



**dyad**strategies

**University of Missouri  
External Review Report**

**October 24, 2017**

**Gentry R. McCreary, Ph.D.**

**W. Scott Lewis, J.D.**

## OVERVIEW and GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

### Overview and Organization of Report

On August 17-18, the program reviewers visited the University Missouri Campus to conduct an external review of the Office of Greek Life (OGL), with particular attention paid to areas involving areas risk exposure related to fraternities and sororities. The on-site visit consisted of a series of in-person meetings with student affairs staff, undergraduate fraternity/sorority leaders, alumni, and a variety of other internal and external stakeholders. In addition to these in-person meetings, the reviewers also evaluated a variety of documents, policies, and reports generated by the University in order to gain an understanding of the focus and priorities of OGL. This report contains a summary of the reviewers' findings, followed by a series of recommendations related to those findings.

### Purpose and of OGL

OGL at Mizzou has suffered in recent years from a lack of purpose, direction and leadership. Our review discovered that, after the office's proposal to pass a Greek Student Fee was not **passed nearly two years ago, the unit's employees were instructed by the previous director to "scale back" their services to chapters to the bare minimum. For the last 18 months, the office** has provided limited to chapters, which has resulted in frustration with both undergraduate student leaders as well as alumni stakeholders. As a result, there is confusion as to what the role and purpose of OGL should be, and this confusion extends from the current OGL staff to students and both internal and external stakeholders.

Each constituency articulated a slightly different opinion of the purpose of OGL, or were altogether unable to articulate the role and purpose of OGL. As one chapter president noted *"if you were to ask me the last thing that they [OGL] have done to help me do my job, I couldn't tell you."* It is difficult to communicate, collaborate, advocate or innovate in an environment with so little agreement or shared understanding relative to the role and purpose of a team of **professionals. Attempting to do so is akin to playing "whack-a-mole."** Philosophically, it is necessary for Mizzou and/or the Division of Student Affairs to articulate a coherent philosophy related to the basic use and purpose of the OGL unit on campus.

Is the ultimate goal to have strong fraternities and sororities, or is the fraternity/sorority experience best approached as a mechanism for achieving the broader goals/outcomes of the University and/or the Division of Student Affairs?

It is critical that University leadership answer this question as it determines the path forward for OGL, **and to invest in appropriate staffing structures necessary to fulfil the unit's mission.**

### Lack of Strategic Focus

It is evident that the Division of Student Services at Mizzou is in the midst of a shift of leadership, philosophy, and strategic priorities. In evaluating OGL's **place in this shifting** landscape, it became immediately clear that OGL lacks any sense of strategic focus. There was no evidence provided to the reviewers indicating that OGL currently operates within any overarching goals, objectives, or priorities. Rather, it appears the office bounces from one fire to the next, spending the bulk of its time advising council officers and responding to allegations of misconduct, allowing the bulk of programmatic responsibilities to be taken on by the governing

councils with little regard for departmental, divisional, or institutional priorities and without any clear metrics for success at the chapter, council or community levels. The one program that OGL seems to take a great deal of responsibility for, the Greek Leadership Summit held in January, was universally dismissed by students as ineffective and poorly designed to facilitate student learning.

#### Lack of Communications

A theme that emerged countless times throughout the visit was the perceived lack of communication coming from OGL. This sentiment was echoed by students and both internal and external stakeholders. Students report feeling **“in the dark.”** Alumni reported frustration of OGL not sharing information. Both internal and external constituents report reaching out to the office and receiving no response. One internal stakeholder, who has historically provided chapter programming related to alcohol education, reported being unable to even get a contact list of chapter presidents from the office. It appears that there is a complete void of communication coming from OGL, which fosters both animosity towards the office as well as confusion regarding departmental initiatives.

#### Perceived Lack of Support

Students within the F/S community do not feel supported by OGL. This often translates into not feeling supported/valued by the institution. Chapter leaders do not see OGL as a resource or an active participant in the F/S experience on campus. Rather, they see OGL as a reactionary unit **that, according one student “only gets involved with us when the shit hits the fan.”** As another student noted **“a fraternity would implode before they would go to the University for help.”** This view of the office was consistent across the IFC and Panhellenic councils, as well as the culturally-based councils. While NPHC/MGC members felt that they received some support from the office in terms of attendance at their events, even they felt that OGL needed to provide more structure and communication and stated that they felt isolated from the rest of the F/S community.

#### Chapter vs. Council Development

OGL staff appear to have previously made a determination that chapter support/development is **not their role. Chapter programming has happened infrequently, and only at a chapter’s request.** Staff have invested minimally in training or providing opportunities for collaboration among chapter officers, instead delegating this responsibility to national organizations. Admittedly, OGL **has taken a “hands off” approach when it comes to chapters, choosing instead to focus all of its energy on council advisement.** Based on conversations with OGL staff, it appears that this council advisement takes place more in regards to addressing the personality issues of governing councils with little regard to advancing any strategic objectives.

#### Resource Allocation

Resources are always in short supply. OGL is no different. This is a department stretched thin, not only by minimal staffing and meager programmatic resources, but also by the aforementioned disparate expectations and lack of focus. Whether expectations are scaled back or resources are added, it will be necessary to be intentional about the ratio of expectations to resources moving forward.

## Need for Communication/Collaboration with Alumni

Mizzou has an incredible asset in their fraternity/sorority alumni community. This group of engaged alumni have strong ties to the University and care deeply about the fraternity sorority community, and for at least the last two years (during a period in which OGL administrators intentionally withdrew support from chapters) have served as the greatest source of support for undergraduate chapters. The energy of this group must be tapped into, harnessed and channeled in a positive direction in order to maximize its potential positive impact on the community. Currently, alumni do not feel that they have a voice in decisions being made impacting the fraternity/sorority community and feel disconnected from OGL on matters of mutual concern.

