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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan and the implications for student affairs. This study was conducted by analyzing three distinct eras (two eras of politicization and one era of quiescence). Each era featured conflict between fraternal organizations and institutional actors (faculty, staff), and was analyzed to determine what, if any, implications there were for student affairs at the University of Michigan. The conceptual framework applied concepts from areas pertaining to conflict and organizational theory. Additionally, these concepts were informed by research about political organizations. The research method used was a case study method. The conflicts analyzed in this study were examined through an historical context in which they occurred. Data was collected through document and record analysis, collectively referred to as artifacts. Examples of records included items such as rosters, grade files, and meeting minutes. Additional evidence reviewed were letters, newspaper articles, case studies, and photographs. The relationship between fraternal organizations and student affairs provided multiple implications for educational leaders. The first is the importance of understanding the historical nature of conflict, how it evolves, and the cyclical nature of conflict. Through this understanding, student affairs professionals are conflict managers. The second implication is the significant role of student affairs professionals in managing conflict. Regardless of the job title of a student affairs professional, this study demonstrated that all student affairs professionals are conflict managers. Finally, this study explained how educational leaders can use conflict to expand the role of student affairs and its various sub-units. Periods of conflict may create conditions where educational leaders can request additional staff and resources to better manage conflict.
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Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

The debate about fraternities and sororities “doing it right” or “doing it wrong” has been a focus of scholarly and popular articles and books (Lavelle, 2015; Mitchell, 2014; Moltz, 2009; New, 2014; Schwarz, 2016; Syrett N., 2009) as well as research studies exploring behaviors and potential benefits or detractions related to membership (Harris III & Harper, 2014; Hevel, Martin, Weeden, & Pascarella, 2015; Ray, 2012). These artifacts often request changes to be made such as helping fraternity men understand privilege and bystander behavior (Harris III & Harper, 2014) or aligning fraternities and sororities with their founding values and missions (Hevel, Martin, Weeden, & Pascarella, 2015).

High-profile incidents such as the death of Timothy Piazza at Pennsylvania State University due to alcohol consumption and hazing (Stolberg, 2017) or a ski trip incident at the University of Michigan (Cappetta, Dunn, & Effron, 2015) created additional requests for change among fraternity and sorority communities. Yet these incidents are not new. In 1929, 10 sorority women were expelled from their school for paddling new members (“School Suspends Ten Girls,” 1929). In 1959, a student at the University of Southern California died in a hazing incident (Associated Press, 1959). In 1990, a student at Clemson University died after drinking too much at a fraternity event (“Campus Life,” 1990). Each of these major incidents garnered a response by the respective institution, ranging from expelling individual students to removing the problem organization to implementing systemic changes within the fraternity and sorority community.

Following the suspension of fraternal organizations at Pennsylvania State University after the death of Timothy Piazza, multiple other campuses imposed community wide bans due to issues related to alcohol, student deaths, hazing, and sexual misconduct (Singh, 2017; Bauer-
Wolf, 2017; Harwood, 2018). Since their founding, incidents related to fraternities and sororities have continued to create change in their communities. Although institutions and stakeholders often respond strongly to these incidents, fraternities and sororities continue to create trouble. This is problematic, as it causes institutions to have to respond to incidents, often by attempting to change fraternities and sororities, but also by changing or creating policies and structures to address fraternities and sororities.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan and the implications for student affairs units.

**Research Questions**

Through the iterative process of conducting this qualitative study, three research questions emerged:

1. Describe three eras of politicization/quiescence.
2. Describe conflict in each era of politicization/quiescence.
3. Describe the implications for student affairs from each era of politicization/quiescence.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework applied concepts from areas pertaining to conflict (Schattschneider, 1975; Edelman, 1985b; Iannaccone, 1982) and organizational theory (Scott, 2003; Thompson, 2003; Parsons, 1960). Additionally, these concepts were informed by research about political organizations (Birnbaum, 1988; Bolman & Deal, 2017).
Methodology

Given the purpose of this study, it was designed using a constructivist paradigm. This paradigm explores a phenomenon in depth, views findings as interpretive and context dependent, and tends to focus on an individual or small set of participants rather than a larger group where results can be generalized. This study both explored and described the phenomenon to try to understand political conflict on a college campus.

The research method used was a case study method. This approach focused on a single case to be studied and asked the question, “What can be learned from the single case?” (Stake, 1994, p. 236). The conflicts analyzed in this study were examined through an historical context in which they occurred. Bricknell (2011) explained that this type of approach, referred to as historical analysis, “a method of the examination of evidence in coming to an understanding of the past” (p. 108).

Data was collected through document and record analysis, collectively referred to as artifacts. Examples of records included items such as rosters, grade files, and meeting minutes. Additional evidence reviewed were letters, newspaper articles, case studies, and photographs.

Upon reviewing the history of fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan as well as completing a literature search of national fraternity incidents from the New York Times, three conflicts and their corresponding eras of politicization or quiescence were selected to be analyzed. These three eras were chosen due to their significance for the fraternity and sorority community at the University of Michigan, their placement in time relative to the national fraternity and sorority movement, and for the richness of data available to be analyzed. The three eras represented the founding of fraternities at the University of Michigan, changing views of discriminatory membership practices, and a contemporary incident.
Data and artifacts were reviewed to ensure their usefulness. This was completed by determining the genealogy/originality of the artifacts or information, the genesis of the artifacts or information, and the authority of the creators of the artifacts or information (Humphrey, 2010). After the artifacts and data were analyzed, evidence was compiled, disassembled, and reassembled before it was interpreted and conclusions were drawn (Yin, 2016).

Summary

Since 1776, fraternities and sororities have been part of college campuses. In recent years, however, the behaviors of fraternal organizations have called their purpose into question. An examination of the history of fraternities and sororities indicated that much of this behavior, as well as the resulting calls for change, are not new. For a long time, fraternities and sororities have created incidents for colleges and universities.

As a result of these incidents, institutions have created new policies and structures to mitigate and prevent future conflict. This study attempted to determine the implications for student affairs from incidents related to fraternal organizations by studying the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan through three eras of conflict. The analysis of these eras was accomplished by applying concepts like organizational theory, conflict and privatization/socialization, and political organizations, within the context of history.

This introduction chapter provided background information pertaining to fraternities and sororities; provided statements of the purpose of the study and the problem it is addressing; listed the research questions for this study, conceptual framework, research design and tradition; and how data was gathered and analyzed. The chapters following provide the history of fraternities and sororities on a national level and specifically at the University of Michigan (Chapter 2); provide more detailed information about the methodology used for this study (Chapter 3);
describe three conflicts and their corresponding eras of politicization or quiescence that are analyzed for this study (Chapter 4); provide an analysis of each of the eras (Chapter 5); and explain the conclusions, implications for educational leaders, and future research (Chapter 6).
Chapter 2: History of Fraternities and Sororities

“If you don’t know history, then you don’t know anything. You are a leaf that doesn’t know it is part of a tree” (Crichton, n.d.). This quote, attributed to Michael Crichton, captures the essence of why understanding history is so important. Without an understanding of the history surrounding an event, it is impossible to know how it fits into the larger picture of time. This chapter explores, in brief, the history of fraternities and sororities on a national level, and then the history of fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan specifically to provide the “tree” to the “leaves” (individual conflicts) described in Chapter 4.

History of Fraternities and Sororities Nationally

Fraternities and sororities on college campuses can trace their founding as far back as 1776. These organizations were greatly influenced by secret societies and both student and military revolts of the time, as well as the colonial beginnings of colleges and universities in North America (Horowitz, 1987). The colonial period of higher education lasted from the early 1500’s until about 1780. During this period of time, students’ lives were largely controlled by the faculty of their institution (Thelin, 2011). Students were often forbidden from activities that did not serve an academic purpose sanctioned by the institution. Although some student organizations did begin to form in secret during this time, most were discovered and disbanded or were incorporated into the structure of the institution (Thelin, 2011). Some, like Phi Beta Kappa, did begin to take hold at the very end of the colonial period, but on the whole, student life outside the classroom was unremarkable (Thelin, 2011; Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

Thelin (2011) discusses how students began to create their own campus life in response to the day-to-day grind of the academic and social expectations put on them by their institutions. A cycle of a student life activity is described as starting, gaining popularity, gaining notice by
faculty, being stopped, and then going away for a time until it would resurface again (Thelin, 2011). Eventually, institutions would realize that the activities were going to take place whether they were sanctioned or not, so they would be assimilated into the college or university.

In 1776, Phi Beta Kappa began building its organization and soon started to gain members and then expanded to multiple campuses. It seems that one reason the organization did not receive the scrutiny of other student activities during this time was due to the secrecy of the organization. This secrecy allowed the organization to expand its membership and discuss whatever topics its members wanted without drawing unwanted attention from faculty (Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2017b).

Phi Beta Kappa would set the stage for fraternities and sororities in the United States. Although it was an organization focused on academics, Phi Beta Kappa would serve as the inspiration for other fraternal organizations that would focus more on the social aspects of college (Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2018). From these fraternities, women’s fraternities (later dubbed as sororities) and identity-based fraternities and sororities would be founded. In the 242 years since Phi Beta Kappa was established, many new fraternities and sororities have been founded, and today there are nearly 4.5 million active or alumni members of fraternities affiliated with the North-American Interfraternity Conference (North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2017) with many, many more active and alumni members in sororities and other collegiate fraternal organizations (National Panhellenic Conference, 2018).

**Beginning of fraternities on college campuses (1650-1907).**

*Phi Beta Kappa.* Higher education in the United States started in colonial times with the chartering of Harvard College in 1650 (Dudley, 1650). Early colonial colleges and universities were established to emulate institutions found in Great Britain like Oxford and Cambridge but
found quickly that, while there could be similarities, American institutions would have a uniqueness all their own. One characteristic of early colleges was that faculty members were responsible for the daily lives of their students as well as their instruction (Thelin, 2011; Torbenson & Parks, 2009). The control exerted over students’ lives left very little room for free expression or the ability to read and discuss what they would like within the institution. Student organizations, like literary societies and debating clubs, often organized to fill the social gaps that students wanted (Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

Phi Beta Kappa was one of these literary societies that allowed students some freedom. It was similar to other literary societies in the sense that men came together to read and debate literature, discuss current events, and write and orate essays. Where Phi Beta Kappa differed from these other organizations, however, was that the organization also served as a social vehicle for its members and operated using the strictest secrecy (Torbenson & Parks, 2009).

In 1776, the year Phi Beta Kappa was founded, there were two secret student societies on the campus of William and Mary College called the “Flat Hat Club” and “PDC” (Lombardi, 2012). The founders of Phi Beta Kappa decided to form their organization in response to these other two organizations. Both the Flat Hat Club and PDC were organized as ultra-secret, exclusive clubs that had no purpose other than to exist as secret societies and provide a place to host “boisterous, drunken parties” (Lombardi, 2012). There were also student organizations at Harvard and Yale, but membership in these organizations was large and nonexclusive (Lombardi, 2012).

On December 5, 1776, five men at William and Mary College in Virginia gathered and established their student organization (Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2018). These men—John Heath, Thomas Smith, Richard Booker, Armistead Smith, and John Jones—designed a medal engraved
on one side with the Greek letters phi, beta, and kappa (Torbenson & Parks, 2009), making The Phi Beta Kappa Society the first collegiate Greek-lettered fraternal organization founded in North America.

The minutes from their first meeting on December 5, 1776, laid out the tone and feel of the new organization:

On Thursday, the 5th of December, in the year of our Lord God one thousand seven hundred and seventy-six, and the first of the Commonwealth, a happy spirit and resolution of attaining the important ends of society entering the minds of John Heath, Thomas Smith, Richard Booker, Armistead Smith, and John Jones, and afterwards seconded by others, prevailed and was accordingly ratified.

And for the better establishment and sanctitude of our unanimity a square silver medal was agreed on and was instituted, engraved on the one side with S.P. (the initials of the Latin, Societas Philosophiae, or Philosophical Society) and on the other agreeable to the former with the Greek initials of ΦβΚ (Φιλοσοφία βι’ου Κυβερνητης, philosophy, or love of wisdom, the guide to life) an index imparting a philosophical design, extended to three stars, a part of the planetary orb distinguished. (Original meeting minutes, taken from Lombardi, 2012)

The Greek letters chosen by the founders showed its commitment to the principle of philosophy as a guide to life and an academic purpose not found in other secret societies. Secrecy was also applied in the original minutes. On the original document, the Greek and Latin mottos were either rubbed out or inked over to preserve the secrecy of their meanings. It was not until 1831
and 1906 that the Greek and Latin motto’s (respectively) meanings were discovered and established (Lombardi, 2012).

Fraternity minutes from January 5, 1777, show the newly founded fraternity had established values, would operate as a secret society, and believed in a higher power:

I, A.B., do swear on the holy Evangelists of Almighty God, or otherwise, as calling the Supreme Being to attest this my oath, declaring that I will, with all my possible efforts, endeavor to prove true, just, and deeply attached to this our growing fraternity; in keeping, holding, and preserving all secrets that pertain to my duty, and for the promotion and advancement of its internal welfare.

(Voorhees & Phi Beta Kappa, 1919)

In these first meetings of Phi Beta Kappa, the founders of the fraternity established the norms, values, and regulations that would eventually become the modern fraternity system in the United States (Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2018).

As time went on, the fraternity continued to grow and adopt new language to maintain the integrity and seriousness of the organization. The fraternity developed a system for members to read and debate literature and a fine system for those who did not adhere to the requirements of membership (Voorhees & Phi Beta Kappa, 1919). In 1779, the organization adopted new language into their bylaws creating a mechanism by which the fraternity could expand:

It being suggested that it might tend to promote the designs of this Institution, and redound to the honor and advantage thereof at the same time, that others more remoter or distant will be attached thereto, Resolved, that leave be given to prepare the form or Ordinance of a Charter party. . . with delegated power in the
plan and principles therein laid down, to constitute establish and initiate a 
fraternity correspondent to this. (Meeting minutes from May 1779, taken from
Lombardi, 2012)

The establishment of the charter party is perhaps one of the greatest contributions Phi
Beta Kappa has made to the modern fraternity system. The only previous model of
organizational expansion like this was from the Free Masons, who only expanded within
the state of Virginia at the time (Torbenson & Parks, 2009). Although Phi Beta Kappa
meant to expand within Virginia as well, very likely imitating what they saw in the Free
Masons, they soon expanded to Harvard and Yale with the help of a 1779 initiate Elisha
Parmele. By the fall of 1781, Phi Beta Kappa had fully expanded to Harvard and Yale,
sure the fraternity’s survival despite the closing of William and Mary College for the
1781 school year and the subsequent closing of the founding chapter for many years to
follow (Lombardi, 2012).

The new chapters of Phi Beta Kappa dropped the requirements for secrecy in the
organization in 1831 following backlash against secret organizations, particularly aimed at the
Free Masons (Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2018). Next to the policy allowing for expansion, the act
of removing the secrecy surrounding the organization was probably what allowed Phi Beta
Kappa to survive and grow. Allowing for transparency in the organization diminished criticism
against the fraternity from those outside higher education, faculty members, and other social
fraternities beginning to form at the time. Removing the secrecy from the organization
effectively removed any “threat” the organization posed (Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2018). From
there, the fraternity has grown and continued to expand to 286 chapters nationwide (Phi Beta
Kappa Society, 2018). Phi Beta Kappa continues to operate on 10% of U.S. colleges and
universities. Chapters invite 10% of arts and sciences graduates based on their grade point average to join the organization that, has from its very founding, lived the values embedded in its Greek letters, “Love of learning is the guide of life” (Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2017b).

Phi Beta Kappa started the fraternal movement in the United States in 1776 by laying the groundwork for organizations to come. Although Phi Beta Kappa is viewed as the first fraternity in the United States, the Kappa Alpha Society is largely acknowledged as the first modern social fraternity (Sigma Chi Fraternity, 2017).

**Kappa Alpha Society and the Union Triad.** Established in 1825 at Union College in Schenectady, New York, the Kappa Alpha Society became the first Greek letter fraternity formed around fellowship, friendship, and brotherhood instead of purely intellectual pursuits. Henry W. Porter, member of the Kappa Alpha Society, said about the fraternity in 1842, “Ours is the office to promote good fellowship and rational enjoyment: to be guided in all things by the hand of virtue and to reprove and discourage all manner of evil… If we would be respected, we must so act that we may be able to respect ourselves” (as cited in Tarleton, 1993). This vision of fraternity was different from Phi Beta Kappa, where Rev. E. B. Parsons, D. D., wrote in the *Phi Beta Kappa Hand-Book and General Address Catalogue*, “The advent of other Greek letter fraternities met the social needs or supposed needs of underclass men and left Phi Beta Kappa to give sole concern to scholarly affairs” (E. B. Parsons, 1900). The founding of the Kappa Alpha Society marked the beginning of the divergence between social fraternities and academic fraternities and literary societies.

Soon after the Kappa Alpha Society was founded in 1825, the Sigma Phi Society and Delta Phi Fraternity (in that order) were established in 1827. Each of these organizations formed in a similar fashion to the Kappa Alpha Society with elements taken from Phi Beta Kappa but
having a strong focus on brotherhood and friendship. Each of these three organizations still operate active chapters today (Sigma Chi Fraternity, 2017).

Taken together, the three fraternities were known as the “Union Triad” (Kappa Sigma Fraternity, 1901). These organizations initially faced resistance from faculty but were able to convince them of the positive aspects of the organizations and were allowed to remain on campus. After successfully arguing for their place at the college, the Sigma Phi Society expanded in 1831 to Hamilton College, and then in 1832 the Alpha Delta Phi Fraternity was founded at the same institution following a failed expansion effort by the Kappa Alpha Society. This began a period of growth as existing fraternities expanded to new campuses, and new fraternities formed where students did not find that an existing organization fit their needs (Sigma Chi Fraternity, 2017).

**Expansion during the antebellum period.** This period, known as the antebellum period, was marked by rapid expansion and growth in higher education (Naylor, 1973) with many institutions looking to a more local, practical educational curriculum than those of the colonial colleges and universities (Church & Sedlak, 1997). Historians have often described this period of time as overlooked and underappreciated, but many agree that these new institutions were not the same as their colonial counterparts (Axtell, 1971; Church & Sedlak, 1997; Naylor, 1973; Potts, 1977; Potts, 1971). Many colleges and universities founded during the antebellum period only existed on paper after receiving a charter or survived for only a short period of time (Potts, 1971). The antebellum period also offered a chance for fraternities to grow, expand, and get situated on college campuses. The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 further created room for fraternities to expand to new colleges and universities immediately following the Civil War (Thelin, 2011).
During this period, there was excitement and enthusiasm for new colleges and universities but not everyone welcomed the new way of teaching and learning that they instituted. Colonial institutions like Yale and Harvard fought these new schools and their departure from a pure, liberal arts education (Yale Faculty Committee, 1828). Additionally, much of the expansion of higher education during this time occurred to the west and south, away from the “elite” institutions of the Northeast. As these colleges and universities expanded, so too did fraternities and sororities (Syrett, 2009).

The antebellum period featured a second important triad. The “Miami Triad,” composed of Beta Theta Pi, Phi Delta Theta, and Sigma Chi (founded in 1839, 1848, and 1855, respectively) (Cliff Alexander Office of Fraternity & Sorority Life, Miami University, 2018), marked the beginning of westward expansion for fraternities. At the time, Miami University in Ohio was considered to be on the western frontier. Of particular importance was the fact that Beta Theta Pi became the first fraternity founded west of the Alleghenies Mountains (Beta Theta Pi, 2018). Each of these organizations continued to expand in the west and then to the south (San Jose State University, 2017). Unlike the Union Triad, which limited expansion to a select number of schools (Sigma Chi Fraternity, 2017), the Miami Triad fraternities expanded to a large number of colleges and universities and are some of the largest fraternities in the country today (San Jose State University, 2017).

From colonial beginnings through the Civil War, fraternities took hold on college campuses. These organizations were able to fill a social void on college campuses and provide men with opportunities to explore life outside the classroom. This allowed fraternities to take hold on college campuses, while the great expansion of institutions across the country allowed for them to spread, even if those institutions did not intend for fraternities to be on campus.
(Rudolph, 1990). Following the antebellum period and as the Civil War came to a close, fraternities again began to grow in numbers and the idea of a fraternal experience would expand to include more than just white men.

**America goes to college… and joins a fraternity (or sorority; 1870-1929).** The number of students going to college and the spread of fraternities would slow during the Civil War (1861-1865) but immediately following the American Civil War began a period of time when America began to go to college in earnest (Thelin, 2011; Lucas, 2006). Numbers of students increased, and colleges welcomed more women and students of color (mostly men; Anderson, 1997; Wagoner, 1997). This increase in diversity enabled African American and Jewish fraternities and sororities to establish (Alpha Epsilon Phi, 2017; Edwards, 2011; Ross, 2000; Worthen, 2011; Zeta Beta Tau, 2017b). This period of time, from 1870-1929, was one of growth and change. Fraternities began to organize across national organizations, women’s fraternities came into existence (later to be known as a sorority), and culturally based fraternities and sororities were established.

**Fraternities and fraternity men in the postbellum years.** Following the Civil War, a third triad of note formed. The “Lexington Triad” consisted of Alpha Tau Omega (1865), Kappa Sigma (1869), and Sigma Nu (1869). Each of these organizations was founded at the Virginia Military Institute in Lexington (Kappa Sigma Fraternity, 1901). Like the Miami Triad, these fraternities marked an expansion into a new territory, the South. This triad came to be during a time when institutions in the South were attempting to rebuild following devastation to many campuses throughout the war (Lucas, 2006). These fraternities grew and expanded to become the large, national organizations they are today.
As fraternities spread to more campuses and membership grew, the various organizations came together, following the lead of their sorority counterparts, and formed the Inter-Fraternity Council (IFC) in 1907, which would later become the North-American Interfraternity Conference (NIC). The IFC was formed to encourage fraternalism among fraternities and to establish better relationships with host institutions (San Jose State University, 2017). Today the NIC exists to educate undergraduate fraternity members, advocate for the rights of its member organizations, and to establish relationships with host institutions (North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2018).

While fraternities were growing in stature and membership was growing, many administrators and students saw them as polarizing. In the years following the Civil War, fraternity men established themselves as the social elite on their campuses and engaged in behaviors such as drinking, smoking, and general debauchery that set them apart from the rest of the student body (Thelin, 2011; Syrett, 2009). As these extracurricular activities became more popular, administrators increasingly saw fraternities as needing increased supervision and coordination. It was thought that, with proper direction, organizations like fraternities could provide positive experiences for students. From this, the student personnel movement began (Lucas, 2006). Deans of Men and Women (sometimes Deans of Students) were hired along with many additional administrators to help monitor the life of students outside the classroom. This extended to student organizations, housing, financial aid, and more. This also allowed faculty members to focus on the academic life of students and less on their social activities (Lucas, 2006).

The growth and influence of fraternities established practices of exclusivity, secrecy, and polarization (Horowitz, 1987; Syrett, 2009; Thelin, 2011). Fraternities were not only denying
membership to those students who did not fit their image (e.g., wealthy, socially adept), they were also denying membership to those who held different identities (Syrett, 2009). This would lead these “outsiders” to create their own versions of fraternal organizations (Horowitz, 1987).

**Women’s fraternities and sororities.** While fraternities, exclusive to certain men, were spreading across the country, women’s fraternities and sororities also began to take hold on campuses. Sororities were generally founded at coeducational institutions and not women’s colleges (Torbenson, 2009). Some women tried to join men’s fraternities but were denied membership or offered partial membership (Torbenson, 2009). In response, women’s fraternities and sororities were created by women as a way to organize on campus and create a student experience for women (Thelin, 2011; Torbenson, 2009). They modelled their organizations on existing men’s fraternities and began to grow and expand across the country (Montrose, 1956).

The first women’s fraternities were established in the 1851 and 1852 at Wesleyan in Georgia. These organizations would become known as Alpha Delta Pi and Phi Mu (both still operating today; Torbenson, 2009). Pi Beta Phi would become the first national women’s fraternity in 1869 with the establishment of its second chapter. The first organization to use the term sorority was Gamma Phi Beta (established in 1874 at Syracuse University) when a Latin professor suggested the use of the term “sorority” (Torbenson, 2009). This became, and remains, the popular way to distinguish between female and male fraternities (Torbenson, 2009).

Even though sororities were modeled on fraternities, one significant difference was that sororities were able to set aside their competitive differences and organize on a national scale (National Panhellenic Conference, 2017b). Sorority women understood that their organizations were a direct threat to the male dominated culture of higher education, so seven national sororities banded together in 1891 (National Panhellenic Conference, 2017a) to organize in
“cooperating with colleges and universities and to foster interfraternal relationships” (National Panhellenic Conference, 2017b). Meetings continued sporadically until 1902 when they formally organized into the Inter-Sorority Conference (changed to the National Panhellenic Conference in 1908). This conference focused on issues such as recruitment, behavior, and relationships between national organization and institutions as well as between sororities. Additionally, they established the tradition of creating a Panhellenic association anywhere there were two or more national women’s fraternities or sororities (National Panhellenic Conference, 2017a). These same issues continue to be discussed today along with other timely and relevant topics (National Panhellenic Conference, 2017b).

**Cultural- and identity-based organizations.** For much of the early history of colleges and universities, admission was limited to certain individuals, usually wealthy, White, and protestant (Thelin, 2011; Worthen, 2011). As colleges and universities began enrolling students who held different identities (religious, racial, ethnic, etc.), different student organizations developed. The creation of new fraternities and sororities based on identity followed this same pattern as students that were being denied membership into organizations that were typically reserved for white, protestant students wanted a place to call home (Torbenson, 2009).

In 1898, Zeta Beta Tau was established at Columbia University as the first fraternity for Jewish men. This fraternity was founded as a Zionist youth society when its members were denied entry into already existing fraternities on campus (Zeta Beta Tau, 2017b). As the organization grew, it stayed true to its founding by working to “preserve and cultivate its relationships within the Jewish community” (Zeta Beta Tau, 2017a). Similarly, Alpha Epsilon Phi was established as the first Jewish sorority in 1909 at Barnard College. There are now five Jewish fraternities and sororities associated with national umbrella organizations.
The first national African American fraternity was founded in 1906 at Cornell University (Worthen, 2011). Alpha Phi Alpha was established to create a community and support system for Black students on Cornell’s campus after many Black students did not reenroll from the year before (Ross, 2000). The first African American sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc., was formed two years later in 1908 at Howard University (Edwards, 2011; Ross, 2000; Worthen, 2011). The founding of these organizations spurred the growth of additional fraternities and sororities focused on the African American student experience on college campuses. Collectively, there are nine historically African American fraternities and sororities known as the “Divine Nine” (Ross, 2000) that are organized under the National Pan-Hellenic Council, also known as the “NPHC” (National Pan-Hellenic Council, 2017).

Other cultural- and identity-based fraternities and sororities have formed over time as well. The first Asian-interest fraternity formed in 1916 at Cornell. The first Latin American fraternity was formed 15 years later in 1931, and in 1994, the first Native American sorority was established. Additionally, there are Christian fraternities, Islamic fraternities, gay and nonheterosexual fraternities, and more (Worthen, 2011).

