

**MINUTES**  
**PRESIDENT’S TASK FORCE ON GREEK LIFE**  
**January 31, 2018**

Rob Stuart, Chair, called to order the meeting of the President’s Task Force on Greek Life in the LSU Foundation Building Harrison Board Room, on January 31, 2018 at 4:30 p.m. Stephanie Tomlinson, Executive Assistant, called the roll.

PRESENT

Rob Stuart, Chair  
Dan Layzell, Vice Chair  
Jason Badeaux, Student Government President  
Kenneth McMillin, Faculty Senate President  
Mari Fuentes-Martin, Dean of Students  
Verge Ausberry, Athletics Department Representative  
Mason Tusa, Interfraternity Council President  
Anesha Pink, National Pan-Hellenic Council President  
Madison Hopper, Panhellenic Council President  
Camille Flint, Residence Hall Association President  
BJ Billeaudeau, Kappa Sigma House Corporation Representative

ABSENT

None absent.

Also present for the meeting were the following: Carlton “Trey” Jones, Managing Attorney in the LSU Office of General Counsel; Stephanie Tomlinson, Executive Assistant to the Board of Supervisors; Hannah Rovira, Coordinator in the LSU Office of the President; Ernie Ballard, LSU Media Relations Director; and representatives of the news media.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments made at the meeting.

I. Opening Comments – Rob Stuart, Chair

Rob Stuart started the meeting with statistics on the Greek Community’s academic achievement. For the fall semester of 2018 the Sorority GPA average was 3.291 compared to the University all-female average GPA of 3.089, the Fraternity GPA average was 2.902 compared to the University all-male average GPA of 2.808. The all Greek GPA average for fall 2018 was 3.16 compared to the all students GPA of 2.956. Rob commented about the five year graduation rate from spring of 2018. He pointed out Greek students five year graduate rate was 73% prepared to the non-Greek five year graduation rate of 55% and is a differential that has held over the last seven to eight years. He further mentioned other Universities have put forward GPA requirements for Greeks and given the performance of the LSU Greek community this is not something the Task Force is considering.

The other recommendation from other Universities is a fee for the Greek Life Office and LSU has been the leader in this for a long time. Our students pay a fee of \$57 a semester and the Greek Life office is funded solely by that and not state funds.

Dan Layzell has reached out to the Gruver's and next week Rob & Dan will have a call with the Gruver's about the work of the Task Force.

## II. Continued Task Force Discussion of Findings and Potential Recommendations

**Establish standing committee with University (faculty, staff, administration) and Greek community representation to review all Greek-related policies, procedures, and training/educational requirements on a staggered four-year cycle and make recommendations on additions, deletions, and revisions**

Madison commented she is in agreement with this recommendation. BJ elaborated the group should be accountable to the Greek Life Office for implementing recommendations from the Task Force, and balance the number of voting members. Jason agreed with BJ and mentioned alumni involvement for the operational level is imperative. He further stated that alumni need to be bought in and establish trust through chartering an organization or committee to partner with the Greek Life Office. BJ further elaborated we should not have our recommendations in place until that group is chartered. Rob clarified chartered means the formal structure of the committee. Mari asked for clarity on how it would work, since there is a board for the fee and the Greek Life Office works with alumni as advisors throughout the year for recruitment, accountability, and philanthropy so what is the level and scope of this committee. Rob replied that these are the questions we need to work out for the recommendation. BJ commented the Greek fee is a specific charge and this would be broader and we could even roll the fee board in to the committee. Mari noted that we have lots of alumni committees, two meetings a year with housing corp. leadership so this is adding another committee. She further asked since we have a lot of alumni committees and involvement, how would this be different. Jason replied that there is alumni involvement in specific events but not a formalized group with the oversight of Greek Life Office. This committee would work with the Greek Life Office as a whole over personnel, policies, and educational aspects. Madison remarked that if there is a board to oversee the overall scope, criteria or application for someone to become a chapter advisor that the same criteria be used for this committee. She further stressed there needs to be certain criteria for the members. Rob commented the University will work out the details over time.

