the community seek greater awareness, training, and strategies to end **sexual violence**. Students seek greater partnership with the university for support, response, and resources to address the issue. PHA specifically mentioned their desire to prioritize safety throughout the year not simply after a crisis. A concerning issue that arose in the conversation is not only the feeling of being unsafe, but then the resulting ostracization of survivors within their chapters. A theme that emerged from conversations with students and stakeholders is the feeling that UW prioritizes liability over safety.

In addition to the students’ observations and requests, campus colleagues shared similar frustrations. Specifically student affairs colleagues shared a range of feelings from disappointment to anger for the **gap that exists** between data driven opportunities for change and a seemingly blind eye to the problem. UW holds significant data on alcohol and other drug use and its impact on student safety that can be effectively used to respond to and partner with students and FSL to proactively tackle this significant challenge.

The complexity of the CSO process was addressed earlier in this report, it is important to reference how risk management, **party monitoring systems** directly influence the safety of students. The failures of the current monitoring and accountability system to ensure safety only amplifies the risks for student well-being.

Safety issues within **off campus fraternity/sorority houses** and Langdon Street are a concern to IFC, PHA, MGC, and NPHC members. IFC and PHA students discussed a lack of communication with the police (in terms of crime reports), lack of blue lighting/call boxes along the street, and feelings of being either placated or ignored by police and the university. The students’ exasperation stems from feelings that they have raised concerns and specific requests to increase safety, and these fears and requests aren’t being addressed. Some said they felt that the university only focuses “on what is provocative” at the time and doesn’t apply the same standard for safety, or sense of urgency to provide a safe environment for all students.

It is important to note that students spoke highly of Officer Figueroa from Madison PD - they appreciated his proactive approach, defining what behaviors were acceptable and which were not, and visiting chapter facilities to meet all members - this was consistent across all audiences, including the unrecognized groups. Outside of their feelings for Officer Figueroa, students and stakeholders were dissatisfied with campus and community policing and philosophy in the community. As described by one student in their comment submitted through review website,

“Langdon Street, where most of the fraternities and sororities are located on campus, can be an isolated and dangerous place to be late at night. Police activity, when present, seems to be more focused on reprimanding underage drinkers rather than protecting the students trying to walk home. While underage drinking can be extremely dangerous and

irresponsible, the university and police department are compromising the safety of students walking home from innocent activities to catch minors. No student on this campus, regardless of where they live or what organization they are a part of, should be afraid to walk home from the library or work.”

It is extremely important to note that students of color were clear: “you just don’t walk down **Langdon**.” This quote sums up their clearly shared sentiment that it is not safe for them to be on Langdon. Students expanded upon this experience, sharing that they felt unsafe throughout the day, however at night the prevalent alcohol use resulted in members who live in those chapter houses feeling more comfortable using offensive racial language. Students across the four councils described watching “people stumble down Langdon” and fights that occurred on the street at night.

Finally, members of the Review Team were confused by the choice to grant a listening session to organizations **not currently recognized** by the university. Participation in this process would seem to be a privilege and not a right afforded to them. Advisors did most of the talking and spent most of the time complaining about the conduct process, the lack of communication during the process and the severity of the sanctions. All four of the participating organizations did indicate that they’d rather be recognized than not. Perhaps the university should take advantage of the renewed commitment to improving Greek life and consider this a time of “detente”. If the university reached out to the organizations to discuss setting a timetable for a return we believe there would be a most positive response from each organization. Critical to this process is clarity in the university philosophy and practices for recognized and unrecognized groups. One staff member submitted these questions through the review website, “With Theta Chi leaving campus I have still heard from students that parties and events are taking place with them. Isn’t this against the rules? How are these chapters being held accountable for their actions? I understand why you wouldn’t want to advertise that a chapter is in trouble, but it should be easily accessible to see what chapters are in trouble with the institution.”

## Recommendations

The following broad recommendations are offered with responsibility for specific details to be determined by various stakeholders:

1. Develop a comprehensive student, staff partnership to address the health and safety of the community. The resulting collaborations need to go beyond additional one-and-done programs to holistically address systems, policies, and practices.
  - a. Critical to the success of this initiative is an understanding of the complexity and holistic nature of well-being. Beyond the physical well-being, many of the safety concerns discussed by students were discriminatory in nature. Themes across race and gender emerged that must be addressed in a comprehensive manner in order for all students to be safe.