## Risk Management

As part of this review, a number of areas of potential risk exposure were identified and examined in further detail. These areas are discussed in detail below:

*Unregistered Social Events* – **The university's social event registration policies** have served to create an environment in which both fraternities and sororities register their large social events and host them at off-campus establishments. **These events generally follow the University's social event guidelines.**

However, this has also created an environment where unregistered social events happen with **great regularity in fraternity houses. These events do not follow the University's risk management guidelines** and involve higher risk of alcohol and substance abuse.

The IFC Social Audit policy was originally designed to address these events, but chapters have **developed systems designed to "beat" the social audit process, rendering them largely ineffective and pointless.** The result is a very low rate of chapters failing these social audits.

Further compounding this problem are the dynamics of police coverage of Greek housing. While technically in city jurisdiction, the local police only conduct cursory patrols and responds to major incidents. University police has a presence in the Greek housing area, but because the houses are not technically in their jurisdiction, they rarely enter the houses. As a result, there is minimal, if any, police presence in and around fraternity houses **beyond the "knock and talks"** mentioned by campus police leadership.

Chapter-purchased alcohol is a concern at these events. Fraternity members indicated that **chapter members would "pass the hat for house booze."** This **"house booze" is generally beer,** but it was stated repeatedly that hard alcohol was often present at these events, provided by individual fraternity members and present in their rooms at the houses.

Sorority leaders (including chapter presidents) indicate that they worry much more about the safety of their members at these informal fraternity house parties in comparison to scheduled events at third party vendors at which risk management protocol is generally followed, and indicated that the majority of incidents involving their members happen in connection with these informal house parties as opposed to registered, planned events.

*Fraternity Recruitment/Freshman Living in Fraternity Houses* –allowing students to accept fraternity bids before they are enrolled, has created a problematic environment that allows freshman students to live in fraternity houses. This is problematic on several fronts. There is

ample research to suggest that freshman students who live in residence halls have the most positive academic and co-curricular outcomes. Freshman fraternity members at Mizzou do not perform well academically compared to their non-affiliated peers.

Secondly, this arrangement perpetuates a two-year fraternal experience in which freshmen live **in the house, sophomores run the chapter, and upperclassmen largely “check-out”** from the fraternal experience. This significantly detracts from the brotherhood and engagement among upperclassmen, and creates an unsafe situation in which the youngest members of the chapter are running the chapter, placing new freshmen in a social environment that detracts from their academic pursuits during their freshman year. This environment also creates a distinct divide between fraternity members and non-affiliated students. **As one staff member noted, “the biggest divide on campus is not between black and white, it is between Greek/Non-Greek.”** Both the summer recruitment process as well as the freshman live-in requirements must be addressed.

*Syllabus Week* – A concern discussed by both students and alumni were the risk associated with **“syllabus week.”** During the first week of classes, fraternity and sorority members perpetuate an expectation that professors only review the syllabus and that there are no academic expectations beyond that. As a result, this week (which coincides with the fraternity informal recruitment period) turns into a week of increased partying and substance abuse on the part of fraternity and sorority members. This is generally the first week that new students are on campus, immediately following sorority recruitment, and while fraternity freshmen have just moved into fraternity houses.

*Substance Abuse* – There is a general perception among students that substance use/abuse within the community is common, particularly among fraternity members.

*Underground/Unrecognized Groups* – In the last two years, the University has withdrawn recognition from two fraternities who continue to operate with the blessing of their national headquarters in spite of their loss of recognition. In addition, campus sororities continue to host social functions with these unrecognized fraternities. This is a dangerous precedent. If a culture is established on campus in which students realize that loss of University recognition poses no significant threat to the existence of a chapter, then groups will become increasingly likely to **operate underground without the University’s blessing. Steps must be taken with the** stakeholders involved in the two current unrecognized groups to bring those groups back into the fold and subject to the oversight of the University.

*Hazing* – There is a concern among students that hazing is an accepted part of the fraternity new member process. Several fraternity and sorority leaders agreed that alcohol consumption **was the “biggest problem” in conjunction with hazing.** Another person noted to the reviewers that coerced alcohol use and personal servitude had largely replaced any physical hazing taking place on campus. The hazing is compounded by the fact that most freshman fraternity members live in the fraternity house, where they have no privacy.

Adversarial, Lengthy Organizational Conduct Process

**The most salient theme in meetings with student leaders was the common refrain of “we only hear from the University when there is a problem” and “it feels like the University is out to get us.” This sentiment seems to stem from an adversarial, lengthy organizational** conduct process that often catches student leaders by surprise weeks, if not months, after violations are alleged

to have occurred. If an individual is alleged to have been consuming alcohol at a fraternity house, the chapter's first communication is a "notice of charges" that is usually sent several weeks after the event is alleged to have occurred. While the majority of these cases are handled informally (only one out of the last approximately 50 cases have gone to a formal hearing), the process can and should be adjusted to create a spirit of partnership between the University and Greek organizations.