**Develop a specific, operational definition of "hazing"**

Rob stated everyone on this Task force is committed to the elimination of hazing and there is zero tolerance for hazing. He further commented there is room for a more specific definition that is actually focused on eliminating hazing. Mari commented that every chapter has a definition of hazing and the interpretation of hazing is challenging. Mari mentioned it may not be the definition as much as the interpretation and intent from an accountability standpoint. She provided an example of scavenger hunts and what risks do chapter members have when they participate in these events. She stated this is where training comes in and using scenarios. Jason stated the University's current definition is so vague and if we go to zero tolerance we have to make clear lines. He also stated he would like to see the State clear this up as well because we have to draw a line. Ken noted that we are talking about acceptable and unacceptable behaviors and there should be

what are these unacceptable behaviors and then what is the chapter going to do to prevent and punish. Mari replied this is correct and if their activities were approved and acceptable that would not cross the line of hazing until it hits the next level.

**Develop “amnesty” policy for reporting of certain infractions**

Rob remarked we are really looking at two policies, one related to medical and second is if a chapter self-reports accountability for members to the University to break the culture of saving the charter. He further stated if it is not a systemic chapter issue then the chapter can feel comfortable to deal with them then pushing it under the rug and not informing the University. BJ asked on the first part does the bystander program establish a good process for reporting. Mari replied yes and no, and further stated the training is very helpful in teaching students what to do and the right thing to do. She also commented how there is so much mandatory training so how do we know students listen and the bystander training is needed but how and when do we do it. She further pointed out that we struggle with the reports in the media of not calling 911 so students don't get in trouble so we need to overcome the fear to call. She stated only the sexual misconduct policy has parameters for amnesty now. BJ asked if the bystander program addressed the call issue. Mari replied that LSUPD has the “see something, say something” campaign but we talk to students about bystander behavior and it does involve some training. She further stated how do we measure students are using this and when someone is in a critical medical condition what is the right thing to do. She said we know it is the right thing to do but what about chapter leaders and new members, it is actually a lot of work to do. Ken commented the leaders only have responsibility for certain aspects but we have to create incentives to report so when an incident occurs we have a list of everybody and some degree of recrimination for those who were bystanders and didn't report. He stated a more diligent process could be an incentive to take care of each other in their brother and sisterhood. Camille remarked so many students think they will be punished so they don't call for help so it is key to get students to report. Ken replied if we change the culture we won't have to use this as often. Jason remarked that amnesty is absolutely necessary but we have a culture of not self-reporting because of a lack of trust with the administrators, this is institutionalized in advisors and chapters. He further stated amnesty does not fix the fear of reporting for a chapter and actions against the chapter. Mari replied that is a two-way street but the community will ask the University where is the accountability for behavior for the organizations actions. BJ stated this is why you build the body that helps oversee and build that trust.

**Review PM-68 (“Construction, Modification, Maintenance, Care and Operation of Sorority and Fraternity Houses Located on University Property”) for implementation of policy changes applicable to resident organizations**

**Review leases of University property by Greek organizations for risk management considerations**

Rob remarked Trey Jones, Managing Attorney, would provide guidance on what this will look like. Mari stated this is an area where alumni and the University work really closely together and the role of house manager. She mentioned we also need to look at the capacity of each building and

modernization of the houses. Mari further commented the presence of the housing corporation are important to maintain the role of each relationship.

**Require all Greek chapters to create "chapter advisory boards" with a minimum of three members, the majority of whom should be from the Baton Rouge area**

Rob commented the advisors need to be here and local. Mari & BJ agreed that this is absolutely critical and should be tiered with the size of the chapter.

**Verify annually that each Greek chapter has a functioning, active Judicial Board with chapter advisory board oversight**

Rob commented this is the Self-policing mechanism so the chapter is taking a role to hold each other accountable. Ken commented those should not be the chapter officers but a separate body within the organization. Mari asked what level of judicial will a chapter hold and when a behavior is a strong safety or criminal at what point does the chapter need to refer to another level. She noted an example is Residence life adjudicates at a certain level and escalates things to SAA so we need to define chapter level and what goes beyond a judicial board. Ken remarked if we have categories of action then we can decide what goes to chapter judicial board or up to the administration. Rob asked Madison where they draw the line in sororities, and Madison replied their advisors are counseled on everything and they handle it together. She further stated there hasn't been any big issues that needed to go to Greek Life. The sororities are very active with their judicial boards and advisors and we bring things to Greek Life. BJ stated this could tie in to the amnesty policy as well. He asked about the Theta Xi core leadership program and if they have instances where they self-regulated hazing and expelled members and the chapter reports this to the University does it fall under the amnesty policy. Mari replied the cases the Greek Accountability team see are reports from campus police or social media reports from others. She mentioned it is a partnership process and work jointly and the issue is how investigations are handled by a chapter. She further stated if a chapter may handle something internally but once the University is aware we have to investigate as well. BJ mentioned with the amnesty program, the partnership process may need to be looked at for changes. Mari said trust is one of the main issues and we are looked at nationally for our partnership program.