- b. Grasp the opportunity to use institutional data to inform and develop new practices and ways of being.
2. Strengthen town and gown partnerships in order to hold shared expectations for response and communication on and off campus and Langdon Street. This includes:
  - a. City and Campus Police collaboration
  - b. Increased lighting and blue lights on Langdon Street
  - c. Safety Alerts and communication of safety issues when they arise
3. Develop a clear message that distinguishes university recognition of chapters and unrecognized groups. An example from a peer institution's website is a statement such as: *UW, (appropriate council), and its national organization, do not recognize (insert chapter) on our campus. We strongly discourage students from joining an organization that is not recognized. Unrecognized fraternities are not held to the university standards that govern their behavior. They operate without the oversight, training, and education provided by university staff.*

## Summary

The recommendations included in this report are derived from a consideration of the data collected throughout the external review process. They are not intended to address each individual observation; rather they are intended to address the *fundamental issues* that the observations collectively represent. Many recommendations may be closely-related and yet offered above in different sections. This underscores that the process of moving forward will require an intentional and inter-connected approach. The recommendations are intended to enhance and sustain relationships and structure for the support of fraternities and sororities. While there are no quick fixes, we believe these recommendations provide Wisconsin with a greater likelihood of success.

Our final recommendation is to start by sharing and discussing reactions to this report. Through an intentional design of organizational development, move forward with strategic decisions your community believes most relevant and the greatest leverage to move the needle of transformational change. Beyond sitting on a shelf, review process reports can be unhelpful when we cherry pick just one or two strategies that seem like the lowest hanging fruit. Our hope for your community is to spend time developing a coherent strategy for the best way forward for UW.

Thank you again for your investment in the future of fraternity and sorority life at the University of Wisconsin. We are grateful for our time with the FSL staff and commend them for their leadership under the constraints of an under resourced team. We strongly believe they, along with all four councils, chapters, and their members, have the ability to inform, shape, and enhance the Wisconsin Experience.

## Review Recommendations

- Led by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, the Division of Student Affairs must build a culture that embraces fraternity/sorority members as “our” students. This culture must be built in two distinct ways:
  - Operationally - All student affairs staff members, regardless of their role, are duty bound to administer to the needs of UW students and to address student behavior on the occasions when it is in conflict with the mission of the institution. Any barriers to these duties must be removed.
  - Informationally - Although the fraternity/sorority community can be confusing to non-members, many of the university staff knew almost nothing about the fundamentals of the Greek experience. Time needs to be set aside for members of the Division to meet with the FSL staff for a primer on fraternity/sorority life that can provide context to their work. Identifying methods to allow staff members with content expertise to work with students and chapter advisors on a routine basis should be determined as well.
- The CSO process of addressing organizational discipline cannot continue in its current form. The complaints and concerns expressed by chapter advisors and students alike must be taken seriously.
- Improving the quality of life in the Langdon Street Area must be a priority.
  - A working group of stakeholders (i.e. police, EMT, fire, students, FSL Staff, advisors) should be established by the Dean of Students to specifically address issues facing housed chapters. Although this small percentage of the overall Greek community might be out of geographical jurisdiction, it is still governed by the Code of Student Conduct and city ordinances of Madison. Identification of the most pressing safety issues, educational opportunities and enforcement protocols would all be good topics to consider in an effort to stem the “town/gown” divide.
  - The university must leverage its relationship with the city of Madison to make Officer Figueroa’s work ethic the rule rather than the exception.
  - At all levels (student/advisor/house director) Langdon Street area chapters must take seriously the feedback provided to the Review Team that MGC, NPHC and non-Greek students do not feel safe in the area.
- FSL staff, with increased supervision and support from the Dean of Students and Assistant Dean & Director of CfLI, should take active measures to establish credence and credibility with relevant stakeholders.
  - FSL staff should conduct an audit of time spent on typical administrative tasks, programmatic assignments and crisis management during any given week. In collaboration with the Dean of Students & Director of CfLI FSL staff should critically evaluate the impact of these efforts.
  - Professional members of the FSL staff should be placed on all relevant divisional committees and be involved at appropriate levels when discussing initiatives that impact the fraternity/sorority community. It is imperative FSL professional staff members are seated at the proverbial table.

