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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 has some problems

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

2. Lack of appropriate due process in some places, such as access to evidence, appeal of initial triage

3. Cases of apparent serious misconduct often adjudicated by students in Greek Judicial Board

4. Lack of confidence in the process (both within and outside of Greek system) and in the fairness of the outcomes
In anticipation of allegations of organizational misconduct associated with the Spring “rush,” several quick improvements are being considered for the current system:

- Plain English procedures
- Recruit and train hearing board panel members, rather than rely on ad hoc service
- Separate personnel conducting investigation from those on hearing
- Provide full investigative report to all parties
- Maintain public database of allegations and review board findings

But, really fixing this judicial system will probably require more...
One idea for revised system

An independent investigation that focuses on unbiased fact finding followed by a hearing before a panel that determines responsibility and imposes sanctions.

Modeled after the approach in Policy 6.4 at Cornell to handle sexual misconduct allegations.
Investigation

- Investigator assigned to gather facts via interviews and other evidence
- Investigator produces a summary of all interviews and an overall report on the facts
- Advisors for responding organization
- Responding organization fully informed of evidence
- Responding organization can propose investigative steps
The Greek system has rules, primarily around social activities, that are not in the Campus Code of Conduct.

If there is no evidence that a Code of Conduct violation occurred, the investigative report would be forwarded to a Greek Judicial System.
Hearing

- Hearing panel selected from pool of faculty and staff
- Responding organization receives investigative report and may propose witnesses and questions
- Hearing panel receives investigative report and selects any witnesses for the hearing
- After hearing, the panel makes a finding of responsibility and imposes sanctions
Appeal

- Panel chosen from the pool of faculty and staff, with no panel members involved in original hearing
- Senior administrator also on panel
- Limited grounds for appeal (gross injustice; procedural error)