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A comprehensive review of the Chapter Review Board process that governs recognition for fraternities and sororities will be conducted and submitted for my approval.

The review will include, but not be limited to, structure, procedures, process, membership and community expectations.
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Current System

1. Complaint to Office of Sorority and Fraternity Life
   - Informal Resolution
     - OK
   - Greek Judicial Board Hearing
     - OK
     - GJB Appeal
       - OK
   - Chapter Review Board Hearing
     - CRB Appeal
Committee agrees on core values

- **Safety** of community members is the first priority
- **Fundamental fairness** is core to any process of accountability
- **Transparency** is essential
- **Educational** system since higher ed context
Current system falls short of these values

1. **Complex system**: different rules and procedures for each process

2. **Lack of fundamental fairness**: inequity regarding access to evidence, investigators on board; *ad hoc* board

3. **Triaging imperfect**: some cases of apparent serious misconduct adjudicated Greek Judicial Board (that is, an all student board)

4. **Lack of confidence** (both within and outside of Greek community): process, appropriateness of the outcomes, and transparency of the process and results
Ideas for short term, meaningful changes to current system

- **Plain English** procedures
- **Recruit and train** Review Board panel members, rather than rely on *ad hoc* practices
- **Investigators** do not serve on Review Board
- Provide **full investigative report** to all parties
- Maintain **public information** of allegations and review board findings
Other considerations for long-term revision

• **Structure:** Removal of chapter conduct cases from the Office of Sorority and Fraternity Life

• **Membership:** Should non-Greek community members be part of the Review Board? Students? Faculty members?

• **Roles:** What roles should the following have in the Review Board process: Harmed parties? Alumni/ae? OSFL? Advisor?

• **ADR:** Use of alternative dispute resolution (e.g., mediation, restorative justice)