- FSL staff should provide year-round communication, face to face meetings and training for fraternity/sorority volunteers. Building capacity into the advisor corps is essential and can provide advisors and house directors with much needed education, fellowship and opportunities for collaboration.
- Accountability must be addressed at all levels within the undergraduate community:
  - New Members should be exposed to accountability early on in their process through a clear delineation of standards and expectations.
  - Chapter Executive Boards should spend time educating chapter members about the nexus between the university Code of Student Conduct, City Ordinances/State Law and Fraternity/Sorority Expectations.
  - Trained alumnus/ae advisors should be guiding each undergraduate chapter judicial/standards board to utilize self-governance processes as outlined by the national organizations.
  - Undergraduate chapter judicial board training must have an expanded focus, to cover not only a review of policies but to encompass procedures used in a hearing, interviewing witnesses, consensus building among hearing board members, appropriate sanctioning, methods to support chapters as they complete sanctions and communication to the fraternity/sorority community about the process itself.
  - A review of purpose and process of each Council's hearing board should be conducted to ensure it is complementary to the needs of its member chapters
- In the process of hiring new staff in the FSL office, the institution should seek samples of job descriptions and qualifications from other institutions that include knowledge, skills, and capacity across all four councils, in addition to diversity and inclusion training to ensure all candidates meet the needs of the community, department, and the institution. The students of color do not feel supported, nor do they see themselves in UW administrative positions of power. This recommendation also supports IFC and PHA students request for training and outreach on privilege and inclusion and is an opportunity to diversify the demographics, experiences, and skills of the team.
- There is a need for culturally-grounded intentional and consistent advising for the NPHC and MGC councils. Consideration to a different advising model needs to be explored. An example would be someone from a different area within the division have a part-time role as the advisor of NPHC and a part-time advisor for MGC. Both of these individuals must have some sort of background with these councils to legitimize them in the eyes of the students.
- Before intake/recruitment season begins, hold All-Greek Council Information sessions at the beginning of the school year to inform all students of the many ways to be Greek at UW. In addition, there should be individual sessions for each council, in order to avoid NPHC and MGC being drowned out by IFC and PHA during these events.
- Create and/or strengthen the partnership between the FSL and the Multicultural Office in providing ongoing cultural competence training for all of the councils. These trainings should be interactive, purposeful, and progressive. The training for new members would be more introductory and as the students matriculate into the university, the training would become more intense. The trainings should be cross council.

- Develop a FSL class for all new members providing education about all of the councils, and speaking to the history of fraternity/sorority organizations and the UW Greek Community specifically.
- Increase opportunities for chapter and community engagement in civic and institutional partnerships that benefit both individual member development and service in the surrounding community. The philanthropic work by IFC and PHA was highlighted and praised, but the sense of giving back to the community through service was not expressed. Hands on service opportunities allow for the four councils to work together, get to know one another, and grow both individually and collectively, as the perception of fraternity/sorority life moves towards the positive in the eyes of the community.
- Form a Greek Council that can serve as an All-Greek Programming Board, providing community-wide learning and engagement opportunities. More than providing updates and announcements, this gathering can be intentionally designed and student led. This creates an opportunity to increase cross-council communication and to build ownership for their community's existence as a diverse collective.
- If there currently isn't a shared four council letter day, identify a weekday that all members of fraternities and sororities wear their letters. This is a form of showing Greek pride, unity within the system, and increasing awareness of the diverse councils, chapters, and members - maybe even alumni!
- If students desire a Greek Week - encourage council leaders to develop and implement a program based on models and best practices from peer institutions. Such a program should be inclusive of all chapters regardless of size, it should be timed appropriately to encourage participation, and should be focused on both fostering healthy competition and promoting the fraternity/sorority experience to the campus. Events could include community service, sporting events, a recognition program, and an event that includes affiliated faculty/staff.
- Continue to provide opportunities for council and chapter leaders and general members to attend regional and national programs as a collective, and design intentional interaction, team building, and cross-council relationships in advance of their attendance. This preparation can include meetings to share expectations, co-create opportunities to learn together, and build UW FSL unity at the conference. Its design is to replace forced integrated activities that result in awkwardness rather than inclusion.
- The team recommends seeking full or significant funding for NPHC and MGC councils to attend national conferences and conventions outside of AFLV. It is important that these councils are afforded the opportunity to participate in events that are created particularly for their councils and their member chapters. We would also recommend programs such as UIFI and the NIC's IMPACT program, which is an excellent on-campus option for chapters and council leaders to work together as a community to deal with community issues and develop action-oriented goals for collaboration and improvement.
- There needs to be a formal pronouncement and acknowledgement of the NPHC and MGC chapters on the campus. IFC and PHA chapters have their houses and their presence at the university is amplified through multiple measures; this is not the case for NPHC and MGC chapters. This acknowledgement can take the form of an area on the