**Actively involve Greek chapter advisory boards in Office of Greek Life planning, policy development, training/education and accountability/oversight activities**

**Require each Greek chapter to develop a comprehensive program for chapter and member accountability, which will include appropriate oversight by the University and chapter advisory boards**

Rob stated the chapters need to adopt a policy for accountability within the chapter and for members. Mari stated that we have to have some agreement for the levels of what should be adjudicated by the chapter, the council, and the Greek Life Office. She mentioned that we have scenarios we can use to hash out these details.

**Require each Greek chapter to have a "membership contract" to be signed by every member each semester which includes code of conduct, other behavioral expectations, and consequences for related infractions at a minimum**

Mason commented if we talk about accountability all of this can go in the member contracts and the members and the University can hold the chapters to that contract. Rob mentioned the chapters draft individual member contracts. Madison suggest there is at least a University guided one that provides a basis that certain language must be included in the contract. Dan agreed that there has to be a basic set of expectations for everybody and that is clearly spelled out. BJ remarked this ties in well to a standing judicial board because this provides set expectations of what they are going to be held accountable for.

**Eliminate current Greek assessment process and replace with staggered four-year review cycle for all chapters that includes University, Greek, and external representation**

Dan mentioned there are good parts of the assessment but students just check the box of requirements and it is not providing any value. Rob remarked there needs to be a more holistic way we can look at chapters and what they are involved with and provide meaningful feedback. Mason agreed with the check the box mentality the assessment has brought on. Ken asked if there are some mechanisms for certain chapters to need an annual evaluation if they have certain deficiencies. Rob replied the details of the implementation will have to be a collaborative effort and we need to think practically about how there is some regular oversight. Mari asked what is meant by the four-year review cycle. Mari further stated we may not be able to implement on an annual basis but there needs to be some basic assessment process because we often hear about scorecards and they want to know the history of the organization. She further noted parents want a very transparent process on past years' performance because of this she struggles with a four-year process because it needs to be annually. Dan said this will be part of the implementation process consideration. BJ commented the scorecard establishes a baseline and gives the data of where the chapters stand but holistic is more in depth than "check the box."

**Develop "Uniform Code of Infractions" (e.g., alcohol/drug violations, hazing, sexual misconduct) and create a "progressive/tiered discipline" system related to the code**

Rob mentioned this was also part of the Greek Alumni Unity Council presentation, and the Task Force is not adopting exactly what they set forth but that Greek Life and Dean of Students would need to define what these are. Mari commented the Greek Life Office leads the investigation but the outcome comes from Dean of Students. BJ stated this would be to outline common things that happen and set pre-established penalties for violations. Mari remarked that we do have rubrics but they are not public, so there is the possibility for a mitigating circumstance. She mentioned caution around fixed outcomes because it does not allow holistic review and interpretation. Ken mentioned students and faculty would prefer there is uniform code of conduct and everyone have the same guidelines. He further stated we have to be careful between Greeks and students, it should be all the same guidelines.

**Develop minimum job qualifications for Greek chapter house managers and require all chapters to have house managers who meet these qualifications by fall 2019**

Rob remarked this is important and for some chapters it is a financial issue but we have to help bridge the gap. BJ asked if this fit under PM68, and Rob responded yes. Mason commented they have to have someone full time in the house and consequence if they are not at the house full time. He noted how sororities have house sitters if a manager has to go away and that would benefit IFC. Ken commented they need to have responsibilities and set minimum qualifications and requirements.

**The Office of Greek Life should create and maintain a web portal for prospective members, parents, and the general public that includes current information on each active Greek chapter regarding:**

- 1. Member demographics**
- 2. Chapter GPA and other pertinent educational metrics and outcomes**
- 3. Rolling five-year history of adjudicated chapter disciplinary matters (e.g., violations, probation, suspension, etc.)**
- 4. Chapter philanthropic and community service activities**
- 5. Other metrics as appropriate**