### Students of Color Do Not Feel Supported by University

Students from both the NPHC and the MGC indicate that they do not feel supported by the University. As smaller groups on the campus, they do not have the financial resources that many IFC and Panhellenic groups enjoy, and indicate that funding is incredibly difficult to attain through the general student org funding process and, according to them, no funding is specifically set aside for culturally-based groups or initiatives. Students shared several anecdotes related to the perceived lack of support – NPHC leaders indicated that they had three council advisors over the last three years. Students indicated that at a recent Midnight BBQ event hosted by the University there was no music played that appealed to students of color. Students indicated that no small-group housing was available for smaller, culturally based groups on campus. Students indicated that, outside of the annual Greek leadership retreat there was no focus on cross-cultural collaboration or programming between the historically white governing councils/chapters and culturally-based chapters/councils. As one student summarized in his comments "Inclusion just does not seem to be a priority for the institution."

## Focus Area One: Role and Purpose

While many of the recommendations presented in this document are of an actionable nature, it is necessary to preface those with a set of recommendations that are of a philosophical nature. Clarity regarding MIZZOU's relationship with fraternities and sororities will inform how or if the remaining recommendations are implemented.

- 1.1. Articulate a clear and concise purpose that provides a sense of focus and clarity related to functions that OGL is uniquely positioned to carry out.
  - a) Inventory existing resources on campus to eliminate duplication of efforts, to maximize resources and to ensure quality of program and service delivery.
- 1.2. In cooperation with the F/S councils, their member organizations and chapter advisors, articulate a set of concrete areas of focus that map to university and divisional outcomes. These areas of focus then become the cornerstone of each program, advising session and/or training -- the purpose of which is to build the community and its chapters in a manner that consistently mobilizes university and divisional objectives.
- 1.3. Articulate a clear set of **Program Level Outcomes** (PLOs) for the OGL. The OGL should develop a clear set of *Course Level Outcomes* (CLOs) for each individual program and service (e.g. event review, member education, individual meetings, etc.). The current learning outcomes provided to the reviewer are poorly written and are not mapped to any over-arching department-level program level outcomes or any divisional or institutional goals or objectives.
  - a) Use this framework to evaluate existing programs and services and to develop future programs and services to ensure focus, consistency, intentionality and clarity in both the overall F/S advising program and in its associated programs and services. *\*This is the*

*identical process that a new academic program might utilize to ensure that an individual course session contributes to course-level outcomes and that an individual course contributes to program-level outcomes.*

1.4 Ensure that new initiatives are tailored to address specific needs. As OGL staff have additional time to manage a broader portfolio of responsibilities, it is important to ensure that any new initiatives are narrowly tailored to address a specific institutional need. An example that came up multiple times during the **reviewer's** visit was the question of whether or not OGL should develop and implement a social event registration process for fraternity/sorority chapters. As these events occur off campus, and are already being policed through relationships with local law enforcement, and information regarding any incidents is being shared with the institution, what would the institution gain by having events registered with OGL when considering the amount of staff time and energy that would be necessary to devote to managing such an event registration process? The development of such a practice would be best described as a solution in need of a problem. OGL staff and their supervisory units must realistically examine departmental human resources and prioritize OGL functions to ensure that all primary functions of the office are narrowly-tailored to meet specific institutional objectives.

## Focus Area Two: Fraternity/Sorority Chapters and Governing Councils

While separate and distinct from the OGL, the F/S chapters and governing councils must do their part to ensure the intentionality, consistency and clarity that will be necessary to foster the desired F/S community.

2.1. In cooperation with the F/S councils, their member organizations and chapter advisors, OGL should develop a formal statement of relationship, shared expectations and community standards. This statement should include: conditions and responsibilities of recognition, mutual expectations regarding housing facilities (if applicable), reference to all relevant policy and governing documents, explicit institutional expectations and rationale for expectations that exceed general student organization expectations and a thorough record of organizational accountability mechanisms.

2.2. Each F/S governing council conduct a thorough internal review of documents, structures, policies, procedures and programs to ensure relevance to the community, clarity of purpose and connection to institutional/divisional/departmental outcomes.

- a) The purpose of each governing council should be reviewed, redefined (if necessary) and communicated in a manner that articulates alignment with community purpose and institutional priorities.
- b) The structure of each governing council should be designed in a manner that efficiently mobilizes the purpose of the council. Past policies, titles and/or executive board/committee positions should not necessarily dictate future structure. *\*Note: This also relates to the diversity and inclusion/cultural competency recommendations referenced later in this report.*

2.3. F/S chapters should review Inter/National risk management policies to ensure compliance and determine needed areas of clarification and/or member education. Education is particularly needed around risk management/social event policy, as most chapter **“social events” are unregistered, unofficial gatherings (often taking place after dry pre-events)** at

unofficial houses off campus. Organizations are taking a significant risk in hosting these events and do not appear to have adequate training related to how these events should be hosted, managed, etc.

2.4 OGL should work with stakeholders to administer a needs assessment to better understand what services chapters are receiving through their national headquarters, what services they are receiving from other departments on campus, and what services need to be provided by OGL. As students reported feeling unsupported by OGL, it is important to develop an understanding of community needs with regards to programmatic and training efforts. As OGL seeks to better understand how it can adequately service chapters, it must determine the programs and services most needed by chapters – and to avoid unnecessary duplication by understanding what training they may be receiving from their national organizations.

### Focus Area Three: Assessment/Strategic Planning

The reviewer evaluated the OGL departmental assessment efforts. While OGL has gathered a great deal of data, there is no tangible assessment plan, no clarity of how the data gathered has been used for continuous improvement, and no demonstration of how the assessments conducted previously have been linked to departmental, divisional, or institutional objectives. The department must develop a more strategic approach to assessment and planning.

3.1. Analyze and prioritize critical issues, selecting 3-5 areas in which the department should focus its efforts. This should be an extension of the role and purpose functional review previously referenced in recommendation 1.3. This can be accomplished through the examination of previous assessment data, gap analysis, SWOT or SOAR analysis, or through observation of community trends and issues. Care should be taken to align these critical issues with institutional and/or divisional priorities.