campus - a garden, benches, trees, flags in the union - something that acknowledges their presence.

- Speaking to the broader experience of students of color of UW campus, the review team heard many remarks that student felt like visitors on campus. They need to be made to feel a “part of” instead of in “addition to”, this feeling extends to their chapter advisors. We recommend a meeting with the University Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and these groups and their advisors to give them an opportunity to share their perspective of their experience within the FSL community, and the institution as a whole. These students need the opportunity to tell administrators their needs and concerns and how they as students can assist with recruitment and retention on the campus.
- More FSL staff, or distributed contacts in other departments. The type of increased engagement, accountability and connection cannot happen in the current structure. This can be done through a larger FSL office structure or through creative partnerships and staff sharing with other departments but there must be more staff empowered to influence and impact the student experience, alumni relationship and chapter support structures.
- Start giving or hosting annual reports or meeting about the state of fraternity and sorority life. The suggestion is not try to over communicate, but to start with an annual concise focus to engage and update alums and the campus in general. This will start to bridge the information divide that is present. Then as those meetings happen other communication needs will change or be espoused and then adjusted for in future meetings and forums.
- Spur the creation of an alumni board. This could be an opportunity to create one per council, as a way to ensure engagement across councils as well and each board could address unique needs and then allow cross council communication at the alumni level.
- Plan specific training and communication plans with housing corporations/boards. This was a clear missing piece, several thousand students are being housed in fraternity and sorority homes and there needs to be an intentional and focused relationship throughout the year, not just when a crisis or problem arises.
- Develop and invest in university resources to tell the UW fraternity and sorority membership experience story. Through press releases, information during campus tours and orientation, via university marketing materials, websites and social media, and broad statements from the university on the role of sorority and fraternity life in the “Wisconsin Experience” - the institution must celebrate and share the story of FSL.
- Examine CfLI and other points of contact offering student services and/or resources to create opportunities for a “yes”. In response to NPHC and MGC students who shared a feeling of being repeatedly turned down for funding, space, resources, etc. find and innovate ways to know the needs and develop support relevant to each chapter/council.
- Develop a university staff, faculty, student group to examine and create innovative responses to the junior absence on campus. FSL chapters cannot be the only student organizations or clubs challenged by this well-intentional policy. How might UW respond in a way that actually enhances everyone’s co-curricular experience?