In the aftermath of the Civil War, colleges and universities began to grow in numbers and stature once again. Fraternities continued to engrain themselves within institutions, and women’s organizations and cultural- and identity-based organizations grew as the college student body continued to change and those students were denied membership in already existing organizations. Social fraternities and sororities became abundant and were seen as part of the “college life” (Thelin, 2011). This period of growth and good feelings would be challenged in the decades to follow.
The Great Depression and World War II (1929-1945). Fraternities and sororities rode a wave of good fortune and optimism through the 1920’s, but by the 1930’s, things changed. Whereas fraternities and sororities had formerly been seen to be a student’s path to a good life, in the 1930’s they were seen more as a frivolity that could not be afforded by many (Syrett, 2009; Horowitz, 1987). The Great Depression had come and forced many to rethink what college meant and how to ensure success following graduation (Horowitz, 1987). This decrease in fraternity and sorority membership would continue through World War II (Syrett, 2009).

The Great Depression. The Great Depression was a hard time for colleges and universities, but that did not stop enrollment from increasing across the country (Lucas, 2006). Throughout the early 1900’s there was a growing number of two-year colleges, which were cheaper to attend and were very attractive to students facing economic hardship. As a result, four-year institutions had to adjust by changing admissions standards, changing curriculum, and changing how they approached students (Lucas, 2006).

The students who were going to college were different, too. They sought experiences that would benefit them following college, mostly through academic endeavors. Syrett (2009) describes this period of time, saying, “following the fraternity heyday of the 1920’s, fraternities in the 1930’s were almost universally regarded by college administrators as being at the nadir of their existence, in terms of numbers as well as behavior” (p. 233). Not only were fraternities regarded as problematic, they were struggling to gain new members (Horowitz, 1987). Fewer students were able to afford fraternities and sororities, and this caused financial hardship for many organizations (Horowitz, 1987). The wealthiest students continued to join fraternities and sororities, and some of these organizations managed to escape the depression largely intact, but many others were forced to close or sell their chapter facilities (Syrett, 2009). Although attitudes
towards fraternities and sororities had changed during this time, it did not stop them from being social. Fraternity and sorority events, like dances and formals, continued to be popular among students looking to have a good time (Lucas, 2006).

**World War II.** The hardships of the Great Depression did not end with the start of World War II in 1939. As the war escalated and the United States was drawn into the war in full, many college men either enlisted or were drafted. Many fraternities were forced to suspend operations permanently or temporarily while their members were off fighting. As this happened, colleges and universities took control of many fraternity facilities to house soldiers who were being trained on campuses across the country (Syrett, 2009).

Not only were fraternities struggling to find members to join their ranks and to maintain control of their chapter facilities, they were also fighting against a rising tide of activism on campus. As Europe was descending into war, many students on college campuses joined political causes aimed at keeping the United States out of the war (Horowitz, 1987). This turn towards serious concerns and issues caused many students to view fraternity life as frivolous and unimportant (Syrett, 2009).

Although fraternities struggled through World War II, sororities experienced the war very differently. Men were enlisting or drafted to go to war, which created more opportunities for women to go to college (Wissenberg, 1958). This also opened the door for more women to join sororities. At the University of Michigan, so many new women were enrolling and joining sororities that houses were crowded to capacity, and many fraternity houses were converted to sorority houses and other women’s residences (Wissenberg, 1958).
Women were not the only students to benefit from changes to colleges and universities brought about by the war. Minority students, Jewish students and Black students in particular, started to see attitudes towards them shift (Lucas, 2006). Throughout the war, national representatives of fraternities fought to maintain the place of fraternities on college campuses by claiming they were the very face of democracy (Syrett, 2009). Some disagreed with this notion, including many veterans returning from a war against fascism and bigotry to find that fraternities and sororities were discriminating against minority students on their campuses (Horowitz, 1987). In the aftermath of the war, an increasing number of Jewish and Black students sought membership in organizations that had traditionally spurned them.

**Activism, discrimination, and declining membership (1945-1975).** The Great Depression and World War II greatly impacted the number of men and women joining fraternities and sororities. Fraternities saw decreases in membership and number of chapters on college campuses, while sororities ended this period of time with more members and chapters. Following World War II, enrollment in college began to increase dramatically, and colleges and universities saw a period of expansion that would last into the 1970’s. Whereas in 1939-1940, enrollment across the country was just under 1.5 million students, by 1949-1950, enrollment was at 2.7 million (Thelin, 2011). This large increase in enrollment was due in part to a shift in attitude toward higher education and policies created to make it more accessible. Prior to the war, higher education was largely seen as a vehicle whereby the wealthy would maintain their wealth and influence. Following the war, the attitude shifted to one where college was for anyone, including the average person (Thelin, 2011). In addition to this shift in attitude, thousands of men who were not able to attend or complete college prior to the war were coming home and finding that there were no jobs available to them, so they were given the chance to go
to college through the G.I. Bill passed in 1944 (Thelin, 2011). This bill afforded veterans the ability to attend college with most, if not all, of the cost covered by the government. By 1950, more than 2 million veterans had opted to enroll at a college or university (Thelin, 2011).

**Post-war fraternity and sorority experience.** For fraternities, veterans did not immediately bring renewed growth and success. Many veterans were older than traditional college students and did not find the prospect of being hazed by teenagers appealing after they had fought a war (Syrett, 2009). By the 1950’s, however, most veterans had come and gone through colleges and universities, and in their wake were many new prospects for fraternities. Membership for fraternities and sororities increased during the 1950’s, and in the 1960’s, more fraternities were chartered on campuses in one decade since the 1920’s (Syrett, 2009).

Whereas fraternities and sororities were largely forgotten or pushed aside in the 1940’s, the 1950’s brought new attention to the organizations as students began to return to extracurricular activities (Fraternities and Sororities, 2017; Lucas, 2006; Nuwer, 1999). The attention was not necessarily positive, however. Prior to World War II, many of the articles about fraternities and sororities praised their activities and members. Following the war, articles became much more disparaging as reporters took more interest in moral issues like discrimination and hazing (Nuwer, 1999; Fraternities and Sororities, 2017).

The media were not the only disparaging voices of fraternity and sorority life. National and world events like the Korean War, Civil Rights Movement, and Vietnam War captured the attention of students. Activism again took hold on college campuses (Horowitz, 1987) and fraternities and sororities began to see their prestige drop once again (Syrett, 2009). Students during this time became more independent and anti-establishment, which were in direct opposition of fraternity and sorority life. While many non-members considered themselves
liberal and took part in the activism on campus, members of fraternities and sororities were often conservative and avoided activism or actively counter-protested. Although membership did rise in the 1950’s and most of the 1960’s, by 1970, membership had started to decline (Horowitz, 1987).

**Discriminatory practices and clauses.** Membership in fraternities and sororities rose through the 1950’s and 1960’s along with the rise in overall enrollment. Although enrollment continued to grow on college campuses, membership in fraternities and sororities slowed and then started to decline in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. This was due partly to the change in the attitudes of college students, and partly due to the discriminatory practices of fraternities and sororities (Horowitz, 1987; Syrett, 2009).

There were many during the late 1940’s and early 1950’s who started to question fraternities and sororities for their membership selection processes (Syrett, 2009; Horowitz, 1987). At that time, membership was still split among the have’s and have-not’s, and the have’s were typically White and protestant (Thelin, 2011). Minority students (including Black, Jewish, and Catholic students, among many more) along with veteran’s and socially conscious students began to openly discuss the discrimination perpetrated by fraternities and sororities (Thelin, 2011; Horowitz, 1987; Syrett, 2009). Additionally, throughout the 1950’s and 1960’s, popular news outlets ran stories about discrimination in Greek-lettered organizations. The *New York Times* alone ran over 40 articles pertaining to discrimination in fraternities and sororities during the 1960’s (Fraternities and Sororities, 2017).

Even though students were more tolerant than previous generations, discriminatory membership clauses found in many fraternity and sorority constitutions and bylaws restricted who local chapters could offer memberships to (Horowitz, 1987; Syrett, 2009). As pressure
mounted on fraternities and sororities to open their membership, some began accepting one or two token Black or Jewish members. Although the students may have been tolerant enough to offer membership, the national organizations and alumni were not. In some cases, chapters received threats of charter removal from their alumni and national organizations for offering membership to students who did not meet (discriminatory) requirements set forth by the constitution or bylaws of the organization (Syrett, 2009). Some chapters relented and did not offer membership, while chapters broke from their national organization and reform as a local fraternity or sorority, so they could control their membership processes (Horowitz, 1987).

National organizations and alumni were not the only influences on fraternities and sororities. Many colleges and universities did not approve of the discriminatory clauses or practices associated with fraternities and sororities but were afraid to force a removal of either (Horowitz, 1987). The fear was that powerful alumni would rescind donations or stop giving altogether. In a time when colleges and universities were trying to recover from the Great Depression and World War II, this was a hard decision to be made, and many chose to side with money (Horowitz, 1987). For example, at the University of Michigan, students created and voted on legislation to have fraternities and sororities remove discriminatory clauses over the course of six years. The president of the university vetoed the legislation for fear of the backlash from it (Horowitz, 1987).

Eventually, facing scrutiny from the public, administrators, and students, national organizations relented and removed discriminatory clauses and practices from official documents (Syrett, 2009). This was a step toward reducing discrimination in fraternities and sororities but did not end it immediately. Horowitz (1987) stated, “discrimination did not end; it just went underground. Some Gentile fraternities accepted a black or a Jewish token member, but until the
changing climate of the 1960s, they largely kept the white Protestant brotherhood intact” (p. 148).

Fraternity and sorority organizations were viewed as anti-democratic, discriminatory, and members of the establishment which affected membership in the 1960’s. Membership numbers in fraternities and sororities grew through the decade, but in proportion to overall enrollment, the number of students joining these organizations declined (Syrett, 2009). The 1960’s reshaped higher education and cast fraternities and sororities at unnecessary parts of the college experience. Chapters closed, and institutional involvement was reduced. The power and prestige that fraternities and sororities established had all but disappeared. By the early 1970’s, for the first time since their founding, fraternities and sororities experienced a decline in both numbers and prestige (Horowitz, 1987).

Emergence of the “Animal House” (1975-2000). The hard times for fraternities and sororities started with the Great Depression and continued through the early 1970’s, but those hard times would not last. As the Vietnam War ended, college students began to move away from activism and entirely serious endeavors and back toward social activities like parties and drinking (Nuwer, 1999). Students once again were allured by fraternity and sorority organizations.

Membership numbers for fraternities and sororities began to rise once again. As students looked for a social outlet, Greek life was ready. Although numbers did go up through the 1970’s, they still did not rise to levels previously seen, in relation to overall enrollment, prior to the depression. Fraternities and sororities also failed to regain their previously held prestige (Horowitz, 1987).
The slow and steady growth of the 1970’s would give way to rapid growth in the following two decades. Early articles in campus newspapers during the 1980’s stated quietly, but often, of the success of new fraternities and sororities and how more students were looking to join the ranks of fraternal organizations (Horowitz, 1987). By 1985, the national media had picked up on the fact that fraternities and sororities were growing once again (F. M. Hechinger, 1985). Through the rest of the 1980’s and 1990’s fraternities and sororities saw their membership numbers continue to rise to levels never before seen on college campuses. The growth and reemergence of fraternities and sororities was seen as a positive sign to some, but not all (Nuwer, 1999).

“Animal House” and bad behavior. Even though fraternities and sororities had not returned to previous heights yet in the mid- to late-1970’s, they continued to regain the attention of the public. In the 1950’s and 1960’s, news stories about fraternities and sororities focused on bias and discrimination. In the early 1970’s, the attention shifted to behavior. At first, articles described the hijinks and accidents related to fraternities and sororities (Nuwer, 1999). This behavior was capture and fueled by the 1978 movie Animal House. The writer of the movie shared that the movie was based on his own experiences and that it was not too far off from the truth (Syrett, 2009).

In the 1970’s, the New York Times only reported on fraternities and sororities seven times (Fraternities and Sororities, 2017). One article in particular captured the bad behavior. On April 16, 1979, Mary Ann Bird wrote an article titled “Fraternities’ Antics Turn Violent on Some Campuses, at Cost of Money and Privileges; Small Minority Involved.” The article described behavior in terms such as “rowdyism” and “pranks” (p. 14) and often used the movie Animal
House as a comparison. Although acts such as abducting, beating, and sexually molesting members was discussed in the article, the term hazing was never used (Bird, 1979).

As time went on, however, stories shifted from using terms for bad behavior like hijinks to using more serious terms like hazing and sexual assault (Nuwer, 1999). The seven articles in the *New York Times* about Greek life in the 1970’s gave way to nearly 100 in the 1980’s. Of these, nearly two-thirds were about fraternity or sorority behavior. This trend continued into the 1990’s, where there were nearly 150 articles about fraternities and sororities written in the *New York Times*. In both the 1980’s and 1990’s, most articles related to behavior focused on either alcohol or hazing (Fraternities and Sororities, 2017).

According to a 1986 article, between 1979 and 1986, at least 39 college men had died due to hazing activities (F.M. Hechinger, 1986). The high rates of incidents began to catch the attention of professionals working with fraternities and sororities, and they started to work towards change. The NIC urged member organizations to eliminate alcohol from houses, end hazing, and help students return to the founding values and ethics of their organizations. The National Panhellenic Conference helped member organizations implement educational programming aimed at preventing hazing and harm related to alcohol (Nuwer, 1999). The National Pan-Hellenic Council decided to ban hazing outright in their member organizations in the fall of 1990 (Marriott, 1990). Although efforts were made to curb hazing and alcohol abuse, issues would persist.

*Multicultural Greek organizations.* Much of the focus of the three decades before 2000 were focused on the growth of fraternities and sororities and the issues and challenges they faced. What they are often not remembered for is being the beginning of a significant influx of multicultural and culturally based fraternities and sororities. These organizations are not
mentioned in many of the histories of American higher education (Horowitz, 1987; Lucas, 2006; Nuwer, 1999; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2011) but are as much a part of the fraternity and sorority community today as any other organization.

Culturally based and multicultural fraternities and sororities were founded for similar reasons to National Pan-Hellenic Council fraternities and sororities. When students of different identities began attending colleges and universities, they were not welcomed into existing fraternities and sororities. Over time, some of these students formed their own fraternities and sororities, while others were eventually allowed to join existing, predominantly White fraternities and sororities (National Multicultural Greek Council, 2018).

Even though some students did form culturally based organizations as early as 1916, according to the National Multicultural Greek Council, most multicultural fraternities and sororities began to emerge in the 1980’s and 1990’s. Their website states,

This emergence and growth was due in part to the success of the civil rights movement that brought forth newfound strength in minority populations. It also coincided with a new wave of immigration coming in from various parts of the world as a result of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act under the Johnson Administration (National Multicultural Greek Council, 2018).

During this time, many culturally based and multicultural fraternities and sororities were created. Some failed, but many were successful and still operate today (National Multicultural Greek Council, 2018).

The period of time between the early 1970’s and 2000’s was a renaissance of sorts for fraternities and sororities. Following hard times from the 1930’s through the 1960’s, fraternities
and sororities once again began to attract new members and become a player on college campuses. During this time, fraternal organizations reached numbers never before seen, and new types of fraternities and sororities were able to take hold. Much of this 30-year stretch was positive for Greek life, but it also came with its problems. People began to pay closer attention to hazing, sexual misconduct, and alcohol abuse by fraternities and sororities, and started calling for change among these organizations.

**Values, liability, and the future of Greek life (2000-Present).** The growth of fraternity and sorority life into the new millennium brought continued attention to the organizations. Conversations about behaviors like alcohol abuse, hazing, sexual misconduct, and exclusivity continued to dominate the public narrative (Fraternities and Sororities, 2017), and research (Eberly, 2010; Jelke, 2014). National associations, like the Association of Fraternity and Sorority Advisors (AFA), also took note and began conversations about how to bring Greek life back in line and curb bad behavior.

**Values congruence.** The bad behavior of fraternities and sororities forced student affairs professionals to address these behaviors. In 2003, a group of college and university presidents met along with the Franklin Square Group and created “A Call for Values Congruence” (Franklin Square Group, 2003). This document was designed to outline a path back to values congruence for fraternity and sorority members. It was later adopted and affirmed by various organizations like AFA, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the NPC, and NIC (NASPA Fraternity and Sorority Knowledge Community, 2018).

A 2006 issue of AFA’s *Perspectives* magazine focused values and actions congruence. The cover even questioned whether or not values congruence might be a “cure-all” for
Articles from the issue focused on what was meant by values and action congruence and recommendations for achieving them (Bureau, Schendel, & Veldkamp, 2008), and how to bring branding and values together to create congruence (Lutzky, 2008). By 2012, however, the call for values congruence as a movement was openly being questioned in Perspectives. Dr. Gentry McCreary (2012) argued that the values congruence movement had produced no innovation and had only provided “bluster” over the previous 10 years.

For a decade, values congruence drove the conversation in fraternity and sorority advising, but that did not seem to stem bad behavior from occurring on campuses. Fraternities and sororities continued to host discriminatory parties (Sack, 2001), fatally haze new members (Foderaro, 2003), and engage in unsafe alcohol consumption (Smothers, 2007). As it became evident that behavior was not changing, the conversation began to change from values congruence to legal concerns and liability.

**Legal concerns and liability.** In his 2017 book, True Gentlemen: The Broken Pledge of America’s Fraternities, John Hechinger (2017) states that “insurance companies have rated fraternities just above toxic-waste dumps because of claims related to drinking, hazing, and sexual assault” (p. 7). He described how Sigma Alpha Epsilon was the deadliest fraternity in the country and was one lawsuit from potential “oblivion” (J. Hechinger, 2017). With these sentiments, Hechinger captured much of the conversation around fraternity and sorority life in the 21st century.

The discussion about legal issues regarding fraternities and sororities and their members was not new. In 1982, “Manley, Jordan & Fischer: A Legal Professional Association” published its first Fraternal Law newsletter. The purpose of the newsletter was to “provide a discussion of
fraternity law” (Manley, Jordan & Fischer: A Legal Porfessional Association, 1982). This newsletter would continue to be published four times per year through the present day.

The shift to legal concerns and liability outside the legal community and national offices would not really be at topic of discussion for fraternity and sorority professionals until the 2008 issue of Perspectives, which focused on “Relevant Legal Issues for Fraternity & Sorority Professionals” (Hevel, 2008). Topics included criminal consequences for behavior, freedom of association, and negligence. Between 2003, when the first call for values congruence was made, and 2008 the New York Times published at least 10 articles related to the death of a fraternity or sorority member that was directly caused by hazing, alcohol consumption, or both. Many of these articles also included discussions about the legal ramifications for the students responsible and their organizations (Fraternities and Sororities, 2017).

As more students and fraternal organizations were charged criminally for their actions, the legal conversation continued to intensify, and universities and national headquarters took harder stances against fraternities and sororities who behaved poorly. Individuals continued to be held accountable, but universities and national fraternity and sorority organizations were also facing lawsuits (Burke, 2011; Burke, 2010). In response, universities closed chapters (Foderaro, 2011; Kaminer, 2013), and national organizations sought legal assistance. In 2012, Manley Burke, LPA, created a new division called Fraternal Law Partners dedicated to “the legal issues impacting fraternities, sororities, student life organizations and their related charitable foundations” (Fraternal Law Partners, 2018).

A review of AFA Perspectives from this time shows that fraternities, sororities, and universities continued to work to create safe environments for all students. Similar to previous decades, this work did not prevent issues from continuing. Between 2010 and 2017, the New
York Times reported on fraternities and sororities in 143 articles, the most in a decade since the 1990’s (144 articles; Fraternities and Sororities, 2017). As problems persisted, questions about the future of fraternities and sororities surfaced. What was their purpose on college campuses, and did they still belong?

The future of Greek life. The recent history of fraternities and sororities have left some questioning whether the organizations should still be on college campuses. Some say fraternities and sororities “complement the academic mission of the institutions where [they] exist” (New, 2014) and are “the premier leadership development experience on a college campus” (North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2014). Others believe fraternities “have a long, dark history of violence against their own members and visitors to their houses, which makes them in many respects at odds with the core mission of the college itself” (Flanagan, 2014).

Major incidents like a sorority denying membership to a Black woman at the University of Alabama (Robertson & Blinder, 2013), the hazing death of a new member at Baruch College (Kaminer & Southall, 2013), sexual assault at a Duke University fraternity party (Associated Press, 2015), and the death of a Pennsylavnia State University fraternity new member after consuming too much alcohol and sustaining fatal injuries at a party (Stolberg, 2017) have created calls for banning fraternities and sororities permanently or until behavior can be fixed (Danielson-Burke & Borton, 2017). Student affairs professionals within the fraternity and sorority community are discussing ways to save fraternity and sorority life (Mousseau, 2015) and what the future holds for the community (Horras, 2016), but no one answer exists (Danielson-Burke & Borton, 2017).

The NIC is one organization that is seeking a solution to the current climate surrounding fraternity and sorority life. In the fall of 2015, members of the NIC developed sweeping changes
to the NIC by introducing “NIC 2.0.” The new NIC was created to bring “tangible action that moves the needle” in the fraternity and sorority community. The goal is to support campus fraternity communities, develop educational programming, create processes to allow for data-driven decision-making, advance the fraternity brand through public relations efforts, and advocate for fraternities and sororities on a local, regional, and national level (North-American Interfraternity Conference, 2018).

Efforts like those of the NIC are in progress and may be paths to change over time, but colleges and universities have taken swifter action. As of February 16, 2018, twenty campuses across the country had issued some type of suspension or moratorium on some or all activities related to Greek life in 2017 and 2018. This compares to 14 similar suspensions from 2013 to 2016 (Harwood, 2018). Most suspensions included restrictions on events with alcohol, new member activities, and recruitment. Some targeted entire Greek communities, while others focused specifically on one or two councils (usually IFC). These suspensions are at various stages in their resolutions but continue to be utilized as a way to “pause” potentially harmful activities while campuses determine how to best move forward in a safe and responsible manner (Harwood, 2018).

The period of time between 2000 and the present has largely focused on values congruence, liability and legal concerns, and how to best address increasing concerns with the behavior of fraternities and sororities. Recent events attributed to fraternities and sororities have created questions about their very existence. Efforts to create change have largely failed, and colleges and universities are now being forced to take drastic measures like suspending entire communities. Unlike the early days of fraternities and sororities where growth and prosperity seemed inevitable, the future for these organizations is unclear.
**Conclusion.** Fraternities and sororities have become a force on college campuses that some say make it nearly impossible for institutions to separate from despite issues that have plagued them (Flanagan, 2014). In the over 240 years since Phi Beta Kappa started the fraternal movement in the United States, there have been many iterations and versions of fraternity and sorority life. From its growth in the 1800’s and early 1900’s to its decline through the 1960’s due to national and world events and eventual reemergence in the 1980’s and 1990’s, the fraternity and sorority community has ebbed and flowed. Much of the behavior of fraternity and sorority members has been looked upon poorly since the inception of these organizations, but recent history has been especially harsh. In the last 30 years, hazing, alcohol and sexual misconduct, and deaths related to these activities have soured the public and college administrators to fraternity and sorority.

From here, the focus will shift to explore the history of fraternity and sorority life specifically at the University of Michigan. In many ways, it mirrors that of the national history of fraternities and sororities. In some important ways, however, it is all its own.

**History of Fraternities and Sororities at the University of Michigan**

The University of Michigan fraternity and sorority community has enjoyed nearly 175 years of existence. Founded in 1845, the community has experienced much and has done much to shape the university. From changing the way the university was governed to how it approached student organizations, fraternities and sororities have left their mark on the institution. This brief history of the fraternity and sorority community at the University of Michigan will highlight major events and significant times.

It should be noted that the history of Greek life at the University of Michigan is dominated by fraternities. While fraternities began in 1845, sororities organized over 30 years
later. Additionally, representing societal norms, as women’s organizations, sororities were not
given the same attention as fraternities. This will be reflected in describing the history of
fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan.

Also lacking is the attention given to culturally based fraternities and sororities. Black
fraternities and sororities first appeared at the University of Michigan in 1909 and 1921,
respectively, and other culturally based organizations may have come and gone in the times
since. Very few records exist that acknowledge or speak about these organizations up until much
later in the history of the fraternity and sorority community. Much of what could be found came
from The Michigan Daily (student newspaper) and meeting minutes where these organizations
may have been mentioned briefly. Culturally based fraternities and sororities are vital parts of
Greek Life today, but their history is elusive.

From the first fraternity established at the University of Michigan in 1845 to present day,
fraternities and sororities have had a significant impact on the history of the institution. This
historical overview will provide context for any further discussions about the fraternity and
sorority community at the university. The following will explore from the establishment of
fraternities in 1845, through periods of growth, hardship, and reinvigoration before discussing
present day issues with the fraternity and sorority community.

Fraternity war, 1845-1850. The history of Greek life at the University of Michigan
starts with the founding of the institution. Originally chartered in 1817, the first classes at the
University of Michigan were not taught until 1841, shortly after the University of Michigan was
moved from Detroit to Ann Arbor in 1837. The first class of students consisted of six men, five
freshmen and one sophomore (Farrand, 1885). By 1842, the student population had grown to 10
male students. By the 1844-45 year, there were 55 students attending the university (Farrand, 1885).

As the student population grew, so too did student activities. Students began to create literary societies, such as Phi Phi Alpha and Alpha Nu, to assist them with their composition and elocution skills. There was also an attempt to start a college newspaper prior to 1845 but that endeavor failed (Peckham, 1994). Prior to the first classes being held at the university, a “code of laws” was developed to help maintain order with the prospect of a growing number of students (Farrand, 1885).

Professor George Williams assisted in writing the first code for the university. This code contained the statement that “No student shall be or become a member of any society connected with the University, or consisting of students, which has not first submitted its constitution to the faculty and received their approbation” (Farrand, 1885, p. 73). While this was initially meant to prevent the unnecessary multiplication of literary societies, it eventually came to greater prominence as Greek-letter societies (social fraternities) began to form (Farrand, 1885).

In 1845, Beta Theta Pi and Chi Psi were created without the knowledge and consent of the faculty at the university. Around that same time, Alpha Delta Phi had submitted a request for admission and offered to share its constitution as required by the code of laws (Farrand, 1885). These organizations were founded as distinct entities opposite from literary societies whose purpose was purely academic. The new fraternities were created to help create an escape from studying, chapel, and church. Their aim was to provide a social outlet for students, and as such they “institutionalized drinking, smoking, card playing, singing, and athletic teams” (Peckham, 1994, p. 28).
The faculty did not know about Chi Psi or Beta Theta Pi and did not immediately grant
Alpha Delta Phi recognition (the fraternity formed anyway). The existence of Chi Psi and Beta
Theta Pi was not discovered until nearly a year after their founding when faculty members began
to look into “some student disorders and troubles with local authorities” (History of secret
organizations, 1896, p. 8). The faculty decided to let all three organizations remain but resolved
to ensure no more students would join, ending these organizations over time (Farrand, 1885).

Believing these organizations to be “evil” and wishing to “crush them” the university
faculty created a new policy where new students had to sign a pledge indicating that they would
not join any organization that faculty had not approved (History of secret organizations, 1896).
In spite of this new policy, all three fraternities added new members to their ranks. Attempting to
be on the right side of the university policy, Alpha Delta Phi again tried to submit their
constitution for review in 1847, but faculty would not grant them recognition, thus not allowing
new students to join, because they “had no authority to legalize them as a society” (Peckham,
1994, p. 29).

The student reaction to the faculty statement regarding legalizing them as a group caused
the students to respond by saying that if faculty could not authorize the group then they could not
forbid it either (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994). The students further argued that their
organizations were not affiliated with the university but were clubs “in Ann Arbor” (Farrand,
1885, p. 75). Their justification for this was that their meetings were not held on university
property but in the town of Ann Arbor.