3.2. Determine appropriate assessment measures. These measures may include institutional data (i.e. GPA or conduct statistics), survey data (i.e. attitudes, beliefs, behaviors) or qualitative data (i.e. focus groups, interviews, analysis of written documents) derived from identifying critical issues/focus areas.

3.3. Collect baseline data where applicable, to determine current status of community at the beginning of the change initiative. Once baseline data are collected and reviewed, targets in each area can be developed (i.e. reduction in hazing-supportive attitudes, increases in feelings of belonging, etc.).

3.4. Develop tactical plan, mapping advising techniques, curriculum, and other educational programming to desired outcomes. Funding should be prioritized on those initiatives most likely to impact positive change in target areas.

3.5. Assess to measure growth/change, using data to demonstrate impact of educational initiatives, revise those initiatives, and determine future focus areas if targets are met.

The process outlined above should be the model for a three-year strategic planning and assessment project aimed at addressing key issues identified by OGL staff, and departmental



resources should be diverted from other areas to focus on the 3-5 key issues selected, assessing the impact of the staff's **initiatives over time**.

## Focus Area Four: Organizational Conduct

The reviewer was specifically asked to provide feedback related to the organizational conduct process, particularly related to the role that OGL should play in the conduct process with fraternities and sororities on campus. In our conversations with students and other stakeholders, it was clear that OGL is currently viewed (especially by IFC and Panhellenic) as an office whose primary focus is policy enforcement. This impression has created an environment in which students and other external stakeholders avoid sharing information with OGL staff because of a fear of punishment and/or lack of trusting relationships. It has also created an environment in which OGL staff have devoted significant time to the organizational misconduct process at the expense of other needed investments of time and resources. As described by one alumnus advisor **“there are too many cooks in the kitchen.”**

The current process lacks transparency, is adversarial, and takes much too long to move through the investigation/adjudication process. In order to achieve many of the objectives laid out in this report and articulated by University administrators for the OGL unit, the current model of organizational misconduct adjudication must change in order to allow for more trust and better relationships between OGL staff and fraternity/sorority members.

In examining OGL goals, current practices at the University, staffing/budgetary limitations, and industry best practices, it is recommended that:

4.1. The Division of Student Affairs adopt a three-pronged approach to addressing organizational misconduct on campus, dividing organizational violations into three tiers, with specific plans associated with alleged violations of each tier. These tiers and the suggested adjudication process are outlined and summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1 – Organizational Conduct Adjudication Process**

Tier Description	Tier 1 – Low-Level Violations/Mid-Level Violations with Proscribed Outcomes	Tier 2 – Mid-Level Violations without Proscribed Outcomes	Tier 3 – High-Level Violations
Violation Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unregistered Social Events/Social Events with Unrecognized Groups</li> <li>• Recruitment Infractions</li> <li>• Minor Alcohol Infractions</li> <li>• Housing Violations</li> <li>• Noise Violations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-Level Alcohol Violations (Common source, distribution to minors, etc.)</li> <li>• Vandalism/Theft</li> <li>• Fighting/Physical Abuse</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hazing</li> <li>• Sexual Misconduct</li> <li>• Sexual Harassment</li> <li>• High Level Alcohol/Drugs (Transports, etc.)</li> </ul>
Adjudication Process	Proscribed Penalty assessed by OGL, appealed to council judicial boards	Partnership Process – Chapter Self-Investigation and Development of Outcomes with OGL	Cases investigated and adjudicated by Student Judicial Affairs or appropriate officials

For Tier 1 incidents, proscribed penalties would be automatically assessed (a menu of these penalties would need to be determined by staff – i.e. an unregistered party is a \$250 fine and loss of a future scheduled event) by OGL upon receiving report related to alleged misconduct, if OGL believes the behavior is more likely than not to have occurred. If organizations chooses to appeal those penalties, the appeal would be made to the appropriate council peer governing/judicial board, removing OGL from the decision-making process for these incidents.

For Tier 2 incidents, organizations would be notified by OGL that a report of a potential violation had been received, and a meeting with organizational leadership scheduled. The organization would then be given the opportunity to conduct its own internal investigation and suggest outcomes related to addressing the incident in question. If OGL and the Office of Student Conduct are both satisfied with the investigation and outcomes, they will be accepted and the case closed. If OGL and/or Student Conduct are not satisfied with either the investigation or report, the case would be forwarded to Student Conduct for further investigation/adjudication.

For Tier 3 incidents, cases would be investigated and adjudicated by the Office of Student Judicial Affairs under the Student Code of Conduct.

The reviewer feels that the implementation of such a model would serve the dual benefit of reducing staff time in investigating/adjudicating organizational misconduct while at the same time building trust and goodwill between undergraduate chapter leaders and OGL staff by removing them from the investigation/adjudication process while allowing them to work in partnership with organizations in resolving their own misconduct issues and building a culture of self-governance.

There is also an articulated need for transparency in the organizational misconduct process. Students and alumni alike expressed frustration for a process that is ill-defined. One alumnus advisor stated **“we have no idea how it (the organizational conduct process) works.”** Another stated that, when trying to get questions answered during a lengthy investigation process, the only answer he received was **“we can’t talk to you right now.”** In continuing to transition the manner in which the institution handles these cases, the University must ensure transparency in the process by having a clearly articulated policy and procedure, points of contact, and clearly delineated roles and responsibilities in the process.

Lastly, the implementation of such a process would be less adversarial than the current system. As noted by one student **“the sanctions we receive seem designed to trip us up,”** noting that organizational sanctions rarely, if ever, resulted in meaningful culture change. **The implementation of the system above reframes the focus away from punitive “sanctions” and towards a collaborative approach with undergraduates, alumni and national organizations on “outcomes” that have student-buy in and are intentionally crafted to change organizational cultures. The shift in philosophy from “sanctions” to “outcomes” is an important one that will result in less animosity, a system that is perceived as less adversarial, and positive changes in culture.**

If this or a similar model is adopted, University Policy 200.020 (Rules of Procedures in Student or Student Organization Conduct Matters) will need to be rewritten. Ideally, University Policy 200.020 would remain in place for individual student conduct cases, and a new policy, reflective of the recommendations in this report, would be developed specifically for organizational misconduct procedures.

## Focus Area Five: Underutilized Partnerships

Generally, OGL benefits from a healthy relationship with and among key internal stakeholders within student affairs and beyond. Relationships between OGL and other divisional departments, the Division of Inclusion and Equity, University Development Division, and Public Safety Services are present, but appear to be lacking truly collaborative efforts positively impacting the student experience.

5.1 Develop programmatic framework involving internal constituents. Once OGL conducts the reviews suggested in Section 2.4 and all of Focus Area Three, it should work with internal stakeholders to develop a programmatic framework to ensure that fraternity/sorority members are receiving necessary education without unnecessary duplication.

5.2 Partner with the University Development Division to develop strategic plan for engaging fraternity/sorority alumni and parents. Multiple institutions do this work very well. In examining benchmark institutions related to fraternity/sorority alumni and parent development, consider the University of Alabama, Clemson University, Miami University of

Ohio, Rochester University, Cornell University, the University of Maryland, and Texas Christian University.

5.3 Develop Stronger Partnerships with Alcohol/Other Drug Prevention and Sexual Violence Prevention Offices. As previous leadership of OGL intentionally disengaged from partnering with key offices on campus, once strong prevention partnerships have been severely damaged. OGL must work closely with campus prevention partners to ensure that appropriate education is being delivered to campus fraternity and sorority members.

- a) Develop framework for alcohol/drug prevention programming – The AOD prevention office currently appears to only be utilized in organizational sanctioning for alcohol-related violations. OGL should work with the AOD office to develop a comprehensive prevention education framework targeting new members, chapter officers, and chapters with alcohol-related policy violations.
- b) Partner with Title IX/Sexual Violence Prevention in Maintenance of Peer Educator Program – Several individuals brought up concerns related to the current structure of a **previously successful men’s** peer education program related to violence prevention. The person previously responsible for that program has moved to another role, and oversight for the program has been assumed by staff in OGL. Concerns have been raised as to whether or not OGL staff has the expertise in violence prevention in order to properly maintain this program. OGL should develop a formal partnership with appropriate **campus entities to ensure this program’s continued success.**

## Focus Area Six: External Stakeholders

MIZZOU has a very unique situation with regards to its external stakeholders, particularly when it comes to fraternity/sorority housing. Having a private developer work independently of the institution to provide fraternity/sorority housing is a model that is unique to Mizzou. Given the **unique nature of the university’s fraternity/sorority housing model**, Mizzou must carefully and thoughtfully consider its approach to external stakeholders.

6.1. Create a Comprehensive Communication Plan designed to engage the various constituencies with clear, direct, frequent and targeted messages and solicitations for input. The absence of information creates a void filled by students sharing their versions, or **selected information with various constituencies. Controlling the “rumor mill” by streamlining** information, engaging in targeted messaging and soliciting feedback about what external stakeholders are hearing are key factors to maximizing relationships with alumni in order to **advance the institution’s mission. For example, when** a fraternity chapter is closed, getting messages out to key stakeholders (chapter advisors, alumni affairs, development, etc.) regarding the issue to get ahead of the rumor mill should be of paramount importance.

6.2 Create Alumni Advisory Council – There is great interest among external alumni stakeholders to have a model of shared governance within the Greek system involving undergraduate councils, university administrators, and fraternity/sorority alumni leadership. The establishment of an Alumni Advisory Council would address this need. This council should be chartered with specific advisory responsibilities related to the governance and direction of the Greek system, and should be charged with working in partnership with both the University and undergraduate chapters to both improve and grow the community, promote the health and

safety of community members, and promote self/peer-governance among the fraternity/sorority community.

6.3 Invest in the recruitment and training of chapter advisors. Mizzou benefits tremendously from having a group of invested alumni members who devote significant time and energy working with undergraduate chapters. OGL should prioritize working with chapters to recruit and train alumni advisors to serve specific roles within undergraduate chapters (i.e. recruitment, new member education, etc.). By investing time and energy into getting alumni involved and trained to serve Mizzou chapters, OGL will be better able to achieve its strategic objectives by aligning alumni advisors in advancing those efforts.

6.4 Investigate Formal Partnership with North American Interfraternity Conference – The NIC has implemented a campus support model that provides fraternity communities with programming, resources and expert guidance in an ongoing fashion. The University, in conjunction with the IFC and fraternity alumni, should investigate and consider the implementation of a formal partnership with the NIC in order to continue providing positive culture change within the community.

## Focus Area Seven: Risk Management

7.1 Revamp Social Audit/Social Event Registration Process. The drinking taking place inside fraternity houses is the single greatest risk management concern. Current policies and practices have created an environment **where only a handful of “registered” social events** at third party vendors take place in a given year, while the majority of chapter social events are unregistered events taking place in residential areas of chapter houses. Steps must be taken to reverse this trend.

Any changes must, from the outset, have buy-in from students and stakeholders (advisors, house corporations, national organizations, etc.) in order to have the desired impact. Building and generating buy in should take place over a series of conversations, with the mutual understanding that the ultimate goal of any proposed changes is promoting student safety.

In order for the Social Audit Process to be truly impactful and well-designed to curb high-risk drinking, the following steps should be taken:

- a) Fraternities Agree to Register all Social Events in Houses – Any changes in the social event management process must be predicated upon agreement by campus fraternities **to bring unofficial social events “above board”** by registering the social events taking place in chapter facilities. In the current model, events are unregistered and, as a result, do not follow established risk management guidelines. Under a new model, fraternities must agree to register events at their houses, and the penalty for failing to register a social event should be so severe as to be a deterrent from failing to register. By bringing these events into the light, further risk management procedures can be implemented to ensure that these events are providing a safe social environment for students.
- b) Fraternities Agree to Ban Hard Alcohol/Common Source from Chapter Premises – Once campus fraternities come to agreement on registering social events that take place in chapter houses, agreement must be reached on banning all hard alcohol (any drinks with an ABV higher than 15 percent) from chapter premises. Again, the penalty for violation of this provision should be sufficient to serve as a deterrent for would-be

violators (both individually and organizationally). Fraternities should agree upon sanctions they will impose internally on individual members who violate this provision, and the IFC/University should develop sanctions for chapters who fail to hold individual members accountable.

- c) Fraternities Agree to Strict Implementation of BYOB Policies – **The current “pooling of funds” to purchase alcohol for these unregistered social events is legally no different** from the purchase of alcohol with funds directly from the chapter treasury. Fraternity chapters must agree to a BYOB policy for chapter social events. This policy should contain strict enforcement of both the type (no hard alcohol) and amount (no more than six, 12 ounce beverages) of alcohol permitted.
- d) Implementation of 3:1 Guest/Member Ratio – Social events held at the chapter facility must adhere to a strict policy of no more than three guests per member, or the maximum number allowed in the facility under fire code, whichever is smaller.
- e) Development and Implementation of Event Security Protocol – In addition to social audits, the University should work with IFC/the fraternity community to identify an outside firm to provide security during registered social events. This firm should be approved by the University, should carry appropriate licensure, insurance and bonding, and should be required to have all staff complete mandatory training on University policy and social **event protocol. Policy related to the firm’s operation should outline expectations of policy enforcement (BYOB, Member/Guest Ratio, No hard alcohol, etc.) as well as expectations of reporting incidents to the University/University Police.** The MOU with the security firm should outline these expectations as well as the University/**IFC’s** avenues of recourse in the event that the firm fails to meet these enforcement/reporting expectations.
- f) Mandated Inspections of Registered Social Events and Spot Checks on Nights with No Social Events – Social audits should happen regularly throughout the night of any registered social events, ensuring that proper procedures are being followed (BYOB, appropriate member/guest ratios, no hard alcohol, etc.). In addition, chapters should be randomly selected for spot-check social audits on evenings with no registered social events to ensure that policies are being followed.
- g) Guest Rooms Opened During Audits/Inspections – The glaring flaw of the current **social audit process involves the fact that residents’ rooms remain closed during audits.** As a result, if a social event is happening, members and guests merely step into rooms and close the doors until the audit is completed. New policies must give social auditors the right to enter into guest rooms during inspections (no differently than when **RA’s/RHD’s enter residence hall rooms for inspections**) or, at minimum, for all guest rooms to be opened, in order to close this significant loophole
- h) Alcohol Restricted to Common Areas During Registered Social Events – Research suggests that by removing alcohol/drinking from guest rooms during registered social events and restricting its use/availability to common areas during social events curbs both binge drinking and sexual assault. If policies are developed allowing social auditors **to enter into residents’ rooms during inspections, the need for students drinking in rooms** should thus be reduced or eliminated. Correspondingly, social event policies should restrict the presence of alcohol from guest rooms during and up to two hours following registered social events. During this time, alcohol should be restricted to common areas only and restricted from residential areas.
- i) Appropriate Limits on Number of Social Events Per Academic Semester – The University should work with the IFC and fraternity leadership to determine an appropriate

limitation on the number of social events that may be held by a chapter during any given academic semester. This limitation should consider social culture, student health/safety, and the **University's** academic calendar.

- j) Enhanced Coordination Between University Police and Local Police Regarding Policing of Fraternity Housing Area –The University should revisit the existing relationship between the UPD and local police to create consistent expectations regarding the policing of off-campus fraternity housing in a manner that will increase police presence both in and around fraternity houses in an effort to promote student safety and accountability to both University policy and federal/state/local laws. If CPD does not wish to engage in this process, UPD should, with help from the General **Counsel's office, determine what** steps can legally and practically be done to comport with these recommendations.

These proposed policies are consistent with the proposed NIC Health and Safety Standards, which should be investigated as a potential option for implementation.

7.2 Invest in Comprehensive Hazing Prevention Program –The University, IFC and other stakeholders should invest in a comprehensive hazing prevention program designed to educate **students, improve the institution's ability to investigate and adjudicate low-level** hazing cases, and provide organizations with the framework to create meaningful rites of passage for new members in ways that do not endanger their health or safety. Specifically, the University and stakeholders should implement the following steps related to hazing prevention:

- a) Establish University Hazing Prevention Task Force – This permanent standing committee should include representatives from all corners of campus involved with student groups commonly associated with hazing nationwide (including OGL, athletics, campus recreation, university bands/performing arts, ROTC and others as determined by the University). This group should be charged with the review and maintenance of all University policies and procedures related to hazing, with developing and implementing consistent educational programming for student groups and advisors/coaches related to hazing prevention, and collecting and analyzing climate data related to the hazing culture on campus.
- b) Establish and Train Hazing Investigation Team – Currently, hazing investigations are conducted by a single official in the Office of Student Conduct. Because of the time limitations inherent with a single investigator approach, current investigation protocols generally involve only a random sample of new members, severely limiting the **University's ability to gather useful information. The University should** identify and train and interdisciplinary hazing investigation team. These individuals will be able to work in teams to conduct timely, thorough investigations involving all organizational new members, utilizing best practices in organizational investigative techniques. Having a team of investigators will also allow for thorough investigations of cases of any nature (regardless of the severity of the allegations), addressing low-level hazing before it escalates into dangerous hazing likely to result in injury or death.
- c) Targeted Training for New Member Educators – OGL should develop and implement semester-long training for fraternity new member educators designed to help them develop new member programmatic outcomes, to align desired outcomes with activities designed to achieve those outcomes, to develop activities designed to facilitate a sense of belonging and the development of informal systems of accountability among new members, and to develop strategies aimed at eliminating hazing within their new member programs.

- d) Include Appropriate Amnesty and Self-Reporting Provisions in Hazing Policy – Currently, the University provides organizations with little incentive to self-regulate and self-govern individual acts of hazing. Hazing in fraternities and sororities is often not sanctioned or endorsed by the organization, but rather are the acts of individuals or groups of individuals operating outside the established parameters of the **organization’s** established new member program. The University should, in its hazing policies, create language around amnesty/self-reporting that would provide chapters with an incentive to self-regulate and work in partnership with the University when these isolated, individual acts of hazing occur. The attached Hazing Model Policy (Attachment A) provides sample language related to this issue.

7.3 Educate House Corporations Regarding Drug Testing Options – The University and stakeholders should educate chapter leaders and house corporation leadership regarding drug testing options. House corporations at a number of other SEC institutions (including Alabama, Auburn, and Ole Miss) have developed and implemented drug testing programs. These programs generally involve both hair and urine sampling and the mandatory testing of all new members, chapter officers, and individuals living in the chapter house, and random testing of other chapter members. These programs have demonstrated decreased drug usage, improved health and safety, and increased academic performance in chapters where they have been implemented.

7.4 Remove Freshmen from Fraternity Houses – As noted above, freshmen living in fraternity chapter houses presents multiple challenges, including risk management, health and safety (including hazing) issues, as well as a scenario in which most chapters are run by **sophomores with upperclassmen generally “checking out” of the fraternity experience.** Adequate data from multiple studies demonstrates that freshmen are most successful when they live in on-campus residence halls. Subsequently, the University should phase out the presence of freshmen in chapter houses. The ideal model would have freshmen living in on-campus residence halls, and sophomores and juniors living in chapter houses with the chapters being run by a mixture of sophomores/juniors and juniors/seniors. This transition could be phased in over a period of two years (i.e. in year one of implementation each chapter could only have a certain number of freshmen in chapter facility with full implementation in year two) or all at once, which would require a group of students to live in the facility for two years (freshman and sophomore year). A committee of administrators, house corporation leaders and undergraduates should be convened to determine the specific plan of action, but the removal of freshmen from chapter houses should be a top priority for the University.

7.5 Revamp Fraternity Recruitment Process – Once freshmen no longer live in fraternity houses, the need for chapters to offer bids to students before they are matriculated to the University becomes diminished. As was noted by both undergraduates and alumni, the fraternity recruitment process is inherently social in nature, wherein prospective members attend social events and parties during a formal process during the summer and a loosely controlled process **at the beginning of the Fall semester. As the rush to “fill beds” in houses dictates the recruitment** process, chapters are under immense pressure to conform to campus norms in order to recruit those students at the beginning of the semester who know they want to be in fraternities. This results in students looking for the stereotypical fraternity experience joining for those reasons. The current system should be replaced with one in which students are recruited once they are matriculated at the institution, in an extended time period that does not require chapters to **chase after these “always joiners.”** By extending the recruitment period as an informal process



extending into the semester, chapters who seek to provide a recruitment experience different from the stereotypical norm will have the freedom and flexibility to do so, allowing them to identify and recruit students who may not be interested in fraternities because of the social stereotypes, but who may be attracted to a more values-driven experience.

Correspondingly, the University should work with the IFC to develop implement an alcohol-free recruitment period at the beginning of the semester in which chapters recruit potential students in an alcohol-free environment. By changing these cultural norms related to how new members are recruited into campus fraternities, the University can fundamentally alter the culture of the fraternity community away from one that is driven primarily by social culture to one that is more aligned with the espoused organizational values of the chapters making up the community.

7.6 Eliminate Syllabus Week –The University should establish a committee of faculty, staff and students to investigate and recommend changes related to Syllabus Week in order to provide a safer transition to college for new fraternity/sorority members.