- Develop meaningful cross council opportunities to develop authentic relationships and learn together. One recommendation to do so is to create a for-credit leadership course for fraternity and sorority members. As resources build, they could be offered cross-councils by age or officer role, or interest in civic leadership, political leadership, etc. A second strategy would be an FSL resource office with council offices, lounge space, power charging stations, a place students - council officers and chapter members - would stop by in between class and “run into” each other.
- Place singular focus and attention on UW’s history, structures, policy, and practices and how they lead to or inhibit the recruitment, retention, and belonging of students, faculty, and staff of color.
- Evaluate, streamline, and eradicate unnecessary reporting and expectation documents. The membership experience, specifically for officers, can often boil down to reports. Reading, responding, writing, and navigating the nuanced differences in FSL, UW, national offices, and/or national councils’ expectations is cumbersome for student leaders. In addition to not receiving relevant action-oriented feedback from the reports, they also don’t have an understanding of “why”, what is the purpose of these technical tasks that may or may not be relevant to their chapter/council experience.
- Re-evaluate Panhellenic’s recruitment rules, creating a more balanced guiding document allowing chapters to celebrate and share the PHA story without fines and fear of “normal friendly contact”. Consult with your NPC Area Advisor on better strategies. Currently, students are so concerned about influencing PNMs that they’ve created rules of silence that constrict conversation (videos, publicity, etc.) to the point where a chapter sharing any information about itself to PNMs is challenging at best.
- It is often the tendency for organizations to add staff to confront challenges. The result is often that is more people doing the same work (e.g. “more staff putting out fires”). While the review panel strongly advocates for additional staff, we emphasize strategic appointments that allow for community growth while acknowledging the need for addressing current challenges. Mistrust between the university and the community stems from the lack of proactive and regular communication and visibility of the broader university staff (e.g. sorority and fraternity life staff, university police, student affairs staff, etc.) in the community.
- Based on feedback from the community, the following responsibilities should be considered in any changes to current staff roles and for new hires:
  - Alumni and Advisors, including training, regular meetings, and communication.
  - Training and communication with other university offices.
  - Training and communication with house directors, potentially in conjunction with relevant parts of training in residence life for hall staff.
  - Chapter President training and mentorship. If the prevalence of sophomore leadership continues, the staff will need to accelerate leadership development and provide mentorship for these leaders.
  - Leadership training
  - Housing, including establishing a working relationship between the university and groups housed off-campus

- NPHC and MGC assigned a dedicated staff member, preferably someone affiliated with a culturally based group. The university may consider dual appointments in sorority and fraternity life and the Multicultural Center and/or Black Cultural Center where students currently go for support.
- An administrative staff professional to handle scheduling, reporting, programmatic logistics, and serving as a frontline ombudsman to help connect various constituencies to the appropriate resources.
- With new staff, the institution can anticipate two reactions from stakeholders:
  - Fear that new/additional staff will change everything, including time honored traditions
  - Excitement that the new/additional staff will be different and lead change.

The university should be thoughtful in onboarding new staff and communicating roles of these staff members to key constituency groups. Clear communication, especially around staff changes, is vital to rebuilding trust among all stakeholders
- The graduate student experience offers an apprenticeship into the field and is also a pipeline for future sorority and fraternity life staff at the university. Graduate students benefit from strong mentorship and supervision, which requires specific time from supervisors. The department should consider how graduate students are paid, their assigned tasks, and how they can be best mentored and supervised.
- How full-time staff are funded should be evaluated. Community fees to fund staff can signal their acknowledgement of the importance of staff positions, but also place the staff member in a precarious position of reporting to a group that the staff member oversees. While some universities use this model, Wisconsin should consider how to signal permanence to a position funded by soft money and to establish clear expectations and annual performance review process that values community input, but is owned by the university.
- Confront standard practices and how work is done. The student affairs staff should envision and buy-in to a new sorority and fraternity life community and confront the institutional knowledge of “how things get done” - change will require a new way of doing business.
  - Any changes to staffing and responsibilities of staff should be broadly communicated within Student Affairs so that everyone shares clear expectations of priorities and the work to be done.
  - Look to Student Affairs and campus partners as extensions of the FSL staff and provide opportunities for better partnerships. This may require training and for other offices to adjust common practices to fit the unique needs fraternity and sorority life. Offices should strive to have policies and procedures that are equitable, not equal, when working sorority and fraternity groups. For example, collection of organizational information from the FSL could also satisfy registration requirements in CfLI.
  - An organization-wide commitment to sorority and fraternity life is best facilitated by fewer reporting lines between institutional leadership and the FSL staff. The closer the FSL staff to leadership, the more easily challenges and opportunities

are communicated unfiltered and the greater efficiency in advancing any new goals.