As tensions between faculty and students grew, the faculty reached out to the regents and
other universities for assistance with the fraternities (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994). After
gathering responses, the faculty submitted a report to the regents regarding fraternities. The
regents voted on whether to exempt fraternity members from punishment, which ended in a tie, giving faculty the freedom to do as they saw fit. As a result, some students from Chi Psi and Alpha Delta Phi withdrew their membership from their organizations, and those who did not were expelled from the university. Members of Beta Theta Pi were able to avoid punishment because the organizations constitution had not been signed, creating the argument that the men were not actually members of the organization (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994).

The actions taken by the faculty to expel these students were met with opposition from other faculty members who held different opinions, from the Board of Regents, the student body, and from the citizens of Ann Arbor. So great was the outrage, that citizens held a meeting on December 20, 1849, to discuss the actions taken by the faculty. At this meeting, calls were made for the reinstatement of the fraternity men, the termination of the faculty members who voted to remove the students, and a change to the structure of the university (Peckham, 1994).

The faculty stood by their decision to expel the fraternity men and submitted a report to the regents, saying, “fraternities were not only defying a rule, but were irresponsible, exclusive, expensive, convivial, and intriguing” (Peckham, 1994, p. 29). Again, the regents took no action on the matter, allowing the faculty to continue acting as they would. Following this, the faculty removed Beta Theta Pi despite the organization not having a signed constitution.

The opposition from students and citizens alike, along with Beta Theta Pi agreeing to compromise in order to regain its status, led the faculty to relent and vote to reinstate all three organizations under strict rules and conditions including each fraternity submitting their membership roster to faculty, all meetings being held on university property, and multiple other conditions which the fraternities did not object to (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994). Although the faculty attempted to work with the students and fraternities, the damage from this period of time
was evident. Citizens and students held the university responsible for the ugly period of time later to be known as the “secret society war” (Farrand, 1885). The graduating class of 1849 included 23 students, whereas the next four years only saw 10 to 12 students a year graduate (Peckham, 1994).

With the reinstatement of the three fraternities, the “secret society war” ended (Farrand, 1885). However, the fallout from this period of time was yet to be realized. In reflecting on the actions of all those involved and time and energy spent on these student organizations, it had become apparent that a central administrator was needed to regulate and support the faculty and to work with the Board of Regents (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994). The faculty found it difficult to make decisions and follow through with them because of the pressure from students and groups outside the university and because of a lack of support from the Board of Regents. A central administrator could have assisted or mitigated some of this opposition and lack of support.

The disillusionment with the university administration led to a significant change in how it would be governed. In 1849, the citizens of Michigan voted to hold a constitutional convention which convened in 1850. During this convention, the University of Michigan Board of Regents was changed from an appointed board to board of officials elected through popular vote, one from each of the eight judicial districts in the state (Peckham, 1994; History of secret organizations, 1896). Additionally, the board was separated from the legislature. In doing this, the Board of Regents was authorized to have complete control over the administration and funding for the university. This act put the Board of Regents on par with the legislature, judiciary, and governor for the scope of supervision. This would create the space and freedom
necessary for the university to grow and prosper without the interference of the state government (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994).

After the new Board of Regents was elected, they quickly created a new constitution and elected a university president to oversee the administration of the university. This act allowed the regents to remove themselves from the administrative aspects of the institution and focus solely on policy creation (Peckham, 1994). Whether the creation of an elected board and the implementation of a university president resulted directly from the issues that faculty had with fraternities cannot be said for certain, but it certainly had an influence (History of secret organizations, 1896).

The events of the “Fraternity War” established fraternities at the University of Michigan. Following this period of time, both the university and fraternities experienced a period of growth. As the university began admitting an increasingly more diverse population of students, culturally based fraternities began to establish, as did women’s fraternities and sororities.

**Growth of the community, 1850-1930.** For a period following the “Fraternity War,” the fraternity and sorority community grew and prospered. By the year 1857, two-thirds of the student body were members of seven fraternities on campus. In 1860, fraternities organized and created the Palladium, a campus publication of fraternal organizations. Soon thereafter, in 1887, nine fraternities joined together to host a “junior hop,” a kind of formal ball or dance, that further solidified these organizations into the university social environment (History of secret organizations, 1896). By 1893, fourteen social fraternities existed on the campus of the University (among many other fraternal organizations focused on academics and professional ideals) where there had only been three in 1850 (History of secret organizations, 1896).
An article from the *Detroit Free Press* published in 1896 describes fraternity men at the time as “men who come to college from families having social positions… furthermore, a man with plenty of money to spend on dress, etc., and who shows himself to be a pretty congenial fellow” (History of secret organizations, 1896, p. 8). The article goes on to say that those men who were not members of fraternities felt that they were missing out on certain social aspects of the college experience and that fraternities were a divisive force because it created factions within the campus community. The author shares that membership in an organization carries prestige and social status, as well as offering an enjoyable living experience:

Here from fifteen to thirty students live together as one big family, and many valued friendships are formed, for the ties between men of the same fraternity are of the closest possible kind. They study together, dine together and meet together after the 6 o’clock dinner hour for a period of joking, singing and social intercourse. (p. 8)

Depictions of a fraternity house and living conditions from the article can be seen in Figure 1 and Figure 2.
While fraternities were growing and flourishing, so too were sororities. Sororities were initially mocked for being imitations of fraternities (Farrand, 1885). This is exactly what they
were. The fraternities were, and remain to this day, single-sex organizations that would not admit women to their ranks. Sororities were places where women could gather socially and escape from the everyday grind of college life.

The first sorority (then called a women’s fraternity) on the campus of the University of Michigan was Kappa Alpha Theta in 1879. As more women were admitted, more sororities were formed. In 1882, Gamma Phi Beta was established (Peckham, 1994). As explained by the University of Michigan chapter of Gamma Phi Beta, it was the first organization referred to as a sorority when Syracuse Professor Frank Smalley said to a group of members, “I presume that you young women feel very elated over being members of a sorority” (Gamma Phi Beta, Beta Chapter, 2014). Three years after Gamma Phi Beta was formed, Delta Gamma was established in 1885. These women’s organizations continued to grow in popularity. In 1890, there were five sororities with 55 members. By 1915, there were fourteen sororities, and thirteen of them had houses (Bordin, 2001).

The increase in the number of women on campus and the subsequent increase in the number of sororities began to create divisions and competition between the various organizations as well as between members and non-members. In 1890, the Women’s League was developed (Bordin, 2001), which created an executive board that had representation from each of the current sororities and an equal number of non-affiliated women. This began to improve relationships between members and non-members (Wissenberg, 1958). A topic of conversation that was occasionally discussed was recruiting new women (rushing) and the issues associated with that process (Wissenberg, 1958).

The topic of rushing was not unique to the University of Michigan. In 1891, representatives of all the national sororities came together for the first time in Boston to discuss
rushing among other topics (National Panhellenic Conference, 2017a). From this, the National Inter-Sorority Conference was developed. This group would later become the National Panhellenic Conference, as it is known today (National Panhellenic Conference, 2017a).

A similar meeting was held among active sororities on the University of Michigan campus in 1904 when it became apparent that rules and regulations needed to be created for the rushing process (Wissenberg, 1958). This meeting established six rules for the 1904-1905 school year, including “meetings of the association shall be held during the rushing season” (p. 1806). This rule established the Inter-Sorority Association (later to be known as the Panhellenic Association). In the beginning, this association met yearly to discuss and establish rules for rushing. Over time, the association began meeting year-round to discuss all topics affecting the sorority community.

Fraternities were not long behind sororities in creating an association to unite each organization towards a common goal. Sororities were already taking steps toward making relationships between affiliated women and non-affiliated women better, at the same time easing tensions with the university, but fraternities were not. Fraternities were seen as problematic for the way they recruited and pledged new members, for their social activities, and their low academic standards. Following a report by the University of Michigan Committee on Student Affairs in 1913, fraternities came together to organize the Inter-Fraternity Conference of the University of Michigan (later to be known as the Interfraternity Council, or IFC) in 1914 (Bursley, 1958).

The stated purpose of this new Inter-Fraternity Conference (1915) was as follows:
To promote the interests of the said University; and of the several fraternities represented therein; to insure cooperation among said fraternities; and between them and the college authorities to the end that the conditions of the fraternities and their relations with the college may be improved.” (p. 1)

The constitution and bylaws provided guidance for membership, procedure, and recruitment. Of particular note were eligibility rules for new members, and the creation of a new judicial committee to uphold those rules (Inter-Fraternity Conference, 1915). This new council would be important moving forward as it would work with the university to address issues like “hell week,” when new members would experience a week of hazing prior to be initiated (Armstrong, 1929).

The men that were members of fraternities in 1915 were generally White and protestant. This was not surprising given that the student body was similar to most other institutions of higher education across the country. Students were generally White, protestant men from wealthy families. As time went on, however, universities became more open to the idea of bringing in some talented students regardless of race and ethnicity. In particular, institutions began admitting more women, Black students, and Jewish students. Even though the student body began to slowly diversify, fraternities and sororities remained exclusive to those students who fit their mold, generally White and protestant (Horowitz, 1987). And so, it was not only White women who found it necessary to create their own imitations of existing fraternities. As more Black students and Jewish students were admitted, they too found that they were not
welcomed in the fraternities the campus had to offer and sought to create their own fraternity and sorority experiences.

The first culturally based fraternity founded at the University of Michigan was Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., in 1909. This historically Black fraternity organized with eight members who sought a social and fraternal experience that they could not receive in any existing fraternity at the time (Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc., Epsilon Chapter, 2008). Later, in 1921, the first historically Black sorority was established at U-M with the chartering of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. The five founding members of Delta Sigma Theta in 1921 were also the only five women admitted to the university (Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., Nu Chapter, 2018). In time, these organizations would become members of the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association (respectively) before becoming members of the Black Greek Association and then the National Pan-Hellenic Council at U-M.

In 1912, the first Jewish fraternity to the University of Michigan when Zeta Beta Tau was established. Originally starting as a club called “Michigoyem,” the group became a fraternity called “Mem Lamed” in 1910. After one member had visited another campus, he decided that the fraternity should be re-established as an affiliated chapter of Zeta Beta Tau. This eventually happened in 1912 (Zeta Beta Tau, 1936). Nine years after the establishment of Zeta Beta Tau, Alpha Epsilon Phi was chartered at U-M, marking the first Jewish sorority on campus (Alpha Epsilon Phi, Pi Chapter, University of Michigan, 2018). Similar to Alpha Phi Alpha and Delta Sigma Theta, Zeta Beta Tau would join the Interfraternity Council and Alpha Epsilon Phi would join the Panhellenic Association.

Over time, many more culturally based fraternities and sororities would come and go at the university. Students seeking experiences that fit their cultural experiences and history would
charter fraternities and sororities based on various identities including Latin, Asian, Southeast Asian, and more. These organizations would also come together to form their own councils separate from the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Council to reflect their values and ways of operating (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018a). The Multicultural Greek Council was established in 2002 to represent and organize fraternities and sororities whose focus was on specific ethnicities, cultures, or multiculturalism in general (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018b). The National Pan-Hellenic Council was chartered in 2005 to promote “unanimity of thought and action… and to consider problems of mutual interest” (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018c) of the nine historically Black fraternities and sororities.

The first 80 years of the fraternity and sorority community saw incredible growth. The numbers of students in fraternities and sororities grew as did the number of organizations overall. As the number of fraternities and sororities increased, so too did the number of rules and regulations. The community also saw a diversification of the type of organizations with the founding of multiple culturally based organizations. The growth of this time would begin to slow as the Great Depression and World War II began.

The Great Depression and World War II, 1930-1950. From the original six men that first attended U-M in 1837, the student body grew quickly to 1,402 students in 1913, and then to 4,328 in 1931 (Shaw, 1951). During that same period, the fraternity and sorority community grew from three fraternities in 1845 to over 80 fraternities and sororities in 1931 (University of Michigan, 1931); however, the Great Depression and World War II took their toll on the community. By 1943, there would be less than 60 fraternities and sororities still operating (University of Michigan, 1943). This period was especially hard due to a decrease in overall student enrollment at the university and in the number of students who could afford to join
fraternities and sororities (Peckham, 1994). A further blow to fraternities was a policy of deferred recruitment was enacted which allowed freshmen join to fraternities not until their second semester (Bursley, 1932a). This limited revenue that fraternities could bring in from membership dues and created financial distress for many which caused some to abandon their houses in favor of cheaper rental homes (Peckham, 1994). After one year of deferring recruitment, a new policy was enacted which allowed fraternities to recruit freshmen 10 days after orientation had ended. This along with other policies enacted by the university, alumni, and national organizations helped to relieve the financial strain for some organizations (Bursley, 1932b).

Even through this period, the fraternity and sorority community was not stagnant. The Interfraternity Council created an event called the “All-Campus Sing” in 1935 (Plans Outlined, 1935) which would later become Greek Week in 1940. Initially, Greek Week focused on bringing members of Interfraternity Council fraternities together to discuss issues related to the community and how to better their relationship with the university (Interfraternity 'Greek Week', 1940). Over time, Greek Week would evolve into a week of social activities meant to bring the fraternity and sorority community together as a whole. Activities included events like IFC Sing and the IFC Ball (Messer, 1952).

While the Interfraternity Council was hosting the IFC Sing and then Greek Week, the Panhellenic Association was hosting its own events. As early as 1922, the Panhellenic Association started hosting an annual ball (Panhellenic Association, 1926). The event would feature dancing and a band. Invitees would include prominent guests including the university president, deans, and the registrar (Pan Hellenic Assembly, 1946). The Panhellenic Ball became
an annual event which, along with dances hosted by the IFC, would exist until the late 1950’s (Peckham, 1994).

The late 1920’s and 1930’s also brought an increasing university presence in the activities of fraternities. At this time, sorority activity generally was supervised by the Dean of Women and fraternity activity by the Dean of Students (Peckham, 1994). Sorority concerns were generally limited to recruitment and housing (Lloyd, 1934; Bacon, 1958; Bacon, 1959). Concerns about fraternities included recruitment and housing, but also academics, finances, and social activity (Bursley, 1933b).

Four years after the creation of the Inter-Fraternity Conference, in 1919, the 18th Amendment to the United States Constitution was ratified, and in 1920 prohibition took hold in the country. Fraternities were not quick to get on board with the new law. To assist with enforcement of the prohibition laws on campus, President Little called a conference between university administrators and officers of the various fraternity alumni associations (University of Michigan Office of the President, 1926). At the conference, various topics were discussed including liquor in fraternity houses and delayed pledging. Dean of Students, J. A. Bursley and President Little explained the university’s position on prohibition enforcement and requested the assistance of the fraternity alumni. The alumni agreed to assist by creating multiple committees to discuss various topics such as alcohol, recruitment, scholarship, and housing (Bursley, 1926). Soon after, the alumni representatives decided it would be pertinent to create a permanent alumni organization to assist the university and the undergraduate men. This would be known as the
Inter-Fraternity Alumni Association (Atkinson, 1926). This brought fraternity alumni into closer contact with fraternities and the university.

In 1933, Dean Bursley requested approval from President Ruthven to implement scholarships for resident advisors or tutors in fraternity houses (Bursley, 1933a). Dean Bursley (1933a) believed resident advisors would “function in a more general supervisory way for the chapter as a whole… also serve to furnish a more mature point of view when matters of general policy are under discussion” (p. 1). While this plan was enacted on a temporary basis (Bursley, 1934) it seems to be have been replaced by the position of fraternity relations counselor for the 1938-1939 school year (Lundahl, 1939). This appears to be the first university staff position dedicated to working with fraternities or sororities. The position was only to last for one year, however. It was cut following a decision by the Personnel Committee that it could not be supported in the budget (Bursley, 1939). It would not be until 1951 when another staff position was created to supervise and advise fraternities (Walter, 1952).

Another initiative that did stick through the 1930’s and 1940’s was the Inter-Fraternity Alumni Assembly (later known as the University of Michigan Interfraternity Alumni Conference and then Alumni Interfraternity Council; Bursley, 1946). In 1945, the University of Michigan Interfraternity Alumni Conference called a meeting of alumni representatives and university officials including Dean Bursley and President Ruthven to discuss the future of fraternities following World War II. The alumni first sought assurance from the university that it was not trying to rid itself of fraternities, and then went on to plan for the years following the war when enrollment was likely to increase at the university. It was clear that alumni were concerned about
the state of the community as it was in 1945 but were hopeful that it would rebound following
the conclusion of the war (Bursley, 1945).

While the fraternities struggled with issues of numbers and oversight, the sororities do
not seem to have struggled as much. Although overall membership declined during the 1930’s
and 1940’s, as evidenced by a reduction in the overall number of sororities from 21 in 1931
(University of Michigan, 1931) to 18 in 1943 (University of Michigan, 1943) and the inability to
fill some sorority houses (Lloyd, 1937), there did not seem to be the same concerns for their
financial or social statuses. Most issues were related to the number of women able to live in
sorority houses (Lloyd, 1933). This did cause some financial hardship, but in a 1941-1942 report
to the president, Dean of Women Alice C. Lloyd indicated that there were 19 sororities on
campus and “the sororities in general are in very good financial shape and run their financial
affairs efficiently and wisely” (Lloyd, 1942, p. 40).

In 1944, the Panhellenic Association implemented deferred recruitment to the beginning
of the second semester for first year women. At first, this was met with skepticism and fear that
the sorority community would lose out on new members. By 1947, the community had embraced
the new system of recruiting. One report indicated that the women openly approved of the new
way of recruiting and believed it created a better distribution of members between groups
(Bacon, 1947). By the 1951-1952 school year, however, the Dean of Women and the Panhellenic
Association decided to attempt fall recruitment again on a two-year trial basis starting the
following year (Bacon, 1952). After the two-year trial, fall recruitment was adopted as the norm
but it was noted that the increasing number of women going through the recruitment process –
1,200 started the process in the fall of 1954 – might create a situation where they would have to go back to a deferred recruitment model (Bacon, 1955).

This period of time, from the start of the Great Depression to the years immediately following World War II, saw the fraternity and sorority community face many hardships. Many organizations were not able to make it through the down times when finances were a concern and enrollment was down. Although the beginning of this time was hard, the community began to see reason for optimism as it moved into the 1950’s (Bursley, 1945).

**Bias clauses and membership selection, 1950-1970.** The 1950’s and 1960’s for fraternities and sororities are not remembered for positive events like “Help Week,” which replaced the hazing associated with “Hell Week” or with growth in fraternities and sororities. Instead, they were remembered as a period of time when fraternities and sororities were called to task for discriminatory clauses found in their constitutions and charters (Bursley, 1952). Twice attempts were made by the Student Legislature in the early 1950’s to forcibly remove discriminatory clauses from all student organization constitutions, and twice the motion was passed by the Committee on Student Affairs. The first vote was vetoed by President Ruthven (Peckham, 1994) and the second by President Hatcher (Bursley, 1952). President Hatcher (1952) said, “We believe that the process of education and personal and group convictions will bring us forward faster, and on a sounder basis, than the proposed methods of coercion” (p. 48). An article written in the Michigan Daily echoed President Hatcher in saying, “There is now a trend towards elimination of discriminatory clauses in fraternities all over the country… University fraternities will follow this trend and solve their problems without outside coercion” (Lunn & Scherer, 1951, p. 4).
As the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association were faced with further challenges to discrimination clauses in the constitutions of their member organizations, the two councils attempted to take steps to remedy the situation. In 1952, the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association Presidents from U-M presented an anti-bias clause to the Big Ten Panhellenic and IFC conference. The clause recommended that individual organizations take action to remove discriminatory clauses from their constitutions. It passed with no dissenting votes (Big Ten Adopts, 1952).

Attempts to force the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Council to adopt sweeping regulations removing discrimination clauses for member organizations continued through the 1950’s (Spencer, 1960). Although the Interfraternity Council did not require member organizations to remove discriminatory clauses from their constitutions, many did during this period of time. In 1949, 22 of 34 organizations had these clauses in their constitutions. That number was down to four by 1959 (Hayden, 1959). In that same year, the Board of Regents adopted Bylaw 2.14, which stated:

The University shall not discriminate against any person because of race, color, religion, creed, national origin or ancestry. Further, it shall work for the elimination of discrimination (1) in private organizations recognized by the University and (2) from non-University sources where students and the employees of the University are involved. (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b)

Just a few months later, the Student Government Council adopted a similar regulation in order to implement the bylaw passed by the Board of Regents:
All recognized student organizations shall select membership and afford opportunities to members on the basis of personal merit and not race, color, religion, creed, national origin, or ancestry. (All cases of possible violation of this regulation shall be referred to the Student Government Council’s Committee on Membership in Student Organizations). (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b)

Following the passage of this regulation, the Student Government Council (1963a) requested statements from all fraternities and sororities indicating any rule, regulation, or policy that existed with in each individual organization pertaining to membership selection. All groups had filed these statements by the beginning of 1962, though many did not contain the required materials. The Student Government Council (1963a) again requested the statements and by the summer, only seven organizations had not complied. All were sororities.

The national offices for each of these seven sororities filed petitions with the university questioning the delegation of authority of power to students. In response, the Board of Regents adopted a resolution at the May 1963 meeting specifying that they had in fact delegated power to students to regulate and enforce membership policies and that fraternities and sororities were included within their purview. The Student Government Council then delineated what would constitute a violation of the anti-discrimination resolution and how it would enforce those rules. This was again challenged by a lawyer representing ten sororities but ultimately was upheld by the university. The Student Government Council moved forward with creating a membership committee and membership tribunal to enact and enforce these rules. In accordance with the new rules, the Interfraternity Council established its own membership committee to carry out the recently enacted bylaw of the council indicating that no member fraternity would discriminate
based on race, color, creed, religion, national origin or ancestry (Student Government Council, 1963b).

Even after the Interfraternity Council passed the bylaw to end discrimination among member fraternities, and then created a membership committee to enforce that bylaw, some member organizations found it difficult to comply. Trigon was one such fraternity. Contained within its constitution were strong references to Christianity and in their ritual new members were forced to avow their Christian beliefs (D. T. Miller, 1964a). The Student Government Council and Interfraternity Council both found this to be a violation and ultimately forced Trigon to change its constitution and ritual (Carney, 1965).

Organizations in the Panhellenic Association were not as quick to adhere to the non-discrimination policies. National organizations continued to fight for the rights of their organizations to determine their own policies and even preferred that their local organizations become unrecognized by the university rather than adhere to the new policies and break with the national organization becoming a local sorority (J. Smith, 1965a). Some sororities were even forbidden by their national organizations from engaging in conversations with organizations like the Membership Committee because they felt that it took power from the sororities (J. Smith, 1965b).

It was not by choice that individual sororities did not remove discrimination clauses and practices. In a letter to Regent Sorenson, Vice President for Student Affairs Richard Cutler wrote, “the Panhellenic Association recently voted 21-2 to take steps to assume a similar posture [to that of IFC on discrimination], and in effect threw down the gauntlet to the National Panhel and the several national sorority groups” (Cutler, 1965b, p. 2). Cutler went on to explain that while the local chapters wished to remove any discriminatory practices from their organizations,
they were financially dependent on their national organizations, which were much less progressive in their thinking. In essence, the chapters were trapped between doing what they felt was right and what they needed to do to survive (Cutler, 1965b).

The National Panhellenic Conference and national sorority organizations did not prevent the Panhellenic Association at U-M from discussing the matter (Rakocy, 1965d). In November, 1965, the Panhellenic Association had brought forth a resolution to form a membership committee similar to that of Interfraternity Council (Rakocy, 1965g). This resolution eventually passed, and a working relationship was formed between the Interfraternity Council Membership Committee, Panhellenic Membership Committee, and the Student Government Council Membership Committees to handle any allegations of discrimination by a fraternity or sorority (SGC Membership Committee, 1967).

Discriminatory clauses were no longer an issue for Panhellenic sororities by 1968, but the association felt that there were still discriminatory practices within organizations. In particular, there was concern over binding and required recommendations for new members. These recommendations would have to be vetted and approved by alumnae members, and collegiate members believed this to be a way by which the alumnae could discriminate. To combat this, the Panhellenic Association passed another resolution requiring member organizations to remove binding and required recommendations from membership selection practices. They requested support from U-M President Flemming in communicating this with their national sorority organizations because they believed it would not be taken seriously without the support of the university (Mochel, 1968). After obtaining legal counsel from the attorney general of the State of Michigan, the university did offer its support of the Panhellenic Association’s decision to remove binding and required recommendations from their membership selection process (Cutler, 1968b).
This support was made official through the passage of a resolution by the Board of Regents on November 15, 1968. Following the action by the regents, all but two national organizations agreed to comply with the resolution to remove binding and required recommendations (University of Michigan, 1968). The two that did not comply, Pi Beta Phi and Kappa Delta, were not permitted to recruit that year (Sororities and Fraternities, 1969).

The action by the Board of Regents in 1968 effectively ended the period of time when discriminatory clauses were a focus for fraternities and sororities. This did not end speculation about these organizations being discriminatory and exclusive in other ways, however (Lord, 1987). This also marked the beginning of a time when student activism and independence ruled the day and fraternities and sororities would suffer until ultimately reemerging and regaining strength on campus.

**Fall and reemergence of Greek life, 1970-1985.** While rectifying issues related to discrimination in their organizations, fraternities and sororities faced other issues during the 1960’s as well. A movement toward anti-establishment, anti-elitism, and a more serious way of thinking among college students across the country greatly impacted the fraternity and sorority community in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. Students found fraternities to be too elite and too social and as a result, membership plummeted (Peckham, 1994).

Like the student body, the university began to pull away from fraternities and sororities in 1969 when the fraternity advisor was reassigned to a research position and it was decided that fraternities and sororities would not have specific advisors (Sororities and Fraternities, 1969). A report the following year offered insight into the state of the community:
The policy of disengagement between fraternities and sororities and the University over the past few years has gone hand in hand with the decline of the groups. Serious consideration should be given to either severing ties completely or re-establishing meaningful relationships that entail burdens and benefits for both these groups and the University. (Feldkamp, 1970, p. 2)

The university decided to disengage with the community nearly completely. It was not until 1995 when Greek life would once again have formal ties to the university (Cianciola, 1995; Cianciola, 1994).

Fraternities were hit harder during this time than sororities were, although both lost members. From 1968 to 1972, the number of fraternities dropped from 46 to 36, and many organizations were being forced to sell their houses because they were unable to fill them (Vartabedian, 1972). In 1970, the Interfraternity Council was, for all intents and purposes, disbanded, in favor of the Fraternity Co-operative Council, founded to assist fraternities looking to adopt a co-op model to survive (Trethewey, 1972). While larger fraternities and sororities seemed to be able to maintain much of their membership and way of life, many smaller organizations were forced to close (Hill, 1974).

The membership decline during the late 1960’s and early 1970’s would not last. By 1975 the Greek community was back on the rise. Leading the way were historically Black fraternities and sororities like Alpha Phi Alpha, Kappa Alpha Psi, Alpha Kappa Alpha, and Delta Sigma Theta (two fraternities and two sororities, respectively). Both Alpha Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Theta had been members of the Panhellenic Association up until October 9, 1968, when they both withdrew, stating, “they could not, in any good conscience, remain affiliated with an association which permits discrimination in any form” (Newell, 1968c). After leaving the
Panhellenic Association, these two organizations and other historically-Black fraternities and sororities came together to form the Black Greek Association sometime in the 1970’s (J. Brown, 1979), although the official date is not available.