Rob remarked this recommendation is to create a scorecard and make it available, meaningful and up to date for parents and students. Mason commented this could be included in the Greek Tiger that is sent to all incoming freshman. Ken asked if there was a reason for a rolling 5-year history instead of basic history because if a chapter is banned for 5 years they don't have a history so prefer a longer history. Jason stated that could unfairly characterize an organization but with graduations and students changing the 5-year history is perfect to see the generational cycle. Mari commented with sanctions we look at 4 years' sanctions so individuals can graduate. Ken stated to Jason's point if the chapter had changed its culture for the better you could put in the history of changes so it is much more attractive. Jason replied you still wouldn't want the weight of the chapter members from over 5 years ago, who are no longer in the chapter, holding down the chapter. Rob remarked Ken's point is more targeted to organizations when there was an on and off issue. Jason stated you could update every semester to see how the organization is trending. Rob asked how much information can we provide if they have had a violation. Mari stated if there are criminal charges that is with the District Attorney's Office and Student Code of Conduct violations are heard through the Dean of Students Office. She further stated the thresholds are different for standards of evidence and they have trouble getting evidence. The group's records in the Dean of Students Office are public but individual cases are private. Jason asked as we shift to amnesty and individual accountability, would that reflect negatively on the chapter for the scorecard. Mari replied the way they would interpret would be what is imposed on the chapter not on individuals and individual accountability would not roll up to the chapter. Ken asked how does the scorecard work. Jason said we could rate a chapter on demographics and GPA and others. He further stated our lobby has the scorecard for the legislator. Ken asked if people are looking for the information, do they need the score or just the information. Jason stated majority of the information is already in the Greek Tiger. Ken asked what are the criteria for the scorecard. Rob stated Greek Life is already working on a

scorecard and the criteria. Mason asked if the scorecard scores a chapter and refers to awards, would this replace the assessment. Mari replied yes and we would include education programs, awards, and participation in Greek Life and there are milestones that could be part of the scorecard. Mason replied the scorecard is a better way because the assessment is not effective. Jason commented it is a good alternative to assessment and gives a holistic view of chapter and needs to be sent out to parents and students to encourage a high score. Ken asked how the score is broken down. Mari replied there will be sections that are categorized and scored. Dan stated this would be the details but other cards will have different sections and a composite. Ken asked what are the categories and scale. Dan replied that will be part of implementation and we cannot at this level provide the details. It will take a group of folks working through the data to assist and make clear the criteria.

**Require chapter advisory boards to have full oversight and accountability for the new member recruitment and education process with at least one board member present at each new member meeting**

Rob commented the Boards will take charge of the new member process. Mari asked if this includes the new member education programs. Rob responded yes it does and an alumni advisory board person at all meetings.

**Require annual submission of new member education plans to the Office of Greek Life for review and feedback**

**Require IFC chapters to limit new member education programs ("pledge periods") to eight weeks**

Jason mentioned a development process from boys to men and the need to create a database of productive resources for chapters to utilize to develop plans. He also stated the need for workshops to train new member educators with a focus on case studies and working with board and the Greek Life Office for coming up with a plan for that semester. Mari stated they found this process is not standardized from chapter to chapter. Jason replied it is not standardized but some basis should be provided and guidance on what you should be doing instead of only what you cannot do. Ken asked if this could be tied in to career development and the career center could assist as well. Jason replied a lot of the material in their development is career development and they could utilize a career center partnership. Mason commented on something Verge talked about which is bringing outside consultants and how there are good ones out there to bring in new light. He further commented how consultants bring in the best practices nationally and they have been beneficial in the past for IFC.

Rob commented the eight weeks is a recommendation coming from other Universities and Organization and the key is finding the right number. He further stated how long do you need for a good development program because the shorter it gets you cram too much at the beginning of school. Mason stated eight weeks is a good time frame and there are a lot of national organizations getting rid of the new member process. He commented that this allows enough time to tell a person's personality. BJ stated it should be the longest pledge period set by nationals and not put

restraints when some of the nationals are already doing it. Jason commented a broken system will still operate in a shorter amount time than the time it is allowed to operate. Mari stated the leadership of the chapter needs to use this time to determine if this should be someone who joins and the new member needs time to decide if they want to join. BJ remarked the length is irrelevant if we don't address issues in the process. Verge asked if it could be different board members attending events or does it have to be the same one. Dan replied realistically speaking we are putting a lot of responsibility on the board so there needs to be one of them there but it does not have to be the same person every time. Madison commented the Panhellenic chapters have a large advisory board where each advisor has a specific focus, including new member education. Rob stated the chapters have to work with the advisory board and cover the new member program sufficiently.

## II. Adjournment

Upon motion of Verge, seconded by Dan the meeting was adjourned.