- Supervisors should support staff by setting clear expectations for and focusing staff on work that advances the community. As one respondent said, “we shouldn’t be putting up curtains when the house is on fire.”
  - Supervisors should encourage staff to make their best decisions given the expectations for the community. Collectively and openly, supervisors and FSL staff should discuss the current culture of fear around making mistakes that paralyzes action. A culture of learning and resilience should be promoted to help make increasingly better, future decisions.
  - Supervisors can respond to challenges facing the community with changes to policies and procedures that can increase efficiency and effectiveness.
- Staff at all levels should be visible. The current state of mistrust can be confronted by increased communication and visibility of institutional leaders with sorority and fraternity life. Special messages to the fraternity and sorority community from institutional leaders throughout the year can signal the willingness of the university to partner with the community. Staff may also consider attending a chapter meeting or chapter programs so that members beyond officers have a baseline knowledge of available staff.
- The size of the sorority and fraternity community indicates that it fills a need for students and shapes the Wisconsin experience. The university should view the sorority and fraternity community as a partner in that experience and should make funds available that specifically target key initiatives and staff that help accomplish the overall goal. By viewing the community as an asset to advancing university initiatives, budget allocations become investments in the future rather insurance payments to lower risk. Recognizing that the institution may not have extensive, available funds, resources should follow good ideas, even in tight times.
- Specific programming funding has been recommended throughout the review (e.g. trainings, communication pieces, outreach, retreats, etc.). The department should prioritize the greatest needs and resource them appropriately. In addition to these, FSL may consider establishing:
  - A pool of programming funds for unhoused chapters to assist with equipment and space rental fees.
  - A rewards program to demonstrate the benefit of being affiliated with the FSL office, including completing necessary paperwork.
- Space signals permanence and a sense of belonging. For all groups, their “space” varied in their needs:
  - Resource support programs for those chapters with facilities, which may include house director training or at minimum, regular facilitated meetings with house directors.
  - Establish spaces on campus for MGC and NPHC (e.g. plots). At minimum, work with campus partners, such as the union and other program spaces, to help lower costs or create ‘safe spaces’ for MGC and NPHC members.
  - Inventory the needs of the FSL staff, including providing storage and conferencing space for larger meetings.

- Capitalizing on the willingness of the community to partner in change, provide a menu of programming focused on volunteer trainings (e.g. alumni, house directors), training for university staff when working with fraternities and sororities, leadership development for all levels of membership, and additional opportunities for chapters across all four councils to participate with one another.
- Create a streamlined process for collecting and disseminating chapter information. Ideally, one form would be submitted to the sorority and fraternity life office and shared with the CfLI and the chapter's respective council to reduce multiple reporting.
- Expectations for groups should be made clear and collected information should be reviewed at minimum with chapter leadership to discuss opportunities for improvement and to celebrate successes.
- Reports should be inclusive of all chapters, recognizing the unique aspects of chapters affiliated with the four governing councils.
- Develop a comprehensive student, staff partnership to address the health and safety of the community. The resulting collaborations need to go beyond additional one-and-done programs to holistically address systems, policies, and practices.
  - Critical to the success of this initiative is an understanding of the complexity and holistic nature of well-being. Beyond the physical well-being, many of the safety concerns discussed by students were discriminatory in nature. Themes across race and gender emerged that must be addressed in a comprehensive manner in order for all students to be safe.
  - Grasp the opportunity to use institutional data to inform and develop new practices and ways of being.
- Strengthen town and gown partnerships in order to hold shared expectations for response and communication on and off campus and Langdon Street. This includes:
  - City and Campus Police collaboration
  - Increased lighting and blue lights on Langdon Street
  - Safety Alerts and communication of safety issues when they arise
- Develop a clear message that distinguishes university recognition of chapters and unrecognized groups. An example from a peer institution's website is a statement such as: *UW, (appropriate council), and its national organization, do not recognize (insert chapter) on our campus. We strongly discourage students from joining an organization that is not recognized. Unrecognized fraternities are not held to the university standards that govern their behavior. They operate without the oversight, training, and education provided by university staff.*

## **Appendix**

### **Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Charge**

Since 1857, the fraternity and sorority community at UW–Madison has enhanced the student experience, given back locally and nationally through philanthropic efforts, and created lasting friendships. We appreciate the many contributions individuals and chapters have made to UW–Madison. We also know that, nationally and locally, challenges remain in the areas of student safety and wellbeing. Many new initiatives and best practices have occurred nationally to enhance the support and positive contributions of these communities.