The Black Greek Association and its member organizations provided places for Black students on campus. For Black men who were looking for a place on campus following the activist movement of the previous decade, fraternities were still one of the best options on a campus that they felt did not fully embrace them. One Michigan Daily article captured this sentiment saying, “Young and black a decade after the peak of America’s civil rights movement, they are not completely at ease here on the campus of one of the most widely-touted institutions of higher learning in the world” (Tobin, 1975).

Not far behind these organizations were the rest of Greek life. The Panhellenic Association started to see growth come back to the community in 1975 when sororities began inquiring about expansion and the number of new members pledged was rising (Jack, 1975). Around that time, the alumnae organization for the Panhellenic Association, called Persephone’s Consilium (now known as the Panhellenic Alumnae Council), hired Cathy Gullickson to serve as the Panhellenic Advisor. She served until 1977. Following Cathy, Sunny Hill served as the council advisor until the fall of 1979 (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018a). After Sunny Hill left, Mary Beth Seiler was hired to advise the Panhellenic Association. Mary Beth Siler would serve as Panhellenic Association advisor until 2014 when she was named director of the Office of Greek Life.

Led by historically Black fraternities and sororities and the Panhellenic Association, after nearly a decade of declining membership and a dismissal of the community by students, Greek life was set to reemerge as a major entity on campus. Membership overall started to rise once
again in 1977-78, and in March of 1978, Greek Week was reestablished (Peckham, 1994).

Whereas in 1975 fraternities were averaging 14 new members in a pledge class (Rumsey, 1984), by 1985 that number had risen to 22 new members per pledge class (Rumsey, 1985b).

**Risk management and university involvement, 1985-2005.** The period of growth from 1975-1985 was accompanied by an increase in awareness of social concerns and the need for increased support and regulation of the community. University housing began cracking down on alcohol in residence halls and then began to try to curb alcohol consumption in fraternity houses by calling the City of Ann Arbor to check to see if those houses needed permits to sell beer at their parties (The Michigan Daily Editorial Board, 1984). Following an increase in neighborhood community members complaining about fraternities and sororities in their communities the university began exploring the creation of a “Code on Non-Academic Conduct” (Rumsey, 1985a).

Upon realizing that the code could severely impact their organizations (Schnaufer, 1985), fraternities and sororities came together to discuss the creation of a new judicial system that would fall in line with the university’s processes and allow the organizations to continue governing themselves (Gregory, 1985). Initially proposed in September of 1985 (Morgan, 1985), the Greek Activities Review Panel (GARP) would not be fully approved by the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association until February of 1986 (Harper M., 1986). The creation of this board was a significant step taken by the fraternity and sorority community to retain control over the fate of their organizations (Morgan, 1985).

The creation of the GARP did not help curb criticism from community members living in neighborhoods with fraternity houses. As fraternities and sororities continued to grow, their impact on neighborhoods grew as well. Although sororities were involved in the social scene
with fraternities, stricter rules imposed on sororities by their national organizations and advisor put much of the spotlight on activities happening at fraternity houses. Fraternities would throw parties that were loud and featured large amounts of alcohol which prompted neighbors to complain about a lack of control on the part of the university. Citing other universities regulations over their fraternities and sororities, neighbors clamored for an increased presence by U-M in the affairs of fraternities and sororities (Vance, 1986). Interfraternity Council President Denny Cavanaugh agreed, saying, “We don’t have any support from the university for these things… there has to be some type of adviser or some type of university staff that we can have access to” (p. 2).

The University of Michigan would not commit to providing support for fraternities and sororities, due to perceived fear of liability for the actions of the organizations, but it did agree to review proposals for the creation of an Office of Greek Life (Vance, 1986). The next few years did not bring additional support from the university, however. Fraternities and sororities were said to “operate independently of institutional administration” (Rumsey, 1988). In an attempt to provide support for fraternities, alumni members came together to reform the Alumni Interfraternity Council of the University of Michigan in October 1989 (Alumni IFC; State of Michigan, 1989). This newly formed council would operate similarly to Persephone’s Consilium and hired its first adviser for the Interfraternity Council in 1989 (A Brief History of Greeks at the University of Michigan, 1994; University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018a).

Almost immediately following the creation of the Alumni IFC and hiring an adviser for the council, the Interfraternity Council began working to create positive change. In 1989, the Alumni Interfraternity Council worked together with the Interfraternity Council to propose a dry-recruitment period. Previously, recruitment seemed to rely heavily on alcohol and this proposal
sought to change that (Lutes, 1989). Around this same time, the National Interfraternity Conference adopted the Fraternal Information and Programming Group’s policies on risk management which greatly regulated the use of alcohol and other drugs for all chapters of member organizations (G. Davidson, 1989a). With the backing of the IFC Executive Board and Alumni IFC (The Interfraternity Council of the University of Michigan, 1989), the vote passed creating a dry recruitment period starting in 1990 (G. Davidson, 1989b).

The focus remained on risk management for fraternities and sororities as social issues continued to arise. There were concerns about drugs (Worick, 1990), open parties where any person could walk into a fraternity party and drink for free (The Michigan Daily Editorial Board, 1990), hazing, sexual misconduct, and the protection of the physical properties owned by fraternities and sororities. In an attempt to educate members about these issues and concerns, events like “Pledge Education Day” (Wang, 1991) and the “Michigan Greek Leadership Conference” were held on campus (Rode, 1991). As of January 1, 1992, the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association adopted the Social Environment Management Policy (SEMP) to hold chapters accountable for their social interactions. The policy created rules and regulations for parties and established a student-run group to check parties for compliance. Like the creation of GARP, the SEMP was established in part to better the community and in part to continue the practice of the community governing itself (Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Council at the University of Michigan, 2016).

The community’s commitment to self-governance created stronger relationships with outside entities but did not necessarily take away issues and concerns from within the community. In October 1993, Fraternity Coordinator Joe Foster (1993b) wrote an update to the Alumni Interfraternity Council:
Our strategy of self-regulation, education, and proactive intervention has been incredibly successful to our outside publics. We have made significant progress in our relations with the Police and Fire Departments, members of the City Council, the University administration, and with our neighbors. Our social functions are smaller, more controlled, and more responsible… On the other hand, internally, the fraternity system appears to be at a crossroads. In the first two weeks of September we experienced a record 29 violations of the IFC/Panhellenic Alcohol Policy… there seems to be an attitude among many fraternity men, that enforcing the alcohol policy is wrong. (p. 1)

As The Michigan Daily pointed out, however, the alcohol policy was not the only concern. In September 1994 a fraternity new member was rushed to the hospital after consuming too much alcohol while being hazed (The Michigan Daily Editorial Board, 1994).

While risk management concerns continued to be an issue for the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association, culturally based organizations continued to go largely unnoticed by the campus community, often garnering only small mentions within full articles about the IFC and Panhel. In 1994, there were four fraternities and four sororities that were members of the Black Greek Association (BGA), one Latino fraternity, and one Latina sorority which was a member of the Panhellenic Association (Nash & Thompson, 1994). In that same year, the Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs (a U-M department) and the Office of Greek Life (not a U-M affiliated department) joined together to provide the Black Greek Association an adviser. This position would start as part-time and temporary until 2011 when permanent funding was secured (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018a).
As the university once again began paying attention to the fraternity and sorority community, discussions about making the Panhellenic Association Adviser and Interfraternity Council Advisers university employees began. Indicators of a closer relationship started in the early 1990’s (Foster, 1993a), but a proposal for funding the positions was not made until 1994 when Associate Dean of Students Frank Cianciola offered terms to Allan Lutes of the Alumni Interfraternity Council. The proposal outlined an agreement where the Panhellenic Association Adviser and Interfraternity Council Adviser would become university employees and gain all rights and benefits of that status, but the salaries and fringe benefits for the positions would be paid for by the Alumnae Panhellenic Association and Alumni Interfraternity Council (Cianciola, 1994). There was initial hesitation from the Alumnae Panhellenic Association given their responsibility financially if the relationship were to breakdown between the university and Office of Greek Life (Cianciola, 1995), but the move was eventually finalized and the Office of Greek Life and its staff became an official department of the University of Michigan (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018a).

After establishing the Office of Greek Life as a university department, two more events would finish forming the fraternity and sorority community into what it is at the time of this writing in 2018. In 2001, 12 culturally based fraternities and sororities came together to form the Multicultural Greek Council (MGC). These organizations were focused on specific cultures, ethnicities, and/or multiculturalism generally. Some of these organizations had been members of other councils while others had been independent of any Greek council prior to the creation of the Multicultural Greek Council (Kassab, 2001). This new council would be advised by the same adviser for the Black Greek Association (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018a).
Later, in 2003, the Black Greek Association would change its name to the National Pan-Hellenic Council (NPHC) to reflect the national umbrella organization name of the nine historically black fraternities and sororities (Dziadosz, 2006). The Michigan chapter of the National Pan-Hellenic Council would be officially recognized in 2005 when it received its charter from the National Pan-Hellenic Council (the umbrella organization; University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018a). This would fully establish each of the four councils that are represented in the University of Michigan Greek Life community in 2018.

Following the struggles of the 1960’s and early 1970’s the fraternity and sorority community once again emerged on campus. Membership numbers rose consistently (and would continue to rise through 2017) (J. Williams, 1981; Kulka, 2017b), and the university once again created formal ties with the fraternity and sorority community. With the increase in membership came increased risk management concerns. The community tried to educate members and create policies and procedures to regulate and adjudicate these concerns, but a period of social excess was just beginning.

**Liability, social excess, and change, 1998-present.** Whether because of increased attention placed on the fraternity and sorority community or because bad behavior had increased, the period of time following the establishment of the Office of Greek Life as a U-M department has been marked by social excess. Issues with alcohol, hazing, sexual misconduct, and exclusivity have marred the fraternity and sorority community’s presence on campus. In a 2015 statement, President Schlissel indicated that the value of a University of Michigan degree could be impacted by the bad behaviors of the fraternity and sorority community (Kinery & Moehlman, 2015). Although these sentiments were being shared in 2015, the problem of social excess jumped to the forefront in 1998.
In September 1998, the Greek Social Environment Task Force was convened to “comprehensively examine the social environment within the Greek community governed by the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association” (Greek Social Environment Task Force, 1998, p. 3). Recommendations were made for improving the social environment, but unfortunately, they could not prevent tragedy from striking. On October 16, 1998, Courtney Cantor died after falling out of her residence hall window. She was a first-year student and a new member of Chi Omega sorority. The night she died, she had been participating in sorority activities and had consumed alcohol at a party hosted by Phi Delta Theta (Easley, 1998).

The loss of Courtney Cantor was not the only incident that fall. IFC Advisor John Mountz (1998) wrote in a letter to the Alumni Interfraternity Council that there had also been a large brawl between two fraternities involving almost 150 people, the suspension of a fraternity for violating their risk management policies, a reported assault by a fraternity member, and increased tensions between fraternities and their neighbors. These issues would continue into the new millennium.

In 2001, the first “Greek Summit” was called to address “fundamental problems and ignite change” in the fraternity and sorority community (Nixon, 2001, p. 1). A speaker at the conference declared that “Greek Life became a social outlet, and core ethics were lost… a disrespect for others has led to an increase in hazing and assault, despite the values Greeks should have for brotherhood and sisterhood” (p. 7). Regent David Brandon, the first regent to address a Greek audience, said at the summit, “the Greek system is crumbling because of a total lack of supervision and control” (p. 7).

Following the summit, fraternities and sororities began to reorganize and attempt to adhere to alcohol policies. Additionally, a hazing task force was created to help students report
hazing incidents (Nixon, 2001). The campus community took note of work the community was doing to reform and improve but was also quick to point out that it was not actually changing things. One community member went so far as to liken the community to “trash, festering and rotten, littering the grass and walks surrounding the Michigan Union” (Adams, 2003).

Examples of this excess continued through the decade. In 2003, a member of Sigma Chi experienced kidney failure after being hazed (J. Davidson, 2006). Seven fraternities and sororities were investigated for hazing in 2004 (Benton, 2004). Sigma Alpha Epsilon was suspended by the Interfraternity Council in 2005 for repeatedly violating social policies (C. Miller, 2005). The chapter would later be expelled by IFC and lose university recognition in 2011 (Alsaden, 2011). In 2006, the social policy was rewritten to get a better grasp on the community’s social activities (J. Davidson, 2006) but in 2007, Beta Theta Pi was removed from campus for violating a probation placed on them by their national headquarters by drinking in their chapter house (VanLonkhuyzen, 2007).

After assuming the role of Dean of Students in 2009, Dr. Laura Blake Jones determined that fraternities and sororities needed to be handled through a collaborative approach between the university and Office of Greek Life. Together with Director of Greek Life Mary Beth Seiler, a new strategic plan was created in 2012 to create a direction for the community. To demonstrate commitment to the strategic plan, the Achievement Expectations Program was created in 2014 to establish minimum expectations for all fraternity and sorority chapters. These programs, the collaborative effort between the Dean of Students and Office of Greek Life, and strong student leadership were helping the community to move forward.

The progress of the community began to slow and then stop altogether in 2014 and 2015. In 2014, University Health Services (UHS) at the University of Michigan shared the results of
their “UHS Health Assessment Survey,” which identified health trends among students. Despite having many policies in place to curb alcohol consumption by members, the UHS survey showed that fraternity and sorority members were more likely to consume alcohol at an unusually high rate (The Michigan Daily Editorial Board, 2014).

Then, in 2015, the full extent of this period of excess was put on display when multiple fraternities and sororities went on “ski trips” to northern Michigan. These trips resulted in hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage to various resorts. Reported behavior included the use of drugs and alcohol and malicious destruction of property (Akhtar, 2015). One fraternity, Sigma Alpha Mu, lost recognition from its national organization and from the university, and Sigma Delta Tau, who was at the resort with Sigma Alpha Mu, received significant sanctions, including losing the ability to recruit new members for up to two years. The actions of these groups were described as “extreme” and “inappropriate” by President Schlissel (University of Michigan Public Affairs & Internal Communications, 2015).

The years following the ski trip weekend focused on reform in the community. In an effort to spur on this reform, a task force was convened by Dr. Blake Jones to explore various issues in Greek life. The task force was comprised of university administrators, students, and stakeholders. Members were asked to serve on various committees to focus on specific areas of improvement like risk management; public relations; and diversity, equity, and inclusion (Moehlman, 2016). Out of this task force came many recommendations, including hiring additional staff and support for the Office of Greek Life (Blake Jones, Krupiak, Walsh, & Kubik, 2016).

The ski trip incident and task force report, along with the work done by Dr. Blake Jones and Mary Beth Seiler, were enough to convince the university that more funding and staff were
needed for the Office of Greek Life. Up until 2014, almost all of the staff salaries in the Office of Greek Life (five full-time staff, two graduate assistants) were paid for from student fees collected by the four governing councils (Berghorst, 2015). By the 2017-2018 school year, the staff had grown to six full-time staff, one part-time staff member, and three graduate assistants. Not only did the staff grow, but the director position was elevated to Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Greek Life (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018d). Additionally, monetary contributions to the Office of Greek Life from the university nearly tripled providing money to help pay for some staff salaries and programming such as the Michigan Greek Leadership Institute Presidents’ Weekend (Kulka, 2017a).

Although many efforts have been made in the last 20 years to curb the bad behavior of fraternities and sororities, at the time of writing this history, the community again finds itself in turmoil. At a November 2017 meeting of the Interfraternity Council, the executive board announced a suspension of all fraternity social activities due to a pervasive culture of excessive alcohol and other drug use, hazing, and sexual misconduct. This suspension was self-imposed by the council, and only directly impacted operations of member organizations of the council (Harmon, 2017). The council is now in the process of reinstating social activities for some organizations, but only after completing chapter-by-chapter assessments (Theut & Basha, 2018). When asked about the suspension of IFC activities, Dean of Students Dr. Blake Jones shared that she was “proud of the leadership” the community showed and that it was an example of strong self-governance at work (Slagter, 2018c).

**Conclusion.** The fraternity and sorority community at the University of Michigan is nearly 175 years old. Beginning in 1845 with the founding of Chi Psi and Beta Theta Pi, the actions of the Greek Life community have continually made the university explore ways to
address them. These organizations forced the university into tough conversations about governance; risk management; and diversity, equity, and inclusion. The path from 1845 to 2018 was not always straight or smooth, but through it all the community has grown from two fraternities with a handful of White men, into a thriving community where four councils exist representing 62 organizations and over 6,200 men and women of various races, ethnicities, cultures, and religions (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2017).

Over its existence, the fraternity and sorority community has indelibly left its mark on the University of Michigan, changing many facets of the institution from the way it was governed to the way it viewed relationships with student organizations. One cannot look at the history of Greek life at the university without exploring the organization of the institution, and one cannot view the organization of the institution without exploring the history of Greek life. The two are intertwined in a way that will continue to shape both for as long as they both exist.

In a similar fashion, the history of fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan is ensconced within the national history of these organizations. Fraternities and sororities at U-M were not exempt from national trends in the early days of their founding and continue to find that they are in line with the national narrative today. This is important to note because it lends credence to the notion that the methodology and conceptual framework used in this study may be transferable to other campuses wishing to explore what implications fraternities and sororities may have had for student affairs at their institutions. The following chapter will explore the methodology of this study in detail.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan and the implications it had on student affairs. This study was conducted by analyzing three distinct eras (two eras of politicization and one era of quiescence). Each era featured conflict between fraternal organizations and institutional actors (e.g., faculty, staff), and was analyzed to determine what, if any, implications there were for student affairs at the University of Michigan. These conflicts were analyzed through the lens of organizational theory, conflict, and privatization/socialization of conflict. The analysis was also informed by the context of the national history of fraternal organizations and of those fraternal organizations at the University of Michigan.

This study utilized a case study research design focusing specifically on the University of Michigan. The study was conducted from a historical perspective, and data for this study were obtained from historical, archival data, such as meeting notes and newspaper articles. From the data, specific eras of conflict were analyzed to determine what, if any, implications they had for student affairs at the university.

Research Design

Given the purpose of this study, it was designed using a constructivist paradigm. This paradigm seeks to explore a phenomenon in depth, views findings as interpretive and context dependent, and tends to focus on an individual or small set of participants rather than a larger group where results can be generalized. Manning and Stage (2003) explained that “researchers employing the constructivist paradigm work with categories and interpretations that are grounded in the data, analyze data through inductive means, and concern themselves with the
discovery of meaning” (p. 21). This study was well suited for this paradigm because it sought to understand a specific phenomenon within a specific context.

To further explain the design of this study, it was important to note the ontological, epistemological, and methodological approaches assumptions made by the researcher. Ontology refers to the researcher’s beliefs about the nature of reality (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Epistemology refers to the relationships between the knower and the known (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Methodology refers to how the knower can obtain the knowledge and understanding they desire (Stage & Manning, 2003).

**Ontology.** Ontology, or the researcher’s beliefs about the nature of reality, asks questions like “Who am I? What am I doing here? What is the purpose of life? And, what is real?” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 70). As the lead researcher, my ontological perspective is that reality is multiple and socially constructed. Lincoln and Guba described this as a naturalist view of reality (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I believe, as is suggested by Yin (2016), that multiple realities are possible depending on the perspective that reality is viewed from. Reality may be perceived very differently from the perspective of those being studied and the researcher. This study utilized historical data to derive meaning. Many of the participants in the events that were studied are no longer living, so the interpretation of reality for these events came from me as the researcher.

I also believe that reality is socially constructed and contextual. The analysis of events in this study was bound by the context of those events (Manning & Stage, 2003). Further, the analysis was dependent on my own construction of events (Yin, 2016). Any understanding gained from the analysis of events was limited to the context, or similar contexts, in which those
events occurred (Manning & Stage, 2003). This makes it so “prediction and control are unlikely outcomes” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37).

Having a naturalist view of reality means that this study did not seek to create undeniable truth. In fact, the very act of conducting this research may have created new questions to be answered (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Instead, this study sought to describe and understand the phenomenon through the context “represented in the data collected by the researcher” (Manning & Stage, 2003, p. 21).

**Epistemology.** Epistemology, or the relationship between the knower and the known, asks the question of whether the researcher and subject of research are independent of each other or if they influence each other (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). My epistemological assumptions align with a constructivist paradigm. I believe knowledge is subjective and that my role in research was intertwined with the organization I was researching. The research changed my understanding of the institution, while my interpretation of the data may have changed how the institution is viewed.

If organizations were rational, it might be possible to study them from an objective lens. However, we know that organizations are not rational and are comprised of human beings and are influenced by innumerable factors (Thompson, 2003). This makes it impossible to view organizations objectively because human factors are at play. Manning and Stage (2003) stated that “there is no way to fully and completely isolate the influence of the researcher from the researched” (p. 21). They indicated that this may actually be beneficial because the interaction between the researcher and researched can produce “high-quality data, findings, and interpretations” (Manning & Stage, 2003, p. 21).
As the researcher, my role was to accurately describe the events I studied. I did this, to the best of my ability, in spite of any assumptions or hypotheses that I may have had going into the study. In this way, knowledge was created through the interactions between myself and the research.

**Methodology.** Methodology, or how the knower can obtain the knowledge and understanding they desire, is driven by the researcher’s ontological and epistemological beliefs. Guba and Lincoln (1994) described methodology through the constructivist paradigm as hermeneutical and dialectical. Recalling the ontological and epistemological assumptions that reality is subjective and knowledge is constructed through interactions between the researcher and researched, they stated that “varying constructions are interpreted using conventional hermeneutical techniques, and are compared and contrasted through dialectical interchange” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 111). This approach required the researcher to be deeply involved in the research.

My methodological approach was in line with Guba and Lincoln (1994). I believed that I had to be deeply involved in the research I was conducting. This procedure meant that I had to be up close with the research and interact with it (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The data for this study consisted of archival data and artifacts, much of which came from a time before anyone is currently living. The more recent events described in this study involved some living individuals, which provided me with the opportunity to interact differently with the data. With all of the data, I was able to be up close with these events by seeking to understand both the events and the context in which they occurred. This was accomplished by casting a wide search around those events that I was studying.
Research Tradition

To best explain the phenomenon explored in this study, a qualitative research tradition was used. Qualitative research can be described as multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials—case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts—that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives. (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 2)

This study sought to both explore and describe the phenomenon to try to make sense of what implications conflicts related to fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan may have had for student affairs at the institution.

Case study. The research method was a case study method. This approach focuses on a single case to be studied and asks the question, “What can be learned from the single case?” (Stake, 1994, p. 236). The phenomenon studied, conflicts related to fraternities and sororities, could have been explored and described by examining every conflict at every institution that has fraternities and sororities. This approach would have been an immense undertaking and would have required significant time and resources. By focusing on one institution, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, the researcher was able to dive deeply into the case and describe it fully.
This study further narrowed the scope of the case by focusing on only a small number of conflicts related to fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan, rather than attempting to explore them all. Reviewing a small number of conflicts allowed those conflicts to be scrutinized deeply in an attempt to explain how these conflicts changed the organizational structure of the university through the lens of organizational theory and conflict theory. Stake (1994) describes this approach as an instrumental case study. This type of case study is used to “provide insight into an issue or refinement of theory” (p. 237). This approach stands in contrast to an intrinsic case study which examines the case because the researcher wants to better understand the case itself (Stake, 1994).

Certain responsibilities are inherent in using a case study approach. First, the researcher must take care to bound the case and explain what was actually being studied. Next, the phenomenon had to be explained carefully. Then, patterns of data were sought to highlight the issues present in the case study. Following that, data was triangulated to strengthen descriptions and findings, alternative interpretations were selected and pursued, and finally, assertions or generalizations about the case were developed.

The case for this study was bound within the University of Michigan and conflicts related to fraternities and sororities. The phenomenon, conflicts related to fraternities and sororities, was described and explained. As data was selected and analyzed, care was taken to find patterns in the data, triangulate observations, seek alternative interpretations, and in developing assertions and generalizations.

**Historical analysis.** The conflicts analyzed for this study were explored through an historical context in which they occurred. Bricknell (2011) explained this type of approach, referred to as historical analysis, “a method of the examination of evidence in coming to an
To fully understand historical analysis, it is important to understand what is meant by the term “history.” For this study, history was thought of as “multivocal” and “interpretive.” History is multivocal in that “any one reading of a historical datum may coexist with other readings that are also ‘true’” (Tuchman, 1994, p. 316). For this reason, history was also thought of as interpretive. The researcher reviewed the data and texts available, corroborated that information if possible, and then interpreted what it meant (Tuchman, 1994). It was the job of the researcher to create “a credible story… creating a montage that speaks” (p. 317). History was thought of as what we can interpret from the past based on the stories that can be gathered and analyzed.

This historical lens was vital to understanding the data gathered while analyzing the artifacts gathered and critical incidents used for this study. Understanding the context in which these incidents existed helped with the interpretation of their meaning. Without the historical context, the only context that could be used is a contemporary context which may have been wholly inconsistent with what the data was trying to convey in its own time. Understanding the context of the time does not necessarily mean understanding everything there is to know about that time. It was important to study only what was actually relevant to the information that was being sought for this study (Tuchman, 1994). Using a historical analysis approach in conjunction with a case study method provided a full and rich description of the case and its context.

**Conceptual Framework**

The problem explored in this study was that the values of fraternities and sororities continued to conflict with those of institutional actors, which has been happening since their inception. The misbehavior of fraternities and sororities is in direct conflict with the founding principles of their national organizations as well as their institutions (Matthews, et al., 2009;
Maisel, 1990). The conflicting values and actions between fraternities and sororities and their host institutions led, in some instances, to organizational change. The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan and the implications it had on student affairs. This study was conducted by analyzing three distinct eras (two eras of politicization and one era of quiescence). Each era featured conflict between fraternal organizations and institutional actors (e.g., faculty, staff), and was analyzed to determine what, if any, implications there were for student affairs at the University of Michigan. Given the problem and purpose of this study, organizational theory, conflict and privatization, and historical knowledge of fraternity and sorority life broadly and at the University of Michigan guided this study.

**Organizational theory.** Organizational theory was utilized to understand what implications the actions of fraternities and sororities may have had for the structure of student affairs at the University of Michigan. This set of work examines elements of organizations, why organizations develop certain elements instead of others, and how elements and structure of organizations impacts other aspects of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2017). The leading organizational theory used for this study was from Thompson (2003), who built upon T. Parsons (1960) work regarding organizations. Thompson defines complex organizations as “open systems, hence indeterminate and faced with uncertainty, but at the same time as subject to criteria of rationality and hence needing determinateness and certainty” (p. 10). He then applied Parsons’ model which suggested that organizations have three levels of hierarchical structure - technical, managerial, and institutional (T. Parsons, 1960).

**Technical level.** At the center of every organization is its “core process” or its “basic method of transforming raw materials into finished products” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 65). For
an institution of higher education like the University of Michigan, the technical levels, or core processes, is research. The university’s main function is to develop new, innovative research. Organizations seek to create rationality, or “a style of behavior that is appropriate to the achievement of given goals, within the limits imposed by given condition and constraints” (Simon, 1972, p. 161). Plainly, institutions of higher education want students and the research process to act in accordance with the goals of teaching and producing research. In reality, both are complex functions that may be impacted by forces within the organization and from the environment (Thompson, 2003).

**Managerial level.** To mitigate these outside forces, and to bring rationality to the core processes, universities create structures, process, and policies to control or diffuse internal and external forces acting on the institution. The managerial level acts to mediate between the technical level and those who use it. Additionally, the managerial level gathers resources and materials necessary for the technical level to function (Thompson, 2003). In essence, the managerial level allows the technical level to operate in an open system and gives it the ability to function, while also protecting it from outside forces.

**Buffering.** Two ways in which the managerial level acts is to protect the technical level through buffering and bridging. Buffering is used under norms of rationality when organizations, “[surround] their technical core with input and output components” (Thompson, 2003, p. 20). This allows organizations to prepare for fluctuations in their market by reducing any impact from the environment. For an organization like the University of Michigan, buffering may take the form of creating systems to mitigate environmental factors before they can impact the teaching and research done by faculty.
Bridging. Whereas buffering operates in an attempt to maintain a closed, rational system, bridging is used when operating in an open-system. In this case, it is recognized that the organization must rely on the environment to maintain its meaning and legitimacy, and also to gain resources (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2005). For an institution of higher education this may be accomplished by creating partnerships or joining associations with other like institutions or strategic partners, or by imitating practices found in the environment (Shinn, 2013; Scott, 2003).

Institutional level. The third level of an organization is the institutional level (Thompson, 2003). While an organization attempts to establish a closed, rational system at the technical level, it is impacted by the environment in which it is situated at the institutional level. At this level, the meaning or purpose of the organization is determined by its context (Thompson, 2003). The University of Michigan is situated in the context of higher education, as a public institution in the state of Michigan, and is perceived as a prestigious institution producing high-quality research. These contexts help provide purpose and meaning to the organization at the institutional level. In gaining this meaning, or legitimization, the institution is able to gather resources from the environment in which it is situated but, at the same time, is impacted by the environment. So, while the organization remains independent to control what it does, it is also fairly dependent on the environment to gain resources (Thompson, 2003).

Cultural level. In his study exploring theocratic governance and divergent Catholic cultural groups in the USA, Muwonge (2012) explained that the culture of an organization, and how it orients itself within the cultural environment, is different, but just as important, from the institutional activities of an organization:
Data showed that institutional and cultural demands on the organizations were not necessarily the same and, in some cases, institutional and cultural demands stood in contradiction. To survive, organizations had to attend to the demands of one without compromising the other. (Muwonge, 2012, p. 371)

The cultural level of an organization “entails dressing centrally dictated… tenets in cultural garb in ways that can be understood by members of specific subcultures” (p. 371). In plain terms, the cultural level deals with the values and beliefs (e.g., language, activities, rituals) of the organization.

**Task environment.** The environment must also be considered. While the term environment can literally mean “everything else” (Thompson, 2003, p. 26), Thompson adopts the concept of the “task environment” from Dill (1958) to focus on what is relevant, or might be relevant, to the technical level and goals of the organization (Thompson, 2003). Exploring the task environment limits the scope of analysis to factors and organizations which might impact the organization in question.

Organizations are dependent on their task environment in proportion to their needs for resources from the environment and based on their ability to provide or find those same resources in other spaces (Thompson, 2003). Organizations also provide resources and services to their environments. In this way, the power of the organization in relation to its environment is determined by inputs and outputs. If an organization is overly reliant on its environment for inputs and does not provide the same level of outputs to the environment, then the environment has power over the organization. The opposite is also true. If an organization provides more to the environment than it needs from it, or if the organization has more than one source of resources and does not have to rely on one source, it will have some power. It is important to
note that organizations and their environment can also grow in power together as interdependence grows (Thompson, 2003).

**Institutional environment.** The institutional environment is a second environment an organization must navigate. It represents an organization's right to exist or its source of legitimacy: “Organizations receive support and legitimacy to the extent that they conform to contemporary norms—as determined by professional and scientific authorities—concerning the ‘appropriate’ ways to organize” (Scott, 2003, p. 137). This environment consists of rules and regulations which organizations have to adhere to maintain their support and legitimacy (Scott & Meyer, 1983). For the University of Michigan, the institutional environment consists of external entities like the State of Michigan, the NCAA, and similar institutions of higher education.

**Cultural environment.** The third environment to consider is the cultural environment: “The cultural environment determines what, in the eyes of a specific culture, are considered legitimate… practices” (Muwonge, 2012, p. 371). This environment is the values and beliefs of those around the organization. For the University of Michigan, this environment consists of the values and beliefs of external entities like the people of the State of Michigan, parents of students attending the university, and alumni.

**Political organizations.** Organizational theory broadly helps to explain the structure of organizations and how various parts of an organization interact. Organizations can be further described by what type of organization they are (Birnbaum, 1988; Bolman & Deal, 2017). One such type is a political organization. Birnbaum (1988) describes a political college or university as “a shifting kaleidoscope of interest groups and coalitions. The patterns in the kaleidoscope are not static, and group membership, participation, and interests constantly change with emerging issues” (p. 132). Similarly, Bolman and Deal (2017) described political organizations as “roiling
arenas, hosting ongoing contests arising from individual and group interests” (p. 184). They offered five propositions to summarize this perspective:

1. Organizations are coalitions of different individuals and interest groups.
2. Coalition members have enduring differences in values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality.
3. Most important decisions involve allocating scarce resources—deciding who gets what.
4. Scarce resources and enduring differences put conflict at the center of day-to-day dynamics and make power the most important asset.
5. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining and negotiating among competing stakeholders jockeying for their own interests. (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 184)

It is important to note that this only accounts for one aspect of the institution. Organizations can be viewed through multiple frames (Bolman & Deal, 2017) or in a variety of different ways (Birnbaum, 1988). This study explored conflict related to the University of Michigan’s fraternities and sororities, and for this reason, the university was considered as a political organization.

**Conflict & the privatization/socialization of conflict.** Conflict is a natural aspect of the political organization (Birnbaum, 1988; Bolman & Deal, 2017; Schattschneider, 1975). Bolman and Deal (2017) argued that conflict is inevitable within organizations because scarce resources and divergent interests will always lead to conflict. Further, they contended that conflict is not a bad thing and can lead to new ideas and innovation (Bolman & Deal, 2017).

Schattschneider (1975) stated that conflict is not only inevitable, but it is also highly contagious. Using a fight as an analogy, he explained that conflict involves those who are directly involved in the fight, but also includes the audience. The audience can swing the way the
fight goes by getting involved in the fight and backing one fighter or the other. To this end, Schattschneider suggested the outcome of conflict is dependent on the scope of it. The number of people involved in the conflict can determine how it resolves (Schattschneider, 1975).

Who is actually involved in the conflict, or excluded from it, is just as important as how many are involved. Political organizations tend to favor upper-class participants and will often exclude everyone else (Schattschneider, 1975). Only when it is advantageous to include other players with political organizations bring them into a conflict (Schattschneider, 1975). This gives way to the concepts of privatization and socialization.

The privatization of conflict occurs when conflict is resolved privately, or between the original “combatants” in the fight. Socialization of conflict occurs when the conflict is broadened to include other players, or the audience, to help sway the outcome (Schattschneider, 1975). Schattschneider (1975) indicated that the original participant in the conflict that has the best chance of winning often seeks to privatize the conflict, or to control it so that it does not grow. The participant that stands to lose the conflict will seek to socialize the conflict to sway support to its side.

Privatization/socialization are important concepts applying to fraternities and sororities involved with conflict. Depending on the conflict, either side may seek to privatize or socialize conflict (depending on who stands to benefit from gaining public support). For example, if a fraternity community were to feel that a new university policy unfairly targeted their community, it may seek to socialize the conflict by gaining support of other student organizations or the student body as a whole. The university may seek to privatize the conflict to keep it between the institution and the fraternity community so as to limit the scope of the conflict, minimize the time and resources needed to handle the conflict, and stay out of the public eye. A visual concept
of this conflict can be seen in Figure 3, where the fraternity community is on the smaller side of the conflict (AB) and the university is on the larger side.
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One way that participants in a conflict seek to privatize or socialize conflict is by changing it (Schattschneider, 1975). For the fraternity community that considers itself targeted by the university, it may seek to socialize the conflict by shifting it so that it can apply to a larger base. It may, for example, state that it is only a matter of time before the same unfair policies that are targeting the fraternity community will be aimed at other student organizations. In this way, the fraternity community will have shifted the conflict to include a larger number of participants. Similarly, the university can seek to shift the conflict to show that the policy was not targeting the fraternity unfairly but rather was put in place to increase the safety and security of all students on campus. In this way, the university may be able to limit the number of participants willing to join the fraternity community cause (because there are few who would argue against
increasing safety and security) and would be able to maintain a privatized conflict. Figure 4 illustrates how the conflict might look after it has been changed by the fraternity (CD) or by the university (EF).


The shift of conflict creates new battlegrounds and, eventually, render the original conflict obsolete (Schattschneider, 1975). Through the constantly changing nature of conflict—changing participants, fluctuating scope, introduction of new elements, etc.—the participants often find themselves coming to the middle to resolve the conflict (Schattschneider, 1975). The path to a middle ground may look different for the various players in the conflict, but they still generally find their way to an agreement. In this way, conflict impacts organizations by forcing them to change or adapt based on how they managed the conflict and how it was resolved (Bolman & Deal, 2017).
Organizations seek to privatize conflict, when possible, to maintain a state of stasis (True, Jones, & Baumgartner, 2007) or quiescence (Iannaccone, 1982), where policymaking is stable and incremental. When these conflicts socialize, however, periods of crisis, or dissatisfaction, can occur where there becomes a divide between the governance of an organization and the demands of the people impacted by it (Iannaccone & Lutz, 1978; True, et al., 2007). Iannaccone (1982) indicated that these periods of quiescence and politicization are cyclical. He stated, “High politicization and expanded political conflict alternate with longer periods of quiescence” (p. 3). Periods of politicization are characterized by policymaking that is “more abrupt, less consistent, and sometimes contradictory” (p. 5). Periods of quiescence stand in contrast to politicization. Generally, a state of quiescence features incremental change that builds off of previous policy. During periods of quiescence, policymaking builds on previously established policy. Periods of politicization challenge the process of policymaking itself, focusing instead on the ideological aspects of policy. In this way, previously established policies can be disregarded in favor of completely new policies (Iannaccone, 1982; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1978; True, et al., 2007).

One way that organizations seek to privatize conflict and maintain periods of quiescence is by reassuring the masses (cultural environment) when they feel threatened (Edelman, 1985a; Edelman, 1998; Edelman, 1985b). This is accomplished by offering condensation symbols, or symbolic gestures, which provide reassurance in the face of a perceived threat. These symbols are often emotionally charged, and the results are unable to be verified with data (Edelman, 1985b). These condensation symbols, which may include acts such as releasing public statements acknowledging a concern and promising action or creating (and publicizing) a task force to address a situation, provide people with reassurance even if the symbolic gesture has done
nothing to change the actual perceived threat. Condensation symbols allow people to focus on other threats, helping the organization privatize the original conflict (Edelman, 1985b).

Whereas organizations use condensation symbols that provide little real change to reassure the masses, they also seek to manage conflict using referential symbols (Edelman, 1985b). Referential symbols provide concrete action and are able to be checked using available data. These symbols are often less publicized than condensation symbols and the change they bring about happens outside the public eye (Edelman, 1985b). Examples of referential symbols include the creation of processes where organizations can standardize responses, plan and coordinate responses, or mutually adjust to conflict with the environment (Thompson, 2003).

To minimize cost and resources necessary to coordinate responses, organizations seek to first localize responses by reciprocal interdependent positions, then by sequentially dependent positions, and finally by grouping like positions. From this, hierarchy is created. Positions are created or positioned to handle ever more specific conflicts and grouped with similar positions under increasingly broad areas. When conflict becomes too specific, entities like committees and project groups are created to address them (Thompson, 2003).

When dealing with situations of interdependence on entities in the task environment, boundary-spanning structures are created in the fashion described in the previous paragraph to work with those entities to shield the technical core of the organization (Thompson, 2003). These structures are situated to manage various aspects of the environment and are further sub-divided to match more specific aspects of the environment. If the technical core and boundary-spanning structures can be maintained separately except for scheduling, organizations will be centralized with functional areas surrounding the core. If the technical core and boundary-spanning structures are interdependent, components will be segmented and arranged in similar groups,
with each group controlling its own domain. This is a decentralized organizational model (Thompson, 2003). The University of Michigan operates as a decentralized organization, with multiple units (i.e., health system, athletics, academics, and student life) each controlling their own domain.

Institutions like the University of Michigan are in the business of teaching and producing research. When other factors impact their ability to conduct these processes, or take attention away from them, they will act in a way to reduce the impact of those factors. This is why institutions respond to conflicts. Conflicts create threats to the core process of the institution, which causes actors within the institution to create units, policies, and procedures to be utilized by the managerial and institutional levels. To fully understand the implications that these conflicts may have had on student affairs, data regarding conflicts related to fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan were examined.

**Data**

**Data needed.** To fully explore and describe the case, the data needed for this study consisted of artifacts related to fraternity and sorority life at the University of Michigan. These artifacts were reviewed for references to critical incidents. Based on a search of documents available at the Bentley Historical Library and on the internet pertaining to this subject (Humphrey, 2010), artifacts reviewed included the following:

- meeting minutes from various sources such as the University of Michigan Regents, Interfraternity Council (governing body of many campus fraternities), and the Panhellenic Association (governing body of many campus sororities) as well as individual fraternities and sororities (meeting minutes from the National Pan-Hellenic
Council and Multicultural Greek Council are not separated out in the archives and may be included as individual chapter notes or in general Greek Life files);

- notes and reports from the President, Vice President of Student Affairs, Dean of Students, and other administrators who worked with fraternities and sororities;
- campus maps and logs that indicated which fraternities and sororities were active at various times throughout the institution’s history;
- archives from the campus newspaper, *The Michigan Daily*; and
- other media sources such as pictures, videos, and audio recordings.

It was important to gather as much data pertaining to each critical incident as possible. This allowed for as many voices from each event as possible to come through in the interpretation of what happened and what implications each event had.

Three conflicts were examined for this study. This number of conflicts was selected to provide space for multiple types of conflicts that occurred in various times throughout the history of the fraternity and sorority community at the University of Michigan. Fewer conflicts could have resulted in missing key findings, while more could have resulted in a redundancy of outcomes. These conflicts were selected through an emergent process; as historical documents were reviewed and analyzed, conflicts were selected.

**Instrument to collect data.** The collection of data was accomplished through document and record analysis, collectively referred to as artifacts. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described records as “any written or recorded statement prepared by or for an individual or organization for the purpose of *attesting to an event or providing an accounting*” (p. 277). Examples included items such as rosters, grade files, and meeting minutes. Lincoln and Guba found that documents are defined as “any written or recorded material *other than a record* that was not prepared
specifically in response to a request from the inquirer” (p. 277). Examples of documents included letters, newspaper articles, case studies, and photographs.

Evidence, such as artifacts, was gathered from the University of Michigan archives (Humphrey, 2010). The University of Michigan is home to the Bentley Historical Library, which “collects the materials for and promotes the study of the histories of two great, intertwined institutions, the State of Michigan and the University of Michigan” (Bentley Historical Library, 2018a). To maximize efficiency and effectiveness while conducting research at the historical library, the researcher conducted prior research to locate possible artifacts in the library catalog system and reached out to the archivist to ask for assistance (Humphrey, 2010).

A second method used to collect data for this study was exploring information available through the internet. The digital library of the University of Michigan provided access to artifacts including photographs and scanned documents, regents’ meeting notes, and reports made to the regents by past university presidents. These artifacts provided important information directly related to how the university responded to certain conflicts, as well as contextual information to the time in which those conflicts were occurring.

Regardless of source, both primary and secondary sources were analyzed. Primary sources provided data that was produced directly by those involved in the conflicts (Yin, 2016). Examples of these included letters written by the Dean of Men, fraternity men, or fraternity advisors. Secondary sources were those that were created by people who were describing an event that happened (Yin, 2016). Examples of secondary sources included a summarization of events found in a yearbook and a news article written about an event that happened on campus. Both of these types of sources added to the overall story being told. Primary sources provided direct voice to the story, while the secondary sources offered context.
After the data was gathered, it was analyzed. To start, data and artifacts were reviewed to ensure they were useful. This step was completed by determining the genealogy/originality of the artifacts or information, the genesis of the artifacts or information, and the authority of the creators of the artifacts or information (Humphrey, 2010). After the artifacts and data were analyzed in these ways, it was all compiled, disassembled, and reassembled before it was interpreted, and conclusions were drawn (Yin, 2016).

Yin (2016) shared that researchers should be able to read between the lines of documents and be inquisitive about them to get the most from them. During the initial process of gathering data and reviewing artifacts, the researcher continually analyzed the information for its usefulness. This was arranged in three ways with each new piece of information. First, each item was reviewed to determine the genealogy/originality of the artifact. Each artifact was analyzed to determine if it was an original or as close to the original artifact that was available. This process garnered as much unaltered, original information as possible. Next, an attempt was made to determine the genesis of each artifact, or where it came from. By reviewing the context in which the artifact was created, who created it, and where it came from a determination was made as to whether it directly pertained to the topic of this study and how important it was. Third, the authorial authority of each artifact was reviewed to determine if the creator was in a position of authority on the subject. If so, the artifact might have provided more relevance than an artifact that was produced by someone with no authority on the subject (Humphrey, 2010).

After gathering useful data and artifacts, the data was catalogued, categorized, and coded. Cataloguing involved assigning unique codes to documents so they could be easily found and retrieved. Categorizing is similar to cataloguing but organizes information in different, predetermined ways so it may be sorted based on patterns and themes. Whereas categorizing
places data and artifacts in predetermined groups, coding refers to giving labels to the information specific to a certain piece of data or artifact (Love, 2003). This was settled using the five phases of analysis and their interactions model as seen in Figure 5 (Yin, 2016).

*Figure 5. Five phases of analysis and their interactions. From Yin, R. (2016). *Qualitative research from start to finish* (2nd ed.). New York: Guliford.*

**Phase One.** The first phase in this process was to compile the information gathered. Any notes, data, or artifacts was compiled into a useful order, or database. This was finalized by cataloguing the collected data.

**Phase Two.** In the second phase, all of the data was “disassembled,” or broken down into smaller pieces. This was completed by categorizing the collected data.
**Phase Three.** In the third phase, the data was reassembled or organized in new ways. This was arranged after the data had been coded and was then reorganized into new patterns or themes.

**Phase Four.** In the fourth phase, the data was interpreted. This was accomplished by using the newly reassembled data from Phase Three. The new interpretations lead to further reassembling of the data in order to seek multiple, alternative interpretations.

**Phase Five.** In the fifth phase, conclusions were drawn based on the interpretations made in phase four and based on the conceptual framework used for this study. The final step was important because it allowed for the story to be told and answered the research questions proposed in this study. It was also important during this final step to realize where there were holes in the conclusions being drawn in order to either conduct further research or go in a different direction with the study.

**Self as a Research Instrument**

As indicated previously, I approached this study from a constructivist paradigm using elements of natural inquiry. Lincoln and Guba (1985) shared that the naturalistic paradigm “asserts that inquiry is value-bound, specifically, that it is influenced by the values of the inquirer” (p. 161). As the “inquirer” for this study, my values and beliefs influenced how I interpreted any findings. Therefore, it was important that I disclosed my values, beliefs, and biases.

My purpose for undertaking this research was to better understand how fraternities and sororities have influenced the institutions they are hosted by. As a member of a fraternity and former fraternity advisor at the University of Michigan, I have always believed in the value of
the fraternity and sorority experience. Although I no longer work directly with fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan, I maintain my membership in the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA) and volunteer to provide educational capacities for various fraternities, sororities, and campus communities. I also understand that fraternities and sororities can cause harm and that much of the research regarding fraternities and sororities cast the experience in a negative light to the point where many are calling for significant changes to how the organizations operate on college campuses. I believe understanding the history and context of fraternities and sororities, as well what implications they had for student affairs at the university, is vital to creating substantive and lasting changes that will benefit both campus communities and fraternity and sorority communities alike.

I believed it also important to disclose that, as the research instrument, I worked at the University of Michigan. Although my role did not directly work with or impact the operations of fraternities and sororities, I did work in the Dean of Students Office that manages Fraternity and Sorority Life at the university. Along with my previous role as the Assistant Director of Greek Life and IFC Advisor at the University of Michigan, my own experiences helped to inform this study.

**Moral, Ethic, and Legal Issues**

The conclusions drawn from this study will only be trusted if the researcher can provide a high level of research integrity (Yin, 2016). The goal for this study was to explore and describe the phenomenon in a truthful and unobstructed manner. However, this does not mean that certain biases did not exist. The researcher has already described himself as a research instrument, indicating how his morals will assist in guiding his research. Further, he sought to ensure research integrity by conducting the research under certain ethical principles, explaining
measures used to reduce the impact on others, and obtaining institutional review board approval for the study.

**Ethics.** Whereas my personal disclosures and claimed biases speak to my morals, or intrinsic set of values, my guiding ethical principles, or extrinsic set of values learned from society, must also be discussed (Keniston, 1965). Ethical issues including harm, consent, deception, privacy, and confidentiality of data were considered. In the course of conducting this study, care was taken to reduce harm to participants, obtain consent from all who participated, be truthful, and maintain the privacy and confidentiality of all people involved (Punch, 1994).

**Code of Ethics.** Guiding the ethical considerations for this study was a code of ethics. Codes of ethics are guides for conducting oneself in an ethical manner and are typically associated with a particular field or profession (Yin, 2016). The code guiding this study came from the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors (AFA).

The AFA Code of Ethics contains general ethical considerations as well as ethical considerations for practice. AFA offers 12 general ethical considerations for all members. All 12 were adhered to for this study, but of particular importance were the following:

1. Maintain the highest standard of personal conduct.
2. Actively promote and encourage the highest level of ethics within the profession and my institution or organization.
3. Maintain loyalty to the institution that employs me and pursue its objectives in ways that are consistent with the public interest.
4. Recognize and discharge my responsibility and that of my institution or organization to uphold all laws and regulations relating to my institution’s or organization’s policies and activities.

7. Serve all members of my institution impartially.

8. Maintain the confidentiality of privileged information entrusted or known to me by virtue of my position.

9. Refuse to engage in, or countenance, discrimination on the basis of race, sex, age, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.

10. Always communicate the institution’s internal and external statements in a truthful and accurate manner by assuring that there is integrity in the data and information used by my institution or organization.

12. Use every opportunity to improve public understanding of the role of fraternity advising. (Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, 2018)

These ethical principles implored me to serve the institution where I am employed, maintain legal and ethical standards, and serve all members of the institution. I used these guiding principles throughout my research process, in conjunction with my personal morals, to maintain an ethical, moral, and legal approach.

**Unobtrusive measures.** An issue that arises when conducting qualitative research is that of reflexivity, or the influence that I as the researcher might have had on the subject of the study. Reflexivity can be reduced, or eliminated, by using unobtrusive measures (Yin, 2016). Using unobtrusive measures allowed me to reduce harm and protect all those involved in this study. Unobtrusive measures are “derived from the existing features of a social environment that have
resulted from people’s natural interactions in the environment—that is, not instigated in any way by a research study or by a researcher’s presence” (Yin, 2016, p. 341).

The historical nature of this study, along with the availability of archival data in the historical library and through the digital library, allowed for the use of unobtrusive measures. Two of the conflicts that were analyzed in this study were from a time before any current employee was at the University of Michigan. Additionally, the participants in those two conflicts may no longer be living given the age of the university and the fraternity and sorority community. Data for the third study was gathered using unobtrusive measures and contained artifacts that were maintained by the university, including emails and meeting notes.

The use of unobtrusive measures did not entirely absolve me of ethical responsibility. Even though I did not interact with any human subjects in this study, the study itself was about my employer, the University of Michigan. The data used for this study was all publicly available, but any conclusions drawn from it were my own and may assist or damage the institution or the fraternity and sorority community. Furthermore, the conclusions from this research may be used to inform future decisions regarding fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan. For these reasons, I was, and remain, prepared to act ethically if the research presents damaging information for anyone involved.

**IRB approval.** A final step ensuring ethical practices were used throughout the course of conducting this research was to submit the study to the institutional review board (IRB). The IRB reviews any research that is conducted using human subjects for ethical hazards and safeguards. Upon submitting a study for review, the IRB may approve the study, reject the study, request modifications to the study, or exempt the study from approval (Yin, 2016). One criterion by which a study may be exempted from IRB approval is if it involves
the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to subjects.” (University Human Subjects Review Committee, 2018, pp. 1-2)

This study was deemed exempt by the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee because the data was preexisting and publicly available.

**Validity and Reliability**

After establishing research integrity, the trustworthiness of the study had to be accounted for. The trustworthiness of a study was established by addressing the validity and reliability of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A valid study is one that “has properly interpreted its data, so that the conclusions accurately reflect and represent the real world that was studied” (Yin, 2016, p. 88). A reliable study is one that can be replicated or produce similar results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Both of these were addressed in this study.

**Validity.** For this study to be considered valid, it had to show that it accurately reflected and represented what was studied. If the idea of one “truth” is rejected, however, the concept of validity changes. From the lens that reality is multiple and interpretive, for a study to be valid, the researcher must show that he “has represented those multiple constructions [of reality] adequately, that is, that the reconstructions that have been arrived at via the inquiry are credible to the constructors of the original multiple realities” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 296). This study attempted to create validity by showing that the conclusions drawn did adequately describe and represent the realities presented. Three tactics, including triangulation, peer debriefing, and rival
thinking, were utilized to establish validity. Additionally, the idea of external validity will be discussed.

**Triangulation.** Triangulation was one method used to verify the information contained in this study. This was done by finding multiple sources that verified a piece of information when possible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Yin, 2016). The power of triangulation was that if multiple sources verify a piece of information, then it was more likely to be valid. If different sources offered different accounts of an event or piece of information, then it could be inferred that at least one of the sources was incorrect, or that the perceptions that participants had of the event or piece of information varied (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

For this study, triangulation was achieved when possible by using both primary and secondary sources. This was difficult to achieve at times due to the historical nature of the data collected. In some instances, a piece of information was only referenced once in any of the available data and there was nobody alive to corroborate that information. When possible, however, multiple sources were used to verify data that was presented.

**Peer debriefing.** A second technique that was used to establish validity was peer debriefing. This technique involved talking with a “disinterested” peer who viewed the data and study from a different perspective than the researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Throughout the course of this study, the researcher debriefed with the members of his dissertation committee who provided feedback and offered their perspective. Subjects that were debriefed included the research design, data collected, interpretation of that data, conclusions drawn, and more.

**Rival thinking.** Finally, rival thinking was sought to establish validity in this study. Rival thinking refers to the process where the researcher was consistently skeptical about his research
and sought to disprove data or conclusions or find alternative explanations (Yin, 2016). This process forced the researcher to view the data from multiple perspectives and could either provide further evidence for or against certain assumptions or conclusions that were made throughout the research process. In the end, practicing rival thinking created a more valid study where most disconfirming evidence and alternative explanations were accounted for, and what was left was the best representation of the multiple constructions of reality available (Yin, 2016).

**External validity.** External validity is concerned with the generalizability of findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Because the purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan and the implications it had on student affairs, generalizing findings to another institution may not be possible. The history, context, and events were mostly unique to the University of Michigan, and so, the findings from this study will not necessarily hold true for other institutions.

Alternatively, what may be generalizable is the conceptual framework and research design given a similar context. However, it is the responsibility of the reader, not the researcher, to determine if the findings of the study, its conceptual framework, or the research design are transferable (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). It is the hope of the researcher of this study that aspects of the study are generalizable. If this is the case, other institutions may have a guide to studying the implications for student affairs of conflicts related to fraternities and sororities at their own institutions.

**Reliability.** In a conventional sense, reliability is the idea that a study can be reproduced or produce similar results when completed again (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Given that this study explored human interactions and was interpreted through the lens of the researcher, it is highly unlikely that a similar study conducted at a different institution, or even one conducted using the
same information with a different researcher, would produce the same results. The mere fact that people are involved, indicates that factors will change (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

One way to address reliability in this type of study is by clearly stating the research questions and the researcher’s role and biases, and clearly specifying the conceptual framework and theories used for the study. The research questions for the study and the researcher’s role and biases in relation to the study have been discussed previously and should provide sufficient information to understand how the study was being conducted and how the researcher interacted with the data. The conceptual framework and theoretical underpinnings for the study came from the field of organizational theory and conflict theory and were informed by the historical contexts of fraternities and sororities nationally and at the University of Michigan specifically. Altogether, the reader should have a sense of how the study was created, how the researcher impacted the study, and what frame and theories were used.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this writing was to make the research design for this study explicit, thereby strengthening the credibility of the study (Yin, 2016). The reader should have an understanding of the research design and traditions used, what data was needed, and how it was gathered and analyzed. Finally, moral and ethical considerations were discussed as well as how the researcher attended to questions of validity and reliability.
Chapter 4: Three Eras of Conflict

Three critical incidents are described for this study. The first critical incident examines the Fraternity War, which occurred from 1845 to 1851. The second critical incident reviews the bias clause and discriminatory membership selection issue from 1950 to 1970. The third critical incident chronicles the ski trip incident from 2015 to the present.

First Era of Politicization: Fraternity War, 1845-1851

“... gold tried seven times in the fire is therefore more pure...” —Beta Theta Pi Meeting Minutes, November 13, 1845

Introduction. Originally chartered in 1817 in Detroit, the first classes at the University of Michigan were not taught until 1841. Shortly after, in 1837, the University of Michigan was moved to Ann Arbor. The first class of students consisted of six men, five freshmen and one sophomore (Farrand, 1885). By 1842, the student population had grown to 10 male students. By the 1844-45 year, there were 55 students attending the university (Farrand, 1885).

In 1840, Professor George Williams, under direction from the Board of Regents (University of Michigan, 1915), sought to limit the unchecked growth of student organizations by writing Article 20, Chapter 4 of the College Regulations, which stated, “No student shall be or become a member of any society connected with the university or consisting of students, which as not first submitted its constitution to the faculty and received their approbation” (Schurtz, 1928, p. 27). Much later, in an 1850 report written to the Board of Regents, it was explained that this rule was adopted for the university because other universities had it in their rules, and to avoid the creation of organizations which existed outside the governance of the university. The faculty explained that this rule was not in place because of fraternities, because at the time, fraternities were not an issue at the university (it was written prior to the first class of
student being admitted to the university in Ann Arbor). Rather, they looked to other American institutions which had come before the University of Michigan, and they looked to German institutions. On the latter, the faculty wrote,

German university have long been overrun with student clans, existing in great maturity who fill the halls and recitation rooms with riot, disturb the community with frays and fights, and indulge in the utmost license of debauchery, drunkenness, pugilism, and dueling. (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928, p. 34)

They went on to write of fraternities,

They are now… powerful enough to over-awe nearly all the college governments of our country; how soon they will have attained among us the despotic power of disorder and savagism rife among their German prototypes, time, or rather the sense and firmness of our authority and of the parents of Michigan, must decide. (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928, p. 34)

Just as Professor Williams expected, as the student population grew, so too did student activities. Students began to create literary societies, such as Phi Phi Alpha and Alpha Nu, to assist them with their composition and elocution skills. These societies were approved by the faculty and Board of Regents and given space on campus to meet and store books (Ten Brook, 1875; Schurtz, 1928). The faculty, in their report to the Board of Regents explaining why fraternities were problematic, explained that the two literary societies were not only approved but were “cherished by the Regents and the Faculty” (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928, p. 36). They explained this:
The college buildings are on purpose so constructed as to supply in each the commodious rooms for their meetings and their libraries, and one evening in each week all other duties are suspended to allow them time for these valuable society exercises. (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928, p. 36).

For a time, Professor Williams’ rule, which came to be known as the “Twentieth Rule” (Schurtz, 1928), was applied to all student organizations which sought to gain organizational status on campus. Faculty members lauded the organizations that were present on campus and even sought to help them in their learning and development (Schurtz, 1928). While the “Twentieth Rule” was initially meant to prevent the unnecessary multiplication of literary societies, it eventually came to greater prominence as Greek-letter societies (social fraternities) began to form in secret (Farrand, 1885; Schurtz, 1928; Ten Brook, 1875). The faculty would come to distrust and despise fraternities, and in 1850 they gave eight reasons: (a) the history of the organizations was one of breaking rules; (b) fraternities required the faculty to submit to their requests; (c) the organizations were exclusive and created divides in the student body; (d) members were immature and trapped in membership; (e) meetings were likely to devolve into problematic behavior; (f) the financial obligations of the organizations were too much for many poor students; (g) literary societies were being harmed by fraternities; and (h) fraternities were sources of issues, would multiply, and distract from the mission of the institution (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928).

As fraternities were starting to organize in institutions of higher education in the United States, fraternal organizations were seeking to expand to new campuses. In 1845, a member of Beta Theta Pi came to the University of Michigan and sought to start a chapter. Shortly after, Chi Psi reached out to a student on campus in order to expand (Schurtz, 1928). Later, in 1846, Alpha
Delta Phi expanded as well and then submitted a request to the faculty for admission and offered to share its constitution as required by the code of laws (Farrand, 1885). These organizations were founded as distinct entities opposite from literary societies whose purpose was purely academic. Whereas literary societies were open, inclusive, and known to the faculty, fraternities offered members an experience that was outside the purview of the university and allowed for behavior that was not permitted within the university such as “feasts, strong drink, loose talk about women, cardplaying, and gambling” (Horowitz, 1987, p. 36).

In addition to providing secret spaces for men to gather and enjoy life outside the university, fraternities also allowed for a continued revolt against faculty. Horowitz (1987) describes how college men in the 18th century were in open conflict with faculty over what the life of students should look like. Faculty sought to control students and establish universities as strict centers of learning and highest morality. Students wished to add fun and learning outside of the curriculum to their experience (Horowitz, 1987). Meeting minutes and letters from early fraternities at the University of Michigan show that the spirit of revolt was alive and well (Schurtz, 1928). Fraternity men viewed the faculty as the antagonist to their protagonist in the struggle to determine what life would look like on campus. Certainly, the faculty felt exactly the opposite. This power struggle would be the crux of the Fraternity War.

The creation and purpose of these organizations would not be tolerated by faculty who would seek to disband and expel the organizations and the students affiliated with them. Starting in 1846, the conflict surrounding fraternities at the University of Michigan would last until 1850. The Fraternity War would fully engross the campus and local community and even find its way into the Michigan State Legislature. In the end, it would change the governance structure and personnel at the university and establish fraternities as part of campus life.
The beginning of the Fraternity War. Life for students in the early days of the university was not easy. The university consisted of a Board of Regents consisting of prominent individuals appointed by the governor of Michigan (Shaw, 1941), a handful of faculty members, and less than 100 students enrolled at the Ann Arbor campus. Students were responsible for completing their coursework, maintaining their living quarters, sweeping hallways for the “Professor of Dust and Ashes” (Shaw, 1920, p. 33), and cutting their own wood to stack behind their building and use in their fires (Shaw, 1941). These students were obligated to attend a church service on Sunday and were only allowed to leave campus for meals (Shaw, 1920). Shaw (1941) shared that “college life in those days was pursued under what would appear today a Spartan regime” (p. 36).

In search of some life outside the bleak and monotonous routine of the university, three groups of students formed fraternities in the years 1845 and 1846. Beta Theta Pi was first organized in July of 1845 in the home of Hiram Becker located in Ann Arbor (Schurtz, 1928). In September of that same year, the new organization wrote to the Beta Theta Pi chapter at Western Reserve to obtain formal consent to be established as an official chapter of Beta Theta Pi. Consent was granted through the Miami chapter (the mother chapter of Beta Theta Pi), and the chapter at the University of Michigan was formally established in November of 1845 (Schurtz, 1928).

Chi Psi was the second fraternity to be organized at the university. Shortly after Beta Theta Pi was established, a chapter of Chi Psi was organized in December of 1845 and formally established in April of 1846 during Junior Exhibition Week (Shaw, 1941; Schurtz, 1928). According to the history of Chi Psi, this chapter built the first fraternity house in America. “The
Chi Psi Story” contains an excerpt written by Frank Whitman about the house (referred to as the first “Lodge” by Chi Psi):

Here deep in the wood, on a spot where now stands the chapel of the new [Forest Hill Cemetery], and about three-quarters of a mile from any house, Chi Psi founded a new temple… One of its occupants in those romantic days describes it as a plain, one story structure, twenty by twenty-four feet, with a gable roof. In the gable end was a door, flanked on either side by a small window. Two windows, fitted with sashes, each checkered by twelve panes, admitted what little light struggled through the trees. A large rough chimney rose in the center, dividing the cabin into two rooms of about equal size…

Within were bare walls, devoid of pictures or ornaments, and the furniture consisted of but five chairs and a table, taken after dark from the college building. In these homely surroundings, the faithful gathered for many a month without molestation, and probably without their secret being known to the college authorities. (Chi Psi Fraternity, 2005, p. 70)

This house in the woods would end up playing a significant role in the start of the Fraternity War. A rendering of the house can be seen in Figure 6.
A third fraternity, Alpha Delta Phi, would be established in August of 1846 after the discovery of Beta Theta Pi and Chi Psi by university faculty members (Schurtz, 1928). Alpha Delta Phi, knowing about the discovery and condemnation of Beta Theta Pi and Chi Psi, offered to submit part of their constitution to the regents for approval as a gesture of goodwill. The regents did not have time to make a decision on this new organization, as they were preparing for commencement, so they indicated that they would make a decision on the fraternity at some point in the future. That same day, the fraternity was formally established, without the approval of the regents and faculty. The formation of this final fraternity was the final step in creating the foundation for what would become known as the “Fraternity War” (Schurtz, 1928).

Even from the time of their establishment, there was opposition to these organizations. Meeting minutes of Beta Theta Pi from November 13, 1845 (Figure 7) state,
Although a spirit of opposition has displayed itself to some extent in this university of which we are members, yet we have not quailed before the attempts, on the part of others, to prejudice individuals against us as a fraternity; nor stooped to the degrading necessity of foiling the endeavors of our antagonist neighbors with their own weapons in order to strengthen our own hands. (Beta Theta Pi, University of Michigan Chapter, 1845-1850)

*Figure 7. Meeting Minutes of Beta Theta Pi, Nov. 13, 1845*

Although Beta Theta Pi indicated resistance to their founding, the meeting minutes continue by showing the resolve of the fraternity to persist:

> Ever keeping in mind that gold tried seven times in the fire is therefore more pure, we have essayed by fair and honorable means to augment the intellectual and
moral wealth of our chapter the courage and independence to withstand the darts
with which contention has assaulted them and judging for themselves of the
principles, character, deportment, and bonds of our beloved brotherhood. Hoping
that the blessing and beneficence of an overruling providence may attend us so
long as we act in accordance with the first principles of humanity, love, and duty,
we thus, with implicit confidence in each other, commence and trust to continue
our operations. (Beta Theta Pi, University of Michigan Chapter, 1845-1850)

Not only did the fraternity show resolve in the face of faculty opposition, they seemingly
perceived their struggle for the freedom to exist and meet in secret as noble. The resolve and
perception of being in the right shown by the fraternity would help set the tone for the Fraternity
War.

Although Beta Theta Pi believed there was opposition to their organization in 1845,
Professor Andrew Ten Brook writes that the faculty did not implicitly know about Chi Psi or
Beta Theta Pi until the summer of 1846 (Ten Brook, 1875). Ten Brook, a professor of moral and
intellectual philosophy at the University of Michigan from 1844 to 1851, describes finding out
about the existing secret societies in his book American State Universities: Their Origin and
Progress (Ten Brook, 1875):

In the summer of the year 1846, while some nightly depredations were being
subjected to inquiry by the faculty, some students were traced to a small house
built and occupied by one of their number and his chum, on the edge of a
neighboring wood; and the respondents refused to answer as to what had occurred
there, on the ground that they were pledged to secrecy. (Ten Brook, 1875, p. 194)
The discovery of the Chi Psi Lodge was a clear indicator to faculty that secret societies were indeed existing at the university. Ten Brook indicates that, upon discovery, both Beta Theta Pi and Chi Psi provided lists of their members, stated their affiliation with other organizations on campus, and intimated “that their strength had become such as to make it difficult to deal with them” (Ten Brook, 1875, p. 194).

As the university faculty grappled with how to handle this discovery, Alpha Delta Phi formed. For the faculty, this made the issue all the more pressing as they realized that a large proportion of the students at the university had become members of these organizations (Shaw, 1941). The discussion turned to whether they should enforce the “Twentieth Rule” and abolish the organizations and discipline the students or allow these students and their organizations to exist and grow unfettered by university intervention (Ten Brook, 1875).

**The first battle of the Fraternity War.** Rather than acquiescing to the desires of fraternities to exist outside the rules of the university or expelling the students outright, the faculty compromised and allowed the fraternities to continue under the condition that they would not take any more new members (Schurtz, 1928; Ten Brook, 1875). In a report written by the faculty in 1850, they reflected back on the decision to compromise as the right decision:

The great correctness of the medium course adopted by the Faculty was now evident. It would have been injudicious to have proceeded to the peremptory execution upon existing members, of a law which might soon be regularly repealed. It would have been equally injudicious to allow new members to be admitted so as to be liable to expulsion if the law were retained. Henceforth then, until the Regents should pass upon the law, it became the difficult yet necessary course to retain the evil, yet to prevent its progress. And this will furnish the
answer to those who many accuse the Faculty of inefficiency, or may argue from
the protraction of the contest the impossibility of eradicating the evil. (G.P.
Williams, et al., 1928, p. 35)

While the members of the faculty viewed their decision as one of fairness, the fraternity men saw
it as a sign of weakness and opportunity:

The faculty at first thought of annihilating all secret societies at once; but when
they found how extensive they were and what difficulty they would be likely to
meet with, they concluded to abandon the project, so that those who are now
members will not probably be disturbed; but it will be difficult to sustain the
society in college unless we can induce the faculty to retract, for which purpose
some of our members have suggested the plan of showing certain portions of our
constitution to a member of the faculty, thinking that we might thereby convince
them that our society is a source of improvement, and thus obtain their consent to
a continuation of this chapter. (Parker, 1928)

Believing these organizations to be “evil” and wishing to “prevent [their] progress” the
university faculty allowed fraternities to continue but also created a new policy where newly
admitted students had to sign a pledge indicating that they would not join any organization that
faculty had not approved (Ten Brook, 1875; Schurtz, 1928). The fraternities were quick to agree
to this in order to maintain their standing as students within the university, and the faculty
believed this agreement to be in good faith (Ten Brook, 1875). In spite of this new policy, at
least two of the three fraternities continued to add new members to their ranks.
Beta Theta Pi was quick to attempt to circumvent this new rule by using two “loopholes” contained in their constitution. First, the constitution of Beta Theta Pi allowed for the chapter to be established in a place, Ann Arbor, rather than at a university. This, and the fact that they met off campus property, allowed them to claim that this placed their organization outside the scope of the rules the university had created. The second loophole the fraternity used was not having new members sign the constitution of the fraternity until the day of their graduation. The constitution held that no man was a member of the fraternity until he had signed the constitution. Thus, the fraternity was able to claim that they were not actually accepting new members (Schurtz, 1928). Even with these loopholes, the fraternity knew they were operating on thin technicalities, as evidenced by a letter written to the Miami chapter of Beta Theta Pi on September 28, 1847:

You are probably aware that we are existing against the law, and that all the members of the university are pledged not to join any secret association. The last class was so pledged, but thanks to our guardian spirit we got five of them and as good fellows, too, as ever wore the sparkling badge of the Beta Theta Pi. They did not break their pledge, but took the pledge not to reveal anything previous to signing our constitution—until which, you are well aware, they do not become members. Our prospects for the future are somewhat obscured by the dark clouds of doubt, but we hope and trust that a favorable breeze will soon dissipate them, and leave our path as bright as the morning. (Ransom, 1928, p. 28)

Alpha Delta Phi, similar to Beta Theta Pi, attempted to pledge new members through use of a technicality. They held that their organization existed by “sufferance of the faculty” (Farrand, 1885, p. 75), so they continued to pledge new members. The faculty discovered these
actions in March of 1847 and subsequently suspended all students involved. In their 1850 report, the faculty write that the actions of Alpha Delta Phi were “painful to describe” (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928, p. 35). The went on to say:

They [Alpha Delta Phi] assumed to be a co-ordinate power competent to treat, to wage war, or to compromise with the Faculty. The broached the most desperate principles in morals, played the hero in insulting the Faculty, and defaming their character… The Faculty were warned of the danger of incurring the displeasure of associations which embraced three thousand influential men throughout our country. (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928, p. 35)

A letter written to Alpha Delta Phi Brother Edward Norton in New York from the Michigan chapter explains the dire straits the fraternity found itself in:

In respect to our present condition it is as good as any one could wish. In respect to the future, no one now can divine what will be done. If the rabid Faculty shall be sustained by the Regents at their annual meeting next week, we are on our backs, but if good principle, aided by God Fellowship among our number, can effect it, probable our lives will be spared. We have fought long and hard. This one more battle will end the contest. (Schurtz, 1928)

Eventually, the faculty allowed the students who had newly joined the fraternity to withdraw membership from the fraternity and re-sign their pledge not to join any organization not sanctioned by the university (Farrand, 1885). The original members of the fraternity were allowed to maintain their student status only by signing a document stating:
“Resolved, That no student shall be admitted into any class without examination satisfactory to the faculty and giving a pledge that he will not be a member of any society which is not approved by the faculty.”

We the undersigned, deeply regretting that any part of our past course has come in collision with the laws of the institution, respectfully solicit admission to the University of Michigan, pledging ourselves not to consent to the admission of any member of the University to any society in opposition to the law on the subject passed July 24th, as quoted above. (Farrand, 1885, p. 75)

A failed attempt to resolve the conflict: The Fraternity War rages into 1849. Only a few months later, attempting to be on the right side of the university policy, Alpha Delta Phi again tried to submit their constitution for review in November of 1847. The faculty would not grant them recognition stating they had “no authority to legalize them as a society” (Peckham, 1994, p. 29). The fraternity reacted to the faculty statement by positing that if faculty could not authorize the group then they could not forbid it either (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994). Alpha Delta Phi, still not recognized by the university, continued to operate saying that their organization was not affiliated with the university but was a club in Ann Arbor, their meetings were not held on university property but in the town of Ann Arbor, and that they had at least three members who were not students, including one regent (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928).

In July of 1848, Beta Theta Pi followed the lead of Alpha Delta Phi and attempted to submit their constitution for approval. It too was rejected by the faculty, saying that it came “under the prohibition of the law” (Farrand, 1885, p. 76). Beta Theta Pi, like Alpha Delta Phi, continued to operate without recognition from the university. This forced the Faculty into further action against the fraternities (Farrand, 1885).
As tensions between faculty and students grew, the faculty reached out to the regents and other universities for assistance with the fraternities (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994). After gathering responses, the faculty submitted a report to the regents regarding fraternities containing their own thoughts and experiences regarding fraternities as well as letters from other universities backing their claim that fraternities should be abolished (Farrand, 1885) but also indicating that none of the institutions written to had been able to rid themselves of fraternities (Shaw, 1941). As a result of this report, during their July 1848 meeting, the regents voted on the following resolution submitted by Regent Goodwin:

Resolved, That the students who have hitherto joined secret societies in the university are not thereby to be regarded as amenable to punishment. (Schurtz, 1928, p. 28)

This voted ended in a tie, neither backing fraternities or the Faculty, so the “war merrily continued between the latter two” (Schurtz, 1928, p. 28).

The Fraternity War continued into 1849 where it was to escalate further. Professor Ten Brook wrote,

Soon after [the start of 1849] the publication of the annual catalogue a loose leaf was found in a copy to be sent abroad, containing the names of all the members of one of these societies in the university, among which were found those of many new students. (Ten Brook, 1875, p. 196)

All of the students named on the list acknowledged that they were members but again justified their membership by saying their organizations did not fall under university policies for reasons previously stated. The faculty did not accept these justifications and told the members of Chi Psi
and Alpha Delta Phi that their affiliation with the university would “cease at the opening of the ensuing term [starting in January], unless they renounced their connection with their respective fraternities” (Ten Brook, 1875, p. 196). As a result, seven students from Chi Psi and Alpha Delta Phi withdrew their membership from their organizations and the rest were expelled from the university. Members of Beta Theta Pi were able to avoid punishment in 1849 because the organizations constitution had not been signed, creating the argument that the men were not actually members of the organization (Farrand, 1885; Peckham, 1994). The expulsion of fraternity members removed a large portion of the student body from the university, as shown by the graduation numbers in the following years. In contrast to the graduating class of 1849 (24 students), only 10-12 students graduated from the university each year from 1850 to 1853 (Shaw, 1941).

The conflict widens. The actions taken by the faculty to expel these students were met with great opposition, a revolt. On the night of the proclamation that students would be expelled if they did not renounce their membership, fires were set all over campus in various places such as outhouses and woodsheds. Families from Ann Arbor observed these fires but did nothing to stop them (Ten Brook, 1875). Schurtz wrote of this time in Beta Theta Pi at Michigan, 1845-1926:

The matter had been taken up by the newspapers, and Greek-letter society graduates, who had been in other colleges and had settled in Michigan, began to attack the faculty. The members of the Masonic body and of other secret orders regarded the movement as a revival of the anti-secret agitation of 1827, and were indignant. (Schurtz, 1928, pp. 28-29)
So great was the indignation that citizens held a meeting on December 20, 1849, to discuss the actions taken by the faculty. At this meeting, calls were made for the reinstatement of the fraternity men, the expulsion of the faculty members who voted to remove the students, and for a new method of choosing regents (Peckham, 1994; Schurtz, 1928). From this meeting, a bill was introduced to the Michigan Legislature in 1850 proposing the regents be elected by the people rather than appointed by the governor. The meeting flyer can be seen in Figure 8.

Figure 8. Many Citizens. (1849, December 20). Attention! Indignation Meeting [Flyer]. Pictorial History of Ann Arbor (Fimu F45 Outbox). Bentley Historical Library, Ann Arbor, MI.

Realizing the strict opposition to the actions of the faculty, the regents called for an emergency meeting on December 29, 1849. At this meeting, the faculty were asked to produce “a detail of the recent occurrences, in consequence of which several students might by their own act sever their connection with the university” (Ten Brook, 1875, p. 198). The faculty stood by their
decision to expel the fraternity men and submitted their report to the regents on January 10, 1850. The report provided a history of their dealings with the fraternities and implored the regents to make a decision on the future of fraternities at the university. The faculty listed eight objections to fraternities, to accentuate their point:

First. The whole history of these societies is a detail of obliquities. One year they existed contrary to the known law requiring the exhibition of their constitution, holding their meetings at unlawful hours, and in unlawful places; and when detected at their after-midnight depredations, they attempted to overawe the Faculty, and have since stood by violating pledges and breaking laws.

Second. These affiliations are a great irresponsible authority, a monster power, requiring submission where there is no obligation. The will of the State of Michigan is the only power by which we are here placed. To the latter power we yield a compliance at any time; to the former never.

Third. They are exclusive and oligarchic in their selection of members and oppressive towards all who are not of their organism. There are many who are refused admission—many who conscientiously perhaps refused to be admitted. The equal rights of the former and the conscientious rights of the latter are equally violated and trampled upon. They are opposed and crushed between their rival corporations and brow-beaten if they attempt to set up rival anti-secret societies or complain as they sometimes do to the Faculty. Yet do these despotic and intolerant oligarchies raise an outcry at the despotism and bigotry of all who question their tyranny. Many have admitted that they were persecuted into
membership of these societies—they found no peace without and surrendered to them as their only refuse.

Fourth. These societies entrap into an immature commitment sons of parents who wholly disapprove of them. Many a father believes that secret societies are within themselves wrong. He also feels his responsibility for the moral character of his children and entrusts them to us. Forthwith they are beset on all sides by these affiliations and contrary to their filial duty and original purposes are hastily committed. How can we answer our responsibilities to such a parent?

Fifth. The meetings of these societies are liable to become, and often are, lawless and convivial. They are held in private houses, beer shops, and hotels, at hours when by all law honest folks should be at home, and the student should be at his room. The transition is easy and is often made to the bar, the grogery, and midnight haunt. Let parents be assured that this is often the road that their sons have taken to ruin, or, as one of the Eastern college presidents expresses it, “the secret means by which many a fond parent’s hopes are blasted.”

“There exists in most every college,” says Rev. J. P. Thomspion, of New York, “a multitude of secret societies. These are often formed ostensibly for literary purposes, though their precise object is often veiled in mystery. Sometimes they are truly useful, combining a pleasant relaxation from severe study with varied intellectual entertainment. But the common course of such societies is this, a constitution is formed prescribing certain literary exercises. These at first awaken interest and render the meeting pleasant and profitable. But
by and by that interest flags, there is a failure in attendance. But what sociability can there be among young men where there is nothing to eat or drink? Cigars are brought in, then light refreshments, due regard being had to moderation and economy, then one and another sends for wine, and in face of the constitution and of all good resolutions, the meeting degenerates into a mere carousal from which some of the first scholars are carried to their rooms at midnight dead drunk.”

Sixth. The poor student (and many of our students are poor) comes to the University struggling to attain an education by his own exertions. Persecuted into these societies the money his labors have earned for educational purposes goes for badges, paraphernalia, convivial entertainment, and journeys on society business.

Seventh. The regular literary societies meanwhile besides being divided and distracted, are neglected and eaten out. To these societies the Regents have granted a room, the Faculty have made personal contributions, and all proper means have been used to render them amply sufficient for the enterprise, intellectual, social, and pecuniary, of all our students. Literary friendships, badges, secrecy, even extended affiliation if they pleased, might all be here indulged to any rational heart’s content. Yet these societies are comparatively neglected and shaded. Our liberal endowment enables the University to dispense not only with all tuition money, but with many incidental expenses to which students in most colleges are subjected. This might leave more means to adorn their society rooms more munificently and to have now a library of hundreds of well selected volumes. Their libraries are not what they should be, nor their
enterprise what it should be; and your Faculty can assign no other reason that that
their hearts and therefore their treasures go elsewhere.

Eighth. These societies are permanent sources of mutual intrigues and
jealousies. One society or one generation of society may be comparatively
elevated in character and pure in purpose, but the organization still stands a tool
for mischief in crafty hands. There are young men whom we might name, of the
most dangerous character, who coiled an influence through these means at which
many a parent has reason to weep and tremble. There are artful seducers whom
we could name who are this day through these societies standing not only
between the Faculty and the student, but between the parent and the deluded
victim. Those combinations often exist as organized clans for the support of a few
demagogue leaders, and for mutual offensive and defensive support; and while
they thus stand in the varied relations of mutual intolerance towards the
uninitiated, and of ready-common defiance of the authorities; societies of this sort
are susceptible of indefinite uncontrollable multiplication. If three can exist, thirty
may; and thus the government may be completely hemmed in and the community
distracted by a collection of Juntos mutually hostile to each other but united in
common opposition to authority. (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928, pp. 38-39)

They ended this report saying of the regents, “Their is the proper authority; theirs is the stake;
and theirs must be the responsibility for the continued existence ‘of this giant evil which in secret
is blasting the hope of so many parents’” (G.P. Williams, et al., 1928, p. 40).

Upon review of the report, the Board of Regents appointed a committee to look further
into the issue, including gathering statements from the students who were to be expelled. The
committee largely found the faculty to have acted in accordance with the rules of the university. Three responses were made to this finding and the original Faculty statement. One was made by seven men who had been expelled and allowed to return to the university, and a second was by five men who said they were acting as a student committee. Both of these statements made the argument that the “Twentieth Rule” was null because “no board had the right to pass, and no faculty the right to execute, a law thus abridging the natural rights of students, and that such laws, though existing in other colleges, are not executed” (Ten Brook, 1875, p. 200). The third response to the original report, written by 15 students (including one Brother of Beta Theta Pi who was subsequently expelled from the fraternity [Schurtz, 1928]), was in favor of the regents and faculty saying that they had acted properly and that the matter would resolve itself quickly and amicably given a little more time (Ten Brook, 1875). All three statements were sent directly to the Michigan State Legislature for review in 1850.

The faculty report and the committee report also made their way to the Michigan State Legislature for review in January 1850, although not in their original form. Professor Ten Brook writes that “two students contrived to get possession of the faculty’s report and copied it, with slight changes; then hastened with this to the capital, and had it printed and in circulation a week or more before the genuine report arrived” (Ten Brook, 1875, p. 201). The changes to the document made the language coarse and unrefined, using vulgar and slang terms (Ten Brook, 1875; Farrand, 1885). The students denied changing the document, and one legislator, Senator Finley, agreed that the document had not been altered, saying,

I am convinced and satisfied that I can prove that the report pronounced as spurious in the card of the faculty, was all of it written by the faculty or some member of the faculty, and the one now claimed to be genuine is an alteration of
the original; which alterations were made by the faculty or some member of the faculty, or the Board of Regents, or all of them. (Schurtz, 1928, p. 33)

In his history about Beta Theta Pi at Michigan from 1845 to 1928, Beta Theta Pi Brother Shelby Schurtz offers:

However that may be the two reports [the one submitted to the Legislature and the one the Faculty claimed was real] are not materially different, and the admittedly true report of the faculty is given here [provided in his book]—it certainly speaks for itself as being far from what the faculty of a great University should exhibit in a written report. (Schurtz, 1928, p. 33)

Whether the statement was altered or not, it seemed to have some impact on the dealings in the legislature. Although the bill proposed by the citizens of Ann Arbor to change the regents to an elected position was voted down at that time, so too were any actions proposed to the legislature by the faculty and university to discipline fraternities (Ten Brook, 1875; Farrand, 1885).

**Michigan Constitutional Convention of 1850.** On March 9, 1950, two months after the Michigan State Legislature heard and ultimately decided not to act on the issue of fraternities at the University of Michigan, a bill calling for a convention to review and revise the state constitution was adopted. Starting on June 3, 1850, the convention would last until August 15, 1850. Many significant changes were made to the constitution during the convention, with many providing the people of the state more power to elect officials including the secretary of state, attorney general, and the state supreme court (Michigan, constitutional convention, 1850). In addition, the issue of the Board of Regents being elected by the people rather than appointed by the governor was brought forth once again.
The discussion turned to the issue of the regents on August 5, 1850 (Michigan, constitutional convention, 1850). Included in the discussion was the idea of changing the number of regents to as many as 12 and how they were to be elected. Of particular debate was whether the regents should be subject to the influence of political parties. Some delegates to the convention believed that the board should be protected from undue influence, while others believed the people’s voices should be heard in the election of these officials whether party politics were involved or not. A proposal was created and put forward by Mr. Whipple from Berrien County, which allowed for eight regents to be elected jointly by the two houses of the Michigan State Legislature. The proposal was voted on and passed along for a second reading (Michigan, constitutional convention, 1850).

On August 7, 1850, an amended proposal was put forward by Mr. Bagg, a representative from Wayne County, which would allow for 12 regents who would all be elected directly by the people. The original idea of having the legislature elect the regents was thought to remove the process from the influence of party politics, but Mr. Bagg argued that the legislature was just as political as the people were, and the convention had already agreed to have judges elected directly by the people to avoid political influence. Furthermore, 12 judges were to be elected, one from each circuit, and Mr. Bagg believed the same should apply to the regents. Mr. McClelland, from Monroe County, agreed with Mr. Bagg and proposed to further amend his proposal by including professors as elected positions. After much discussion on the matter, it was agreed that the regents should be elected by the people, but professors should not. The proposal was voted on and passed along for a final reading (Michigan, constitutional convention, 1850).
The convention again turned discussion to the issue of the Board of Regents on August 14, 1850, where the following was adopted into the new state constitution under Article XIII, Sections 6-8:

Sec. 6. There shall be elected in each judicial circuit, at the time of the election of the judge of such circuit, a regent of the University, whose term of office shall be the same as that of such judge. The regents thus elected shall constitute the board of regents of the University of Michigan.

Sec. 7. The regents of the University and their successors in office shall continue to constitute the body corporate, known by the name and title of “the regents of the University of Michigan.”

Sec. 8. The regents of the University shall, at their first annual meeting, or as soon thereafter as may be, elect a president of the University, who shall be ex-officio a member of their board, with the privilege of speaking, but not of voting. He shall preside at the meetings of the regents, and be the principle executive officer of the University. The board of regents shall have the general supervision of the University, and the direction and control of all expenditures from the University interest fund. (Michigan, constitutional convention, 1850, p. XXXIV)

With the adoption of this new amendment to the constitution, the regents became elected officials and the position of university president was created. This also established the university as “a co-ordinate and not subordinate part of the state government, thus ensuring direct control by the people of the state” (Shaw, 1941, p. 19). Although it would take many years and intervention from the state supreme court before the university would be truly free to operate
independently from the legislature, the stage was set for autonomy at the convention of 1850 (Shaw, 1941).

**The last fraternity falls.** As the constitution convention was taking place in Lansing from June to August of 1850, the Fraternity War continued in Ann Arbor. Following the emergency January Board of Regents meeting, the regularly scheduled annual meeting was held on July 16, 1850. Once again, the matter of fraternities was brought to the floor.

At the start of the winter semester, per the decree by the Faculty that members of Chi Psi and Alpha Delta Phi would be expelled if they did not renounce their membership, both fraternities were no longer in operation and their members were either gone or had given up their affiliation. Beta Theta Pi was allowed to continue because their constitution was not signed by any active student. Those men from Chi Psi and Alpha Delta Phi who had been expelled by the university took issue with this and petitioned the faculty to take action against Beta Theta Pi (Schurtz, 1928). As a result, the following resolution was adopted during the morning session of the July regents meeting:

*Resolved, That whereas the Faculty in their report represent that there are several members of the University known to them to be connected with a secret society in violation of the law of the University, but do not distinctly state whether any course of discipline with them has been instituted, that the Faculty be requested to report to this Board whether they are applying the discipline of the University to such transgressing members and, if not, for what reasons. (University of Michigan, 1915, p. 456)*
During the evening session of the meeting, some members of the faculty reported that the members of Beta Theta Pi did not fall in violation of the “Twentieth Rule” because they had not signed their constitution. Other members of the faculty argued that this was unfair to the expelled members of the other two fraternities and that all should be treated the same (Schurtz, 1928). Resolutions were then made to take action against Beta Theta Pi and to postpone any action indefinitely. A third resolution sought a middle ground, asking that all papers and information regarding the situation be brought to the following day’s session for review (University of Michigan, 1915). The faculty, remembering the extreme opposition faced when they expelled the members of Chi Psi and Alpha Delta Phi, sought to place the burden of holding Beta Theta Pi accountable on the Board of Regents. They submitted to the Board of Regents:

The following resolution was passed and ordered to be communicated to the Board of Regents:

Resolved, That those gentlemen of the Regents who are prepared to furnish evidence of the membership of certain students of the University in the Beta Theta Pi Society be respectfully requested as soon as possible to put the Faculty in possession of such proof.

By order of the Faculty, J. Holmes Agnew, Secretary. (University of Michigan, 1915, p. 458)

The Board of Regents response was to withdraw from the issue on July 17, 1850: “Mr. Allen asked leave to withdraw his resolution of the sixteenth instructing the faculty to enforce the rule against secret societies. Granted” (University of Michigan, 1915, p. 460). Once again, neither the
faculty or the Regents wanted to be responsible for taking action, especially with commencement taking place so soon after the meeting.

Beta Theta Pi had narrowly avoided the same fate as Chi Psi and Alpha Delta Phi and celebrated by holding a special meeting on July 18, 1850. The meeting minutes read:

Mr. J. Sterling Morton, who had previously been elected a member of the Beta chapter at Hudson, Ohio, was duly nominated into the association.

The members of the graduating class then signed their names to the constitution of the Beta Theta Pi and after some social conversation, there being no further business before the chapter, on motion the chapter adjourned.

(Northrop, 1850a)

Two months later, on September 18, 1850, the faculty moved to expel James Kendrick Knight due to his membership in Beta Theta Pi. That night, the chapter held a special meeting to discuss how to respond. It was decided that all but one member of the fraternity would stand in solidarity with James Knight and leave the university with him. The other member, a first-year student, would be expelled from the fraternity so he would not face expulsion from the university. It was also decided that chapter operations would be suspended.

A second meeting took place on September 27, 1850 to discuss matters further. The full meeting minutes of the September 27, 1850 meeting read:

A special meeting of the society was held on the evening of the twenty-seventh at nine o’clock, P.M., and being called to order by the President, Brother A. J. Poppleton, was opened in the usual manner by reading a passage from the Bible. The president then stated briefly but feelingly the objects of the special meeting,
which would probably be the last we should hold in our present relations, alluding to the expulsion of all members of the society from the university and to the course to be pursued toward the faculty, toward the public, and toward each other as “Companions in Arms and Exile."

The communications and resolutions of the faculty to the members of the society were then read by the recorder and nearly all the members as they were called upon by the secretary expressed their views, feelings and determinations in the matter which, to be summed up briefly, could be best expressed by those remarkable words of the elder “Sink or swim, live or die” we stand by the Beta Theta Pi society.

It was then on motion unanimously resolved, that knowing this society has been of incalculable, intellectual, and social benefit to each of us as its members by its meetings of the society will be for the present suspended by the removal of its members from the university, that wherever we go or our lot may be case, we shall ever recall its meetings with the choicest and most cherished memories of our collegiate life, that our heartiest curses shall ever follow the authors of our evil, we yet feel the kindest regards toward those whose sympathies and well wishes have ever been with us in this struggle and pledging our ceaseless and united efforts toward rewarding our friends and revenging the society of its enemies— we press the parting hand in sadness with the fervent hope and earnest prayer that we may all meet again.

The resolution was carried by acclamation.
The members sat down to a farewell supper, provided by the committee of arrangements, when old memories and old friends were revived. Healths were drunk to all the absent members of this chapter, to all Greeks throughout the world, and a health and wish for long life and happiness to each at parting.

After a pleasant and happy social time which will live long in the memory of those present, at midnight on motion, the society adjourned *sine die*, to meet again at the call of the president. (Northrop, 1850b)

With that, the Beta Theta Pi chapter at the University of Michigan was the last chapter to be expelled in the Fraternity War.

**The end (and the beginning) of the Fraternity War.** As was the case when the faculty expelled members of Chi Psi and Alpha Delta Phi, the outcry from students and citizens alike was great. Shaw (1941) writes, “this continuing agitation eventually became too strong for the faculty” (p. 1800). In addition to this outpouring of support for the fraternity men, one of the expelled members of Beta Theta Pi, Arthur D. Rich, was allowed to return to the university and immediately sought to gain the reinstatement of his fraternity (Schurtz, 1928). Over the course of a series of meetings in October of 1850, all three fraternities would gain recognition by the university.

A letter written by Rich was first read at the regular faculty meeting on October 14, 1850. It stated, “I am authorized to inform the faculty that the constitution of Beta Theta Pi society may be submitted for their approval or disapproval, and I would respectfully ask the faculty to examine it” (University of Michigan, 1928, p. 67). That same day, a committee was appointed to
review the constitution of Beta Theta Pi. The faculty met multiple times in the following week to
discuss the matter and decide whether or not to grant approval for Beta Theta Pi.

At the October 22, 1850, meeting of the faculty, Professors Williams and Agnew
proposed multiple motions designed to disapprove the constitution of Beta Theta Pi on the
grounds that it was “instituted by an authority foreign to this university” and that “neither this
faculty nor the Board of Regents has the power to recognize the Beta Theta Pi society as a
society in the University of Michigan” (University of Michigan, 1928, p. 68). Their motions
were denied by the remainder of the faculty who instead moved and passed the following:

The following preamble and resolution was then moved and seconded:

_Whereas_, The Constitution of Beta Theta Pi society has, in compliance
with the twentieth Article, Chapter 4, of the college laws, been perused for the
approval of the faculty in order that students may be members thereof,

_Resolved_, That the faculty, having examined, do so far approve said
constitution as to permit students of the university to be members of said society
on condition.

1. No senior shall belong until written consent of his parents is filed with
   president of the faculty;

2. Faculty shall be informed of times and places of meetings;

3. All meetings shall be held in college buildings;

4. No change shall be made in constitution without approval of faculty;
5. Faculty shall be furnished names of every member within one week of his admission;

6. Fraternity shall not interfere with the administration of college government;

7. The regulations shall be obligatory upon the entire fraternity. (University of Michigan, 1928, pp. 68-69)

The resolution was passed by a count of 4 to 2, with Professors Williams and Agnew dissenting.

On October 28, 1850, Alpha Delta Phi submitted a request for the faculty to review their constitution, which had not changed since they had submitted it previously, which was accepted under the same conditions as Beta Theta Pi. Again, Professors Williams and Agnew dissented. Chi Psi followed suit and petitioned the faculty to review their constitution on November 4, 1850. The faculty denied their petition on the grounds that Chi Psi did not submit their full constitution. Upon further review and work with the students which either allowed for further examination of the constitution or explanations of the parts exempted, the faculty approved Chi Psi on November 14, 1850 (University of Michigan, 1928).

With the reinstatement of the three fraternities, the Fraternity War ended (Farrand, 1885). However, the fallout from this period of time was yet to be realized. Although the faculty had attempted to compromise and work with the students and fraternities, the damage from this period of time was evident. Citizens and students held the university responsible for the ugly period of time later to be known as the Fraternity War (Farrand, 1885; Schurtz, 1928).

The aftermath and conclusion. Following the approval of the three fraternities, Chi Psi and Alpha Delta Phi resumed operation. They both still had members at the university who had
previously renounced their membership but were taken back into the societies to reestablish them. Beta Theta Pi would not reestablish until 1854 (Schurtz, 1928).

In November of 1850, the new constitution for the State of Michigan was ratified, officially implementing a new Board of Regents structure and a university president. Following this, the superintendent of public instruction at the time, Francis Shearman, called for a visiting committee to come to the university to review it in all aspects. In regard to the matter of fraternities, they found that the Board of Regents and faculty had gone too far in trying to subdue fraternities (Ten Brook, 1875).

With this finding, one member of the committee appointed by Shearman sought opinions from students and professors regarding the Fraternity War. From this research came the recommendation that Professor Andrew Ten Brook resign his position as Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy (Ten Brook, 1875). A resolution was created and presented for the April Regents meeting to have Ten Brook resign. That same day, Dr. Pitcher, a member of the committee, said of the situation, “it is the beginning of the end; those professors who have shown their willingness to offer up an associate as a sacrifice of expediency with an eye to their own safety, have sealed their own fate” (Ten Brook, 1875, p. 208). Ten Brook offered his resignation the following day (Ten Brook, 1875), which was accepted by the regents during their July meeting (University of Michigan, 1928).

In December of 1851, at the last meeting of the Board of Regents before the newly elected board was to take effect, the board terminated the terms of office for most of the literary department, including Professors Williams, Agnew, and Whedon. With this, the four main opponents (including Ten Brook) of fraternities throughout the Fraternity War had been removed from the university, although Professor Williams would return to the university by vote in 1852,
and Professor Ten Brook would return to the university as a librarian in 1864. Professors Douglass and Sager were also members of the literary department (as well as the medical faculty) but were not terminated. Douglass was a member of Beta Theta Pi, and both he and Sager had “seen the light” (Schurtz, 1928, p. 71) in regard to fraternities in time to avoid being fired (Schurtz, 1928).

After the new Board of Regents took their positions in January of 1852, they created a new constitution and immediately sought to restructure the institution by accepting the termination of much of the literary department and hiring new faculty. The medical faculty commented on the first semester following the end of the Fraternity War that “throughout the session the greatest harmony has prevailed, and nothing has occurred which could interfere with the general prosperity of the institution” (University of Michigan, 1928). In August of 1852, the Board of Regents elected the first university president, Dr. H. P. Tappan, to oversee the administration of the university. This act allowed the regents to remove themselves from the administrative aspects of the institution and focus solely on policy creation (Peckham, 1994).

In the years that followed, both the university and fraternities experienced a period of growth (Shaw, 1941; Farrand, 1885; Schurtz, 1928). The events of the Fraternity War firmly established fraternities at the University of Michigan and set the stage for future organizations to grow and develop by establishing a sense of self-governance among students (History of secret organizations, 1896). Where there had once been an adversarial relationship between students and faculty, the Fraternity War established the rights of students to organize and function independent from university control. This revolt had also forced the university to explore alternative methods for working with students. Previously, the faculty were charged with the governance of the institution along with their teaching duties (Shaw, 1941; Peckham, 1994;
Farrand, 1885). As a result of this conflict, whether direct or indirect, the university was forced to change its structure both internally and within the state. A separation was made between the faculty with their teaching role and the administration of the university which was responsible for student life. At the same time, the university was set to gain autonomy from the State Legislature.

In just five years, from 1845 to 1850, the Fraternity War fundamentally altered the University of Michigan. Fraternities had been established and the university was beginning to recon with student life on campus. Although the original conflict ended in 1850 and a time of peace ensued, over the course of time, the conflicting values between the university and fraternities would reemerge over and over again with different actors creating new chapters in the Fraternity War.

**Era of Quiescence: Membership Selection, 1949-1970**

After being founded, and fought for, the University of Michigan fraternity (and later, sorority) community began to grow and thrive. From three organizations in 1850, the community continued to grow and diversify along with the university. By 1949, there were over 60 fraternities and sororities operating on the campus (Walter, 1949; Bromage, 1949).

In the time between the Fraternity War and the 1960’s attitudes about fraternities and sororities changed both nationally and at Michigan. As the country recovered and recalibrated after World War II, a more diverse set of students sought membership in fraternities and sororities. Additionally, veterans returning from “the war against fascism committed to the cause of ending bigotry” (Horowitz, 1987, p. 147). In general, students began to gain interest in politics and civil rights movements and lost interest in organizations like fraternities and sororities,
which they viewed as discriminatory, exclusive, and as part of the establishment (Horowitz, 1987).

Overall membership in fraternities and sororities rose through the 1950’s and 1960’s along with the rise in overall enrollment. Although enrollment continued to grow, membership in fraternities and sororities slowed and then started to decline in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. This change in membership growth was due partly to the change in the attitudes of college students, and partly due to the discriminatory practices of fraternities and sororities (Horowitz, 1987; Syrett, 2009).

There were many students, faculty, and staff on college campuses during the late 1940’s and early 1950’s who started to question fraternities and sororities for their membership selection processes (Syrett, 2009; Horowitz, 1987). During this period, membership was still split among the have’s and have-not’s, and the have’s were typically White and protestant (Thelin, 2011). Minority students (including Black, Jewish, and Catholic students, among many others) along with veteran’s and socially conscious students began to openly discuss the discrimination perpetrated by fraternities and sororities (Thelin, 2011; Horowitz, 1987; Syrett, 2009).

Even though students were more tolerant than previous generations, discriminatory membership clauses found in many fraternity and sorority constitutions and bylaws restricted who could be offered membership by the local chapters (Horowitz, 1987; Syrett, 2009). As pressure mounted on fraternities and sororities to open their membership, some began accepting one or two token Black or Jewish members. Although the students may have been tolerant enough to offer membership, the national organizations and alumni were not (Syrett, 2009). In some cases, chapters received threats of charter removal from their alumni and national organizations for offering membership to students who did not meet (discriminatory)
requirements set forth by the constitution or bylaws of the organization (Syrett, 2009). Some local chapters relented and did not offer membership to students the national organizations and alumni disapprove of, while other chapters resigned from their national organization and reformed as a local fraternity or sorority so they could control their membership processes independent of a national organization or alumni (Horowitz, 1987).

National organizations and alumni were not the only influences on fraternities and sororities. Many colleges and universities did not approve of the discriminatory clauses or practices associated with fraternities and sororities but were afraid to force a removal of either (Horowitz, 1987). The fear was that powerful alumni would rescind donations or stop giving altogether. In a time when colleges and universities were trying to recover from the Great Depression and World War II, this was a difficult financial and political decision to be made, and many chose to side with the money and influence (Horowitz, 1987).

Eventually, as fraternal organizations faced increased scrutiny from the public, administrators, and students, national organizations relented and removed discriminatory clauses and practices from official documents including their constitutions, bylaws, and ritual (Syrett, 2009). This pressure was a step toward reducing discrimination in fraternities and sororities but did not end it immediately. Horowitz (1987) stated, “discrimination did not end; it just went underground. Some Gentile fraternities accepted a black or a Jewish token member, but until the changing climate of the 1960s they largely kept the white Protestant brotherhood intact” (p. 148).

While the movement to eliminate discriminatory practices from fraternities and sororities was happening all across the country (Horowitz, 1987), the situation was no different at the University of Michigan, and fraternities and sororities were pressured to change their ways (Peckham, 1994). Unlike the Fraternity War of the 1840’s, which pitted students against faculty,
This membership conflict featured fraternity and sorority members facing opposition from other students, faculty, staff, and an overall environment that was shifting towards removing discrimination from policy and practice. The cultural clash and institutional rules from the university challenged the culture and institutional rules of fraternities and sororities and their members.

This membership conflict emerged in 1949 when the Committee on Student Affairs first tried to address discrimination on campus by creating a new rule against it (Walter, 1949). Ten years later, the Board of Regents passed a bylaw prohibiting discrimination at the university (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962a). This bylaw set up the necessary conditions for action to be taken against the discriminatory rules and practices used by fraternities and sororities. Throughout the conflict the Interfraternity Council would seek to privatize its portion of the conflict in order to minimize the impact on its member organizations. The Panhellenic Association, due to the structure and national policies of member organizations, was forced to socialize the conflict, widening the scope of those involved and prolonging any possible resolution. What started as a demand to remove discriminatory rules and practices from fraternities and sororities turned into a significant conflict that spanned 20 years and involved nearly every aspect of the university.

**First steps toward removing bias clauses and discriminatory practices.** In May 1949, the joint faculty and student Committee on Student Affairs adopted two motions to address discrimination on campus. The first stated,

That every student organization recognized by the Committee on Student Affairs file in the Office of Student Affairs a copy of its Constitution or a constitutional
form which follows the pattern set forth in the publication *University Regulations Concerning Student Affairs, Conduct, and Discipline.* (Walter, 1949, p. 38)

The second motion stated, “That the Committee on Student Affairs refuse to recognize any organization which prohibits membership in the organization because of race, religion, or color” (Walter, 1949, pp. 38-39).

Initially thought to target all future student organizations applying for recognition, the committee turned its focus to fraternities and sororities, in particular, during 1950 (Peckham, 1994). The Committee on Student Affairs voted and passed a motion that “demanded that any ‘discriminatory clauses’ in membership rules be removed by the fall of 1956” (Peckham, 1994, p. 241). President Ruthven would veto the motion in 1951, just prior to ending his tenure as president (Peckham, 1994), stating, “In our zeal to protect the constitutional privileges and immunities of certain citizens, we must be careful not to infringe on or impair equally sacred rights of others” (a cited in Spencer, 1960, p. 11).

Following President Ruthven’s departure, the Committee on Student Affairs again voted and passed a motion to forcibly remove discriminatory clauses from fraternity and sorority constitutions (Peckham, 1994; Spencer, 1960; Walter, 1952). The only difference in this second attempt was that there was no time limit suggested. The penalty for not complying would be a loss of recognition by the university (Walter, 1952). President Hatcher, following in the footsteps of President Ruthven, vetoed the motion, saying, “We believe that the process of education and personal and group convictions will bring us forward faster, and on a sounder basis, than the proposed methods of coercion” (p. 48). This sentiment seemed to echo an article written in the Michigan Daily only a few months prior, which said, “There is now a trend towards elimination
of discriminatory clauses in fraternities all over the country… University fraternities will follow this trend and solve their problems without outside coercion” (Lunn & Scherer, 1951, p. 4).

Although some people thought that it should be left to fraternities and sororities to remove discriminatory clauses on their own (Walter, 1952), others condemned the president’s actions in vetoing the motion. The May 23, 1952 edition of The Michigan Daily featured a headline on the front page, which stated, “HATCHER VETOES ANTI-BIASES BILL” (Hatcher vetoes, 1952). The surrounding articles further stated the displeasure and protest of the portion of the student body that supported the motion (Hatcher vetoes, 1952).

Even though the motion to remove discrimination clauses from the constitutions of fraternities and sororities failed, it was evident to the fraternities and sororities that they needed to do something. This series of votes and motions set fraternities and sororities in motion toward removing discriminatory practices from their organizations. This started as early as 1951, following the first motion, but would not be fully resolved until almost 1970.

The Student Government Council and the Committee on Membership in Student Organizations. As the Interfraternity Council (IFC) and Panhellenic Association (Panhel) were faced with further challenges to discrimination clauses in the constitutions of their member organizations, the two councils attempted to take steps to remedy the situation. In 1952, the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association Presidents from U-M presented an anti-bias clause to the Big Ten Panhellenic and IFC conference. The clause recommended that individual organizations take action to remove discriminatory clauses from their constitutions. It passed with no dissenting votes (Big Ten Adopts, 1952). The driving motivation behind this anti-bias clause followed closely with President Hatcher’s own thinking that organizations would eventually choose to remove bias clauses on their own without outside pressure.
The passage of this anti-bias clause did not stop attempts to force the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Council to adopt sweeping regulations removing discrimination clauses for member organizations (Spencer, 1960). Although the Interfraternity Council did not require member organizations to remove discriminatory clauses from their constitutions, they did encourage it (Big Ten Adopts, 1952), and many did remove them during this period of time. In 1949, 22 of 34 fraternities had some form of a bias clause in their constitutions. That number was reduced to four by 1959 (Hayden, 1959).

While fraternities were working to remove discriminatory clauses on their own, the university was restructuring how student organizations were governed. Prior to 1955, the Committee on Student Affairs, comprised of seven students and six faculty members, was charged with the overall management of student organizations on campus (University of Michigan, 1962). In 1955, after two years of studying the matter, the Committee on Student Affairs was replaced by the Student Government Council (SGC) and the Board in Review. The SGC, created to supervise and govern student organizations, was comprised of 18 students, 11 elected from the campus at large and seven presidents from major student organizations including Interfraternity Council, Panhellenic Association, Inter-House Council, Assembly Association, The Michigan League, The Michigan Union, and The Michigan Daily (University of Michigan, 1962). The Board in Review was developed to review any challenges to decisions made by the SCG and was comprised of two students, three faculty members, the Dean of Men, and the Dean of Women (University of Michigan, 1962).

The establishment of the SGC was not initially met with resistance by fraternities and sororities, but that quickly changed. As early as 1956, sororities questioned the authority that the SGC had over them as the issue of spring recruitment was brought to the council. Challenges to
the SGC’s authority continued as time progressed. In 1959, fraternities and sororities, along with alumni and national fraternity and sorority organization representatives, proposed an SGC committee to oversee fraternities and sororities that would be comprised of fraternity and sorority students, alumni, faculty who were also alumni, and the Deans of Men and Women. This plan was considered but ultimately rejected in favor of the SGC retaining its presumed authority with the Vice President for Student Affairs having veto power over the council, if necessary (University of Michigan, 1962; Harris, 1963).

In November of that same year, the Board of Regents took a formal stance against discrimination at the university and adopted Bylaw 2.14, which stated:

The University shall not discriminate against any person because of race, color, religion, creed, national origin or ancestry. Further, it shall work for the elimination of discrimination (1) in private organizations recognized by the University and (2) from non-University sources where students and the employees of the University are involved. (University of Michigan, 1960, p. 1099)

When adopting this bylaw, the Board of Regents made clear that the university “always practiced a policy of nondiscrimination in the administration and management of its internal affairs” (University of Michigan, 1960, p. 1099), but they wanted a clear bylaw in place so university administrators working with private groups, like student organizations, would have specific language that prohibited discrimination in those groups as well (University of Michigan, 1960).

Just a few months later, the SGC adopted a similar regulation in order to implement the bylaw passed by the Board of Regents. Whereas fraternity and sorority leadership had previously
challenged the authority of the SGC, they worked with the council to create and pass this regulation. It read:

   All recognized student organizations shall select membership and afford
   opportunities to members on the basis of personal merit and not race, color,
   religion, creed, national origin, or ancestry. (All cases of possible violation of this
   regulation shall be referred to the Student Government Council’s Committee on
   Membership in Student Organizations). (Committee on Membership in Student
   Organizations, 1962b)

   To implement the SGC’s regulation, the Committee on Membership in Student
   Organizations was established in 1960 (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b). Comprised of students and a faculty advisor from the law school, the Committee on Membership in Student Organizations was organized to gather general facts regarding membership selection practices by student organizations, create a formal hearing process to address violations of the SGC’s regulation, and determine what sanctions would be appropriate in the case of a violation (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1961). In their first semester, the committee determined that, although they were created to work with all student organizations, they would start with “Panhellenic, Interfraternity Council, the Administration, and ultimately with the leadership of the individual groups themselves” (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1961, p. 1).

   In the fall of 1960, fraternity and sorority constitutions once again became a focus for those trying to rid the campus of discriminatory practices. Previously, in 1949, all fraternal organizations were required to submit their constitutions to the Committee on Student Affairs with the stipulation that they would only be accessed by “high administrative officers of the
university and under no circumstances to students” (University of Michigan, 1962, p. 3).

Although responsibility of student organizations passed to the Student Government Council, fraternity and sorority constitutions remained under the supervision of the Deans of Men and Women. Still wanting access to them to determine if they complied with the SGC regulation on discrimination, a compromise was created to allow fraternities and sororities to only submit the part of their constitution that pertained to membership (University of Michigan, 1962).

The Committee on Membership sent notification to all fraternities and sororities indicating that they were required to submit the membership portions of their constitutions in January of 1961. The information being requested by the committee included

- a statement which lists all current rules, regulations, policies, written or oral agreements or any other written or unwritten criteria which affect the selection of members. Accompanying these statements was to be the group’s interpretation of its ability to comply with the University regulation on membership. (University of Michigan, 1962, p. 3)

A follow up letter was sent in October 1961, and by January 17, 1962, it was reported that all groups had complied to the request (University of Michigan, 1962). The committee discovered that many of the submissions did not contain adequate information for them to review, so a 60-day deadline was created in February for organizations to resubmit an amended document (University of Michigan, 1962).

While awaiting revised submissions, the committee sought to clarify its procedures and begin addressing discrimination on campus. Three areas in particular became salient: (a) “Does a waiver of a discriminatory clause immediately place a group in compliance with Student
Government Council’s regulation?" (b) “Groups with explicit discriminatory provisions,” and (c) “Local autonomy and external control or influence in membership selection” (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962a, p. 2). It was determined that groups who received a waiver and groups that were found in direct violation should be treated on a case by case basis to determine the best application of the SGC regulation. The question of local autonomy and external control or influence in membership selection explored how some fraternities and sororities locally were forced by outside entities, like their national organizations or alumni, to utilize certain discriminatory practices. Initially, the committee found that they needed more information on this subject and sought the assistance of the campus fraternity and sorority advisors to work with the students, alumni, and national organizations (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962a).

The committee’s next report, from May 1962, reported limited success (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b). By this time, many groups had resubmitted documents or had requested extensions. Many were granted extensions, while others were not. Their report indicated that they had found a number of organizations in violation of the SGC regulation and had worked, or had begun working, with those organizations to resolve those violations. In doing so, however, they found that some fraternities and sororities on the campus had limited power to change their policies when their national organizations would not allow them to change (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b).

The committee specifically referenced the Sigma Nu fraternity and the Panhellenic Association (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b). The committee shared that Sigma Nu would be granted a waiver despite clauses in their constitution that were discriminatory because their national organization would not allow them to change it. The
committee reported that national representatives of the chapter spoke directly to university administrators to gain a waiver rather than working through the committee. This, in the opinion of the committee, undermined their authority and the system that was in place to work with organizations like Sigma Nu (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b).

Similarly, National Panhellenic Conference voted to not allow its collegiate members to work with the Student Government Council or its committees. While the chapters were willing to work with the committee to fix any violations, the national organizations were not (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b). The conflicting values between the fraternity and sorority chapters at U-M, their national organizations, and the university made the work of the committee exceedingly difficult. As a result, the Student Government Council asked the Board of Regents for assistance in clarifying the policy of non-discrimination and granting the Student Government Council official authority over fraternities and sororities. Further, they requested assistance from the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association in developing better avenues of communication to increase the effectiveness of the committee (Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, 1962b).

After noting resistance from the national organizations of Panhellenic sororities, on June 12, 1962, the committee found that only seven organizations, all sororities, had not filed adequate statements on membership (University of Michigan, 1962). Each of the seven sorority’s national organizations indicated that they would not file where students had access to their information. Further, they claimed adherence to the original 1949 rule which indicated that they only had to file information with university administrators and not students. These organizations made the claim that SGC did not have authority over their chapters because they were not part of the university administration (University of Michigan, 1962).
While some sorority national organizations were resisting the committee, the president of the Interfraternity Council, John Meyerholz, wrote to University of Michigan president, Dr. Hatcher, sharing his thoughts on the matter. He noted that fraternities had complied with all that was asked of them, stating, “All of this has been done with reluctant yet diligent cooperation from the local chapters, national organizations, and the Interfraternity Council” (Meyerholz, 1962, p. 1). He went on, however, to share his opinion that the Board of Regents should clarify their stance on discrimination in student organizations, that the review of such organizations should fall to administrators, and that the Interfraternity Council would comply with the rules as they stood but would fight back if they went further. Meyerholz stated on this last matter,

The Interfraternity Council and its member fraternities have and I feel always will continue to cooperate with the university on this matter. They have expressed concern over written bias clauses in the fraternity system. Most important however, they are concerned with the continued right of a fraternity to select its members on the basis of personal merit. It follows then, that if this problem of membership selection is to go beyond the written bias clause that cooperation will cease. (Meyerholz, 1962, p. 3)

For the Interfraternity Council, even though it did not entirely agree with the process by which fraternity’s membership was vetted, the line was drawn. Fraternities would continue to cooperate as long as the issue did not extend past bias clauses.

Upon hearing calls for clarification in its process for reviewing, approving, and dismissing student organizations, the university sought to do just that. Over the course of 1962 and into early 1963, the university created and then adopted what came to be known as the
“Harris Proposal” (University of Michigan, 1963a; University of Michigan, 1963b). This proposal, named after Vice President Harris, read:

Whereas, In November, 1959 (R.P., 1957-60) the Regents approved the revised plan of the Student Government Council and specifically approved the rules and regulations setting forth the functions of the Student Government Council, and by such resolution delegated to the said Student Government Council authority in accordance with Regents’ policy for enforcement of rules and regulations concerning student organizations and the conduct of recognized student organizations with particular emphasis on enforcement of the policy of the Regents on non-discrimination as set out in Section 2.14 of the Bylaws, and

Whereas, Questions have been raised as to whether or not the Regents have in fact delegated authority to the Student Government Council and, if so, whether or not fraternities and sororities are included in the above regulation concerning student organizations.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, That the Board of Regents hereby

1. Declares that all actions taken by the Student Government Council in establishing rules, withdrawing recognition, or imposing other sanctions shall be subject of the Vice-President for Student Affairs.

2. Confirms the delegation of authority to the Student Government Council to recognize student organizations and to withdraw recognition in implementing the policy of Bylaw 2.14.
3. Specifically includes fraternities and sororities within the term student organizations.

4. Grants to Student Government Council, subject to the veto of the Vice-President for Student Affairs, the power to establish rules relating to recognition of student organizations, power to establish rules requiring the furnishing of relevant information, and rules relating to procedures for settling any controversies which may arise.

5. Declares that implementation of the policy of non-discrimination set forth in Bylaw 2.14 shall be carried out to preserve, so far as possible, the confidentiality of secrets of recognized student organizations, the freedom of association, and to guarantee fair notice and hearing to affected organizations. (University of Michigan, 1963b, p. 1177)

The passing of the Harris Proposal confirmed the authority of the SGC and, for the time, settled the argument over whether the SGC did or did not have the power to request information from fraternities and sororities or hold them accountable for violations of rules established for student organizations.

With the cooperation of the IFC and passing of the Harris Proposal, all member fraternities had submitted documentation to the Student Government Council. Some, like Sigma Nu and Trigon, were either granted waivers or not approved, but those organizations were actively working with the SGC to resolve the issues (University of Michigan, 1962). Member sororities of the Panhellenic Association were not as compliant. Seven sororities had refused to file the appropriate documentation with the SGC and sought to reverse the Harris Proposal (University of Michigan, 1962).
**Sorority resistance.** For fraternities, especially alumni, the Harris Proposal and subsequent creation of rules and regulations was significant enough to be a topic of discussion, but not significant enough to call them to action (Feldkamp, 1963; Kast, 1963). At that time, all fraternities had already complied with the SGC regulations. This was not the case with all sororities.

The Student Government Council and its committees set forth to create new rules and regulations to better work with student organizations. A report from August 27, 1963, shows that the Committee on Membership Procedures sought to create regulations for Student Government Council rule-making, a Membership Committee, a Membership Tribunal, an appeals process, and more (Committee on Membership Procedures, 1963). The Membership Committee was to “receive complaints, collect and process relevant information, investigate suspected violations, attempt conciliation, initiate and prosecute proceedings before the appropriate campus tribunals, adopt procedure rules consistent with [regulations on SGC rule making] and engage personnel including Counsel” (Committee on Membership Procedures, 1963, pp. 1-2). The Membership Tribunal would be the counterpart to the Membership Committee and was created to adjudicate and provide sanctions for all cases brought to them by the Membership Committee. The tribunal would be comprised of a student, faculty member, and administrator (Committee on Membership Procedures, 1963).

These new rules and regulations were subject to feedback from the Office of the Director of Student Activities and Organizations (1963) and to a public hearing where members of the university and stakeholders would have a chance to speak (Brown, 1963). The Office of the Director of Student Activities and Organizations (1963) offered many suggestions, but few that
substantively changed the tenor of the original plan. The public hearing proved to be more contentious.

Although the public hearing, held on September 16, 1963, was not meant to be a place of discussion for legal matters (Brown, 1963), an attorney named Laurence D. Smith, representing multiple sororities—Delta Delta Delta, Kappa Delta, Sigma Kappa, Alpha Epsilon Phi, Phi Mu, Gamma Phi Beta, Alpha Phi, Zeta Tau Alpha, Alpha Gamma Delta, and Alpha Delta Pi—and one fraternity, Pi Kappa Alpha (which had already complied with the SGC regulation by providing the necessary information), presented an argument against the new rules and regulations from Student Government Council (L. D. Smith, 1963a). Although he stated that he was not there to discuss a legal brief, he did touch on why his clients believed the new rules and regulations should be rejected. First, they did not “concede the authority of the Board of Regents any more than the State Legislature, to delegate rule making powers, appointive powers, judicial powers or the powers to impose sanctions to any non-governmental body” (L. D. Smith, 1963a, p. 2). For this reason, they did not believe that SGC had the authority to prosecute and adjudicate cases and then apply sanctions. Next, they argued that the fact that SGC was the prosecutor, judge, and jury for cases made the process inherently biased. In addition, because the SGC was responsible for the oversight of student organizations, they had the authority to compel student organizations to testify in a hearing even if it would be detrimental to the student organization. L. D. Smith (1963a) went as far as to call this practice “out of date legally, morally, and constitutionally since the days of the witch hunt” (p. 4). Finally, they argued that the proposed changes to membership selection could negatively impact recruitment for the represented organizations which could result in monetary losses (L. D. Smith, 1963a).

As an alternative, L. D. Smith (1963a) and his clients proposed the following:
1. That SGC advise the Board of Regents that this is a problem for them as the representatives elected by the people of Michigan to handle the affairs of this University and thus decline the purported delegation of authority. (Reference might be made to the Fair Employment Practices Act and Michigan Legislation concerning procedure and rules of Administrative Agencies) or,

2. That these rules not be adopted in their present form and instead an attempt be made to formulate a set of rules that everyone can live with. I might suggest that you ask the Board of Regents to appoint one or two members to work with a Rules Committee and, if invited, I or some of the other attorneys representing national groups might participate on a non-voting basis. (p. 7)

They closed by noting that the University of Michigan was world renowned university, but if action was not taken to veto or change the proposed rules, further action could be taken on the part of the represented fraternal organizations (L. D. Smith, 1963a).

Despite the vehement opposition, the Student Government Council passed the membership regulations with some minor revisions on October 2, 1963 (Student Government Council, 1963b; Committee on Referral, 1963). Less than two weeks later, on October 15, L. D. Smith (1963b), on behalf of the 11 organizations he was representing, submitted a letter to Vice President for Student Life Dr. James Lewis asking him to veto the actions taken by the Student Government Council. The reasons outlined in the request were the same as presented at the public hearing.

The request for veto prompted the university to further explore the actions of the Student Government Council (Lewis, 1963; Committee on Referral, 1963). Following the request for
veto, the Committee on Referral convened to assist the Vice President in making a decision. The Committee on Referral was a committee comprised of faculty, students, and administrators designed to advise the Vice President for Student Affairs when a veto was being requested or contemplated (Feldkamp, 1963). The committee determined that the rules created by SGC were generally acceptable with the exception of a few changes. First, the committee suggested that the Membership Tribunal be comprised of only students. This change was suggested in accordance with the Board of Regents “Student Government Council Plan,” which gave the SGC the power to create student committees but not University committees (Committee on Referral, 1963). Other proposed changes also sought to clarify language to ensure SGC was within its rights given to it by the Board of Regents (Committee on Referral, 1963). The Vice President received the recommendation from the Committee on Referral and affirmed their proposals. Further, he encouraged SGC “to proceed with all possible hast to institute the process for the creation of the membership committee and the membership tribunal” (Feldkamp, 1963, p. 8).

Failing to obtain a veto from the Vice President of Student Affairs, L. D. Smith requested the Board of Regents, during their November 1963 meeting, prevent the new rules and regulations from taking hold (Feldkamp, 1963). They instead affirmed the Vice President’s decision by a 5-3 vote based on the previously adopted Harris Proposal (University of Michigan, 1966). L. D. Smith again requested that the Board of Regents stay the action on membership regulations and requested an appearance before the Board to make his case during the December 1963 meeting (University of Michigan, 1966). He was again rejected and, instead, offered an informal meeting with the regents. Although L. D. Smith and his firm would continue to represent multiple organizations (Feldkamp, 1964c), the regents dismissal of his request largely ended his role in determining the future of membership selection for fraternities and sororities.
Interfraternity Council acceptance and Trigon resistance. With the creation of the Membership Committee in the Student Government Council, the Interfraternity Council took steps to maintain some control over their membership selection process. The council established a “membership committee of three individuals to carry out the bylaw of the Interfraternity Council which requires that ‘members of fraternities shall not discriminate in selection of members on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin or ancestry’” (Feldkamp, 1963, p. 8). The creation of this committee allowed the IFC to effectively take on the role of the SGC Membership Committee for fraternities. The SGC Membership Committee allowed the IFC Membership Committee to receive, hear, and adjudicate issues of discrimination within the council but maintained the right to intervene if it determined that the IFC Membership Committee was not adequately managing a case or if a case needed to be reviewed (SGC Membership Committee, 1964a; SGC Membership Committee, 1964b; SGC Membership Committee, 1965a).

IFC President Rick Hoppe described the IFC Membership Committee during series of meetings of the Panhellenic Association. He shared that the committee had no formal relationship with the SGC committee and that they allowed the IFC to operate independently to uphold all rules and regulations pertaining to discrimination. He also stated that the SGC would take over if the IFC failed in their responsibility. Further, he shared that the IFC was able to create and maintain this committee because the National Interfraternity Conference (NIC) had no power to stop them from doing so (Rakocy, 1965c). Finally, the IFC viewed the creation of their committee as a positive public relation move, indicating that they were willing to eradicate discrimination on their own (Rakocy, 1965d).
The IFC Membership Committee set to work to review cases involving member fraternities. In many cases, the issues were with a national policy regarding membership or an inability to release information due to restrictions by a national organization (Feldkamp, 1964b; SGC Membership Committee, 1964b). Once case, however, rose to prominence as the fraternity fought hard to maintain their ability to select members that fit their identity as a fraternity.

The case against Trigon. Trigon, a local fraternity established at the University of Michigan in 1904 (Trigon Fraternity, 1964), became the focus of the IFC Membership Committee due to overt Christian references in their membership clause (D. T. Miller, 1964b). Where the membership committee saw discrimination, Trigon saw their identity as a Christian organization (Trigon Fraternity, 1964). Starting in 1963 (D. T. Miller, 1964b), the Trigon case lasted through 1965 (Burton, 1965a).

Starting in October of 1963, the IFC Membership Committee had found Trigon to be in violation of Article X, Section 1 of the IFC bylaws, which stated, “It shall be the policy of the Interfraternity council that member fraternities shall not discriminate in selection of members on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin or ancestry” (D. T. Miller, 1964b, p. 1). In a letter to the IFC, dated October 6, 1964, the membership committee requested judicial action against the fraternity, asserting that Trigon had violated the IFC bylaw by using “obviously discriminatory language in its constitution, pledge oath, and initiation ritual” (p. 1). A letter to the Trigon president, Hal Tobin, more specifically explained why the committee believed the fraternity was in violation:

In response to your request for a clarification of the charges of the Membership Committee and the reasons therefore, we submit this for your consideration.
In Article I, Section 1, appears the following passage, “Any Christian… may be a member… provided he is willing to accept the vows and the promises contained in the ritual.” We feel that “Christian” in this context refers to a member of the religion referred to as Christianity. If membership is limited to those of the Christian religion, we feel this constitutes religious discrimination as prohibited by the bylaw of the IFC.

By the wording of the pledge vow, the prospective pledge must repeat, “I _______ believing in a Christian way of life…” We feel that a member of a religion other than Christianity might find this statement repugnant to his faith, and thus under the wording of the bylaw, this statement constitutes religious discrimination.

In the Ritual, the Master asks, “Do you believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and are you willing to strive each day to live as His follower and servant should live?” The prospective member answers, “I do so believe and am willing so to serve.” Again, we feel that someone of a faith other than Christianity would find this statement repugnant to his faith and therefore could not repeat this part of the Ritual. As stated in the wording of Article I, Section 1, the prospect may become a member, “… providing he is willing to accept the vows and promises contained in the ritual.” Therefore, a prospect, if he was unable to repeat this promise, could not become a member. This, in effect, is selection of members on the basis of religious faith, and therefore, we feel it to be in violation of the IFC bylaw on Membership Selection.
We feel that the above is a clear statement of the specific sections of your Membership Statement that you are being charged under, and our reasons for holding that these sections are in violation of the Council’s bylaw on Membership Selection.

If there are any questions, please feel free to call me at 662-4055. Otherwise, I will be looking forward to discussing this matter with you at length, in the near future. (D. T. Miller, 1964a)

*The case for Trigon.* In response to the assertion by IFC that Trigon was engaging in discriminatory practices, the fraternity issued a 14 page response complete with addendums stating their case (Trigon Fraternity, 1964). The fraternity began its defense by sharing its history at the University of Michigan dating back to 1904. Following that, Trigon makes the case that its membership clause is not discriminatory but, instead, are just in accordance with the Christian founding and nature of the organization (Trigon Fraternity, 1964).

Trigon was originally founded as a chapter of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew in 1904 by five freshmen who had been active members of the Brotherhood at St. John’s Episcopal Church in Detroit, Michigan. The Brotherhood of St. Andrew was an active organization within the Episcopal Church and was based on two rules:

1) the Rule of Prayer; that each member of the Brotherhood will pray daily for the spread of Christ’s kingdom among men and especially young men; and

2) the Rule of Service; that each member will try, each day, to bring one man closer to Christ through the Church. (Trigon Fraternity, 1964, pp. 1-2)
During the 1904-1905 school year, the organization grew to 30 members (Trigon Fraternity, 1964).

The men acquired a house to live in together in the spring of 1905, and in the fall, they adopted the name “REDS” from the first letter of each word of their motto, “Render each day service” (Trigon Fraternity, 1964), and sought to develop a ritual for the organization. The ritual was adopted in October of 1905, and in January of 1906, the group changed its name to “The Trigon.” Shortly after, a constitution for the group was created which stated its relationship with the Brotherhood of St. Andrew clearly (Trigon Fraternity, 1964). With this, Trigon became a fraternity at the University of Michigan.

The fraternity continued to operate over the following years, and in 1907, the fraternity developed a plan to create a formal relationship between alumni and active members, similar to a national organization for other fraternities (Trigon Fraternity, 1964). As a result, the fraternity began publishing the “Trigon Annuals” and the first Triennial Convention was held in 1910. The fraternity also established a Board of Trustees and Grand Council to oversee and advocate for the fraternity (Trigon Fraternity, 1964).

The Trigon report further explained all of the activities that the fraternity had engaged in during the 60 years it had existed. It also indicated that it no longer had official ties to the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, but was accepting of men of all Christian faiths. It retained its Christian identity by recruiting men of Christian faith and remaining committed to being active in the community, especially related to Christian activities (Trigon Fraternity, 1964). The fraternity argued that by removing the Christian element of its constitution, ritual, and pledge, it would be removing a vital element of the fraternity’s identity.
Trigon then listed four reasons why the fraternity fully complied with the IFC bylaws:

1. Nothing in the Trigon Constitution, By-Laws or Ritual permits members to discriminate in the selection of candidates for membership on the basis of race. In fact, quite the contrary is true. Trigon has had in recent years at least one Negro pledged to the Fraternity, and has extended bids to others.

2. Nothing in the Trigon Constitution, By-Laws or Ritual would permit our members to discriminate in the selection of prospective members on the basis of color, and as noted immediately above, we have not discriminated in the selection of our members on this basis, and such would be prohibited by our professed beliefs.

3. Nothing in the Trigon Constitution, By-Laws or Ritual would permit our members to discriminate in the selection of prospective members on the basis of national origin, and as a matter of fact, we have pledged and initiated, among others, German, Norwegian, Chinese and Indian candidates.

4. Nothing in the Trigon Constitution, By-Laws or Ritual would permit our members to discriminate in the selection of prospective members on the basis of ancestry and as a matter of fact have initiated men who are the sons of the very poor as well as the very wealthy. (Trigon Fraternity, 1964, pp. 8-9)

Further, the fraternity makes the argument that race, color, national origin, and ancestry were not aspects of a man’s identity which could be chosen, so they have no control over them (Trigon Fraternity, 1964).
They continued by arguing that men could make choices in their creed and religion, and these things could change frequently over the course of a man’s life (Trigon Fraternity, 1964). For that reason, the fraternity argued that it was hard to determine what a man’s actual creed or religion actually was. Additionally, they argued that their membership clause did not state that prospective member had to hold membership in the Church but only had to “voluntarily and openly profess a belief in Our Lord Jesus Christ” (p. 10).

The fraternity stated that all members were asked:

Do you BELIEVE:

(a) In a Christian way of life?
(b) In Our Lord Jesus Christ?

Are You WILLING:

To strive each day to live as His follower and servant should live? (Trigon Fraternity, 1964, p. 11)

But, they argued, this did not necessarily exclude non-Christian’s from joining the fraternity:

Whom does this exclude from membership in Trigon? Very simply: it excludes everyone unwilling to subscribe to these statements, irrespective of what their religion may or may not be. Does it exclude a Jew? Christ was a Jew, and certainly it would not exclude Him. Does it exclude a Moslem, a Catholic, a Baptist, a Mennonite? Perhaps it would; perhaps it would not. So far as Trigon is concerned it would not exclude them because of their religion, but only if they are unwilling to take Trigon’s vows. Whether Trigon’s vows would exclude a man because of his particular religious beliefs is purely a subjective consideration for
the individual prospective member. For anyone but the individual to determine
this for himself, as for example the IFC or Trigon, would seem to be an
unwarranted invasion of an individual’s right to self determination. (Trigon
Fraternity, 1964, p. 11)

Finally, the chapter concludes by stating that not even all Christians were automatically accepted
into the fraternity. They too had to accept the “vows and promises contained in the Ritual”
(Trigon Fraternity, 1964, p. 12).

The fraternity ended its defense by again arguing that the fraternity did not discriminate
against members in any way that they were unable to change and that they only would reject a
member who was unwilling to take their vow. They stated that the IFC was inflicting great
damage on the fraternity by labeling it as discriminatory and that they were only being selective
like every other fraternity. They finished by stating that the IFC should dismiss the charges and
make the dismissal public so as to restore the reputation of the fraternity (Trigon Fraternity,
1964).

The decision and aftermath. After a series of meetings, the IFC Executive Committee
and Fraternity Presidents’ Assembly found against Trigon. The decision was upheld after an
appeal to the Fraternity Presidents’ Assembly (Idema, 1965; Rea, 1965). The IFC issued a
decision directing Trigon to modify its Ritual prior to the start of the following school year. The
decision read:

MOVE: That Trigon Fraternity be directed to revise to the satisfaction of the
Interfraternity Council Executive Committee those sections of the Trigon Ritual
which have been found in violation of Article X, Section 1 of the IFC Bylaws, on
or before September 1, 1965.

In the event that the above sections are not so revised by that date all
fraternity privileges regulated by the Interfraternity Council shall be immediately
and indefinitely suspended and recommendation shall be made to the Fraternity
Presidents’ Assembly that the membