

Student Life Committee Minutes
March 4, 1998

Present: Anton, Balaam, Mace, Kay, Washburn, Fitzhugh, Mileti and Piccardo

Guests: Baldwin, Hoppe, Cladis and Zorich

Minutes for the meeting of 18 February 1998 were amended slightly and approved as amended.

Mace (scribe for a day) asked Anton to take over as Chair for this meeting.

Cladis and Zorich gave an overview of how judicial issues are handled by IFC and PHC. The voting members of the IFC Judicial panel are the presidents of each house. They meet approximately weekly to consider violations, some of which are forwarded by Hoppe or Baldwin and other of which arise from the IFC weekend risk management patrols. Most of the violations involve noise or liquor and most of the sanctions meted out involve community service or the drying/canceling of functions. The PHC Judicial panel does not meet regularly; if periodicity is to be assigned, "annually" would be most accurate. The paucity of meetings can be attributed to the fact that "things just don't happen" since sororities do not put on functions.

Cladis commented that IFC was working on a policy of judicial policies and wondered if sororities should be held responsible if they were listed as cosponsors of a function. It was noted that co-sponsoring of events is unique to UPS and that fraternities and sororities should attempt to get the issue of responsibility clear. Kay commented that for most functions sororities were not co-sponsors, but rather simply listed as guests. Kay noted that a listing of a sorority as a co-sponsor was a "red flag" to her.

Balaam asked Cladis to comment on the opening paragraph of the Accountability of Chapters and Individual Members document discussed in the last meeting. It was decided to change the references to "chapter's leaders" to "chapter's executives" to spare such "leaders" as the chapter historian from liability. Balaam asked further if Cladis thought the document could be implemented. Cladis responded that there were problems with some aspects of the document, such as #2; Cladis wondered how many members had to be involved in order for an alleged violation to have taken place on a premises occupied by chapter members. Further, in the sanctions section IFC opposes #2 and #3; #2 is opposed because IFC already handles situations by restricting the rush period for sanctioned chapters; #3 is deemed to be too vague; is the intent to restrict community philanthropy as a sanction?

Washburn commented on the first sentence of the sanctions section, pointing out that all the sanctions except #6 seemed to be punitive, yet the section started by stating that the sanctions were supposed to be educational.

Anton asked if there was an appeal process for an imposed sanction. Cladis responded in the affirmative and outlined the procedure.

Mace queried Cladis as to the need for such a document in light of the fact that IFC was working to establish its own document covering adjudication and sanctions. Cladis commented that IFC considered alcohol, noise and "dirty rush" problems (all house/chapter offenses) and rarely considered alleged offenses by individuals. The purpose of the Accountability document was discussed briefly.

It was suggested and generally agreed that the sanctions section would be deleted, the first section would be kept with modification to the opening paragraph and the title would be changed to "Guidelines for Determining the Accountability of Chapters and /or Individuals Chapter Members ..."

Discussion then moved to the "Expectation" documents. Cladis questioned points #5 and #10 in each document. For #5, Cladis wondered if "time served" during an investigation could count toward a sanction; Kay indicated that it generally does. #10 was viewed as being too general if left without some examples or guidelines. It was agreed that specifics for #10 would be generated by Baldwin and Hoppe.

With the time approaching 3:00 p.m. PST, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Mace.