We are proud to have four councils overseeing fraternities and sororities at UW–Madison: Interfraternity Council (IFC), Multicultural Greek Council (MGC), National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC), and Panhellenic Association (PHA). These groups oversee 60 chapters supporting 4,500 student members. While there are similarities among the four groups in terms of commitment to scholarship, service, and brotherhood/sisterhood, they also have unique attributes and processes. We are proud of the many contributions of these student organizations and yet we know we can do better and increase the safety of our students. Therefore, I have requested a review of our fraternity/sorority community occur by hiring a team of national experts in fraternity/sorority life to do a review of our organizations.

### **Purpose**

This external review is a proactive approach to assessing, clarifying, and strengthening the relationship between the University of Wisconsin–Madison and the fraternity and sorority community. By working with external experts in the field, we have the opportunity to explore specific areas of the community and our students' experiences, to set shared priorities, and determine next steps to ensure we continue to have a healthy and productive partnership. Our shared goal is for students to be healthy and safe and for fraternities and sororities to contribute positively to the campus community through their shared values of scholarship, leadership, service and brotherhood/sisterhood.

In preparation for this review, UW–Madison's Fraternity & Sorority Life (FSL) staff team consulted with Big Ten and industry peers for guidance in an effort to ensure that the review

meets our intended purpose. This document contains information that will help inform the review process.

### **Project Scope**

Given the complexity of the fraternity and sorority community, a broad series of topic areas will be addressed to help generate a comprehensive review. These areas of focus are listed in alphabetical order and may be expanded based on initial findings of the external consultant(s). Each area will be explored across all four councils with specific areas of review identified within the descriptions below.

**Accountability:** Review existing discipline structures and processes, including the Committee on Student Organization, council based judicial efforts, and individual misconduct to determine effectiveness.

**Diversity and Inclusion:** Evaluate community climate (especially for traditionally underrepresented students), assess programming, and review institutional support.

**Institutional Relationship:** Explore role in FSL Housing (IFC, PHA), staff involvement in community (chapter hosted events, liability, etc.), and how self-governance plays a role within the community.

**Membership Experience:** Assess recruitment (IFC, PHA) and intake processes (MGC, NPHC), new member education, membership development efforts, leadership opportunities and academic engagement.

**Resources and Support:** Analyze current University advising and staffing structure, space, funding, programming and services that support the fraternity and sorority community.

**Student Safety:** Evaluate current strategies, programs and policies related to alcohol, other drugs, sexual violence, and hazing.

### **External Review Team**

The task of the external review team is to develop trust and gather accurate and in-depth information. A review team of 5 individuals, each holding membership in an organization that is

part of our four governing councils (IFC, MGC, NPHC, PHA), will be charged to build trust and rapport with our students and generate a detailed report that meets our needs. The team of five will include a team lead responsible for submitting the final reports.

Team Lead: Dr. Laura Osteen

Laura Osteen serves as the Director of the Florida State University's Center for Leadership & Social Change. The Center is a campus-wide endeavor to transform lives through leadership education, identity development, and community engagement. In addition, Laura teaches in the Undergraduate Leadership Studies Program and writes with her colleagues on the Culturally Relevant Leadership Learning Model and the Leadership Identity Development Model. Laura envisions a world where everyone is enabled and empowered to create positive sustainable change in their community. Laura received her doctorate of philosophy degree from the University of Maryland – College Park in the field of College Student Personnel with an emphasis in leadership and organizational change and is a member of Alpha Delta Pi.

IFC Team Member: Kurt Foriska

Kurt Foriska works as the Director of Development for the Office of Student Life at The Ohio State University, where he gains support for programs and services through fundraising efforts. He began his career at Ohio State in 2003 as coordinator of Sorority and Fraternity Life, and has held various positions in Student Activities, the Ohio Union, and Recreational Sports. He holds a BS in biology from Allegheny College, an MA in college student personnel from Bowling Green State University, and an MBA from The Ohio State University. Kurt is a member of Delta Tau Delta.

MGC Team Member: Sam Centellas

Sam Centellas crossed into Sigma Lambda Beta at Western Michigan University. He was a charter member of his chapter and went on to help start a chapter at Grand Valley State University while getting his master's degree in College Student Affairs. Sam has served on the National Board of Directors for Gamma Sigma Alpha in Los Angeles, the Western Region Greek Association in San Francisco, and his own fraternity, Sigma Lambda Beta International Fraternity, Inc. in Iowa City and was a founding Board Member of the National Hazing Prevention Organization the organizers of National Hazing Prevention Week. Sam's "real" job is

Executive Director and CEO of La Casa de Amistad a Latino Youth and Community Center on the West Side of South Bend.

NPHC Team Member: Jennifer Jones

Ms. Jennifer M. Jones received her BA in Sociology and a Master of Liberal Arts from Southern Methodist University. She became a member of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. at Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas, and is currently a member of Kappa Zeta Chapter, Dallas, Texas. She is the Executive Director of Student Life at Southern Methodist University where she has been employed for the over 30 years, 16 of those years in various positions within Residence Life and Student Housing. She also served as the SMU NPHC advisor for eight years and currently serves as the Advisor to the SMU Student Senate. She has served as National President of the National Pan-Hellenic Council and served as the past National First Vice President of the National Pan-Hellenic Council and Regional Secretary for the Southwestern Region of NPHC. Jennifer has served in a number of national fraternal organizations including, but not limited to the Fraternity & Sorority Coalition Project, NASPA Knowledge Community, Circle of Sisterhood, Interfraternity Institute (IFI), and Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors.

PHA Team Member: Amy Vojta

Amy Vojta has worked at Rutgers University as the Associate Director of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs since 1996. She has also worked at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio as the Assistant Director of Greek Affairs and at the University of Texas at Austin as the Panhellenic Advisor.

She is a graduate of Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio. At BG she joined Alpha Gamma Delta and later worked for the Fraternity as a Leadership Consultant. For ten years she served as the Executive Director of the Northeast Greek Leadership Association, served two terms as the President of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisor and served as the Chairman for the AFA Foundation. She is a current volunteer for the Central New Jersey Alumnae Panhellenic's Scholarship Committee and the Alpha Gamma Delta Foundation.

## **External Review Schedule**

### Day One: Sunday, March 31st

2:30 – 3:30 pm PHA Executive Board & Chapter Presidents\*

3:30 – 4:30 pm IFC Executive Board & Chapter Presidents\*

4:45 – 5:30 pm MGC Chapter Advisors\*

5:30 – 6:15 pm NPHC Chapter Advisors\*

6:45 – 7:30 pm IFC Chapter Advisors\*

7:30 – 8:15 pm PHA Chapter Advisors\*

### Day Two: Monday, April 1st

10:00 – 10:45 pm Campus Partner Session\*

11:00 – 11:45 pm Campus Partner Session\*

2:30 – 3:15 pm Campus Partner Session\*

3:30 – 4:30 pm Open Session: University/Community – Session will take place in Memorial Union (Old Madison Room)

4:45 – 5:45 pm Fraternity & Sorority Life Members

5:45 – 6:45 pm House Corporation & House Directors\*

7:15 – 8:15 pm NPHC Executive Board & Chapter Presidents\*

### Day Three: Tuesday, April 2nd

10:00 – 10:45 am Campus Partner Session\*

11:00 – 11:45 am Campus Partner Session\*

2:30 – 3:15 pm Campus Partner Session\*

3:30 – 4:30 pm VCSA & Interim Dean of Students\*

4:45 – 5:45 pm Past Chapter President/Council Officers\*

6:00 – 7:00 pm Fraternity & Sorority Life Alumni

7:30 – 8:30 pm MGC Executive Board & Chapter Presidents\*

### Day Four: Wednesday, April 3rd

10:00 – 10:45 am Unrecognized Greek Groups\*