7.7 Work in Partnership with Alumni and **HQ's of Underground Groups to Establish Plan for Recognition** – Allowing underground fraternity chapters to continue to operate without University recognition establishes a dangerous precedent for the campus. As noted earlier, two fraternities currently operate on campus with the full blessing of their national headquarters, but without University recognition. These groups openly participate in many aspects of campus life, and continue to socialize with campus sororities. Steps must be taken to bring these groups back into recognized status. The University should work with local alumni and the national organization to develop an MOU for each group, laying out specific benchmarks that these groups should attain in order to regain University/IFC recognition (i.e. participation in training opportunities sponsored by both University and National Organization, GPA requirements, risk-management benchmarks, etc.). The MOU should lay out steps the University will take in the event that these organizations do not comply with these directives and continue operating **underground (i.e. letters to parents, notification to sorority HQ's when sororities are known to have participated in events with unrecognized groups, inability for organization members to participate in intramural sports, etc.)**. The approach to ensuring compliance and bringing these **groups back into the fold would best be described as a “carrot and stick” approach, with incentives for these organizations to comply with University directives in order to achieve recognition, and harsh penalties if they fail to engage with the University in regaining recognition.**

7.8 Invest in Sexual Harassment/Misconduct Education Programming – Coordinate with the Title IX office and other appropriate campus partners to develop mandatory Sexual Harassment/Misconduct prevention education that is specifically directed to the experiences of members of the fraternity/sorority community. This mandate would be similar in nature to the recent mandates from the NCAA for athlete-specific prevention programming.

## Focus Area Eight: Cultural Competency | Diversity & Inclusion

**Mizzou's culturally based fraternal organizations (CBFO's), while active, have historically struggled at the institution, lacking a critical mass of potential members and struggling with a perception of not being fully supported by the institution.**

The OGL staff shifted the advising model in recent years to ensure each council benefits from directed advising. While these students feel supported by OGL and are appreciative that they

have advisors attend their council meetings, they do not feel connected to the broader F/S community, do not feel that they are given adequate resources, and feel that institutional policies adversely impact them.

8.1. Consistently evaluate the unique needs of its CBFOs. When planning for meetings and programs, the first question should always be to determine to whom the information applies. If the information does not apply to the CBFOs, then they should not be required to attend the meeting where the matter is discussed. When enacting new policies and procedures, a culturally competent lens should be used to determine if the matter disproportionately impacts the CBFOs. When engaging in fraternity & sorority community-wide programming, speakers should be briefed to ensure they are using inclusive examples, or unique programming should be sponsored.

8.2. Advocate for additional financial programming dollars for the CBFO communities. Given the significant investment of time in the Panhellenic and IFC communities over the last 30 years, and given the sheer volume of students in those groups, there are structures and budgets in place to support the programming needs of those communities at the council level. Not only is the size of the CBFO communities an inhibiting factor, but the infrastructure of the councils who support the community are not nearly as well developed. The CBFO communities offer tremendous support to a vast array of students of color on campus, but feel that there are no resources available to them through the institution to provide for the development and education of their organizations/members. The retention and matriculation rates are higher for affiliated students than those who are unaffiliated students of color. With Mizzou's overall desire to increase diversity and inclusion on campus, there may be funds available through the foundation or other grants to help offset any budgetary impact.

8.3. Fortify relationships with graduate/alumni chapters and respective advisors. Recognizing the familial, tight knit relationships that exist within CBFO culture, a key stake in building the necessary trust to effectively work with the CBFO community. While strides have been made, additional work in this area should occur.

8.4. Establish a reasonable outcome for diversity & inclusion programming efforts. OGL staff articulated a desire to foster a diverse and inclusive community; however, it does not seem that there is a clear vision for what that means, or looks like at Mizzou. CBFO members report feeling disconnected from the IFC/Panhellenic communities. Fostering an inclusive fraternal community requires time and energy. Student leaders articulated a feeling that the Mizzou fraternities and sororities function **more as a "system" versus a "community"**, as there are limited cross-council relationships in place outside of those between IFC and Panhellenic. **Hosting an "all-Greek" social does not foster a sense of inclusion;** but, student leaders articulated a desire to strengthen this aspect of their community. The students specifically indicated that there was limited knowledge amongst IFC and Panhellenic chapters about the CBFOs on campus; and, they further indicated their desire that OGL **"bridge the gap" between their councils and the IFC/Panhellenic groups.**

8.5. Provide recruitment and growth guidance for their CBFO communities. MGC and NPHC membership numbers are not as strong as those of campus communities of similar composition. In discussion, it appears that some groups do not understand how to recruit. Additionally, the historical lack of understanding and support of CBFOs by OGL creates a mistrust for guidance in this area. Growth is a sensitive topic for CBFOs as there is a pride in selectivity and quality over quantity. However, this can also be an excuse to not engage in strategic recruitment.

## Final Thoughts

The University of Missouri has a fraternity/sorority community that could best be described as underachieving. Most students have a positive outlook on what the fraternity/sorority experience should and could be. There are invested alumni and other external stakeholders committed to **the community's success. There are internal stakeholders who stand willing and ready to assist** in both education and outreach efforts. The culture surrounding fraternity/sorority life on campus is largely positive. A key missing component is consistent leadership from OGL capable of getting all of the various constituencies moving in the same direction. OGL must improve its communication, its training and development programs, and work with intentionality and a spirit of partnership if the institution wants to see the fraternity/sorority community realize its full potential. With the changes noted in this report, there is no reason to believe that the Mizzou fraternity/sorority community could not be one that is widely recognized for its success and accomplishments at impacting student learning and institutional culture in positive and meaningful ways.

It is also recommended that the University engage external parties to both facilitate and monitor progress related to the recommendations outlined in this report. This monitoring should include both assessment of the impact of these changes, as well as facilitation of recommendations with stakeholders. In addition, the University faces a challenge with staffing and supervision of the OGL unit. Current staff is bright and energetic, but young and relatively inexperienced. The current supervisory structure does not include individuals with a strong background in fraternity/sorority life. Any external party engaged with the University in an ongoing basis should be selected in order to provide ongoing coaching and development for OGL staff in ensuring the success of these and other departmental initiatives until a permanent staffing plan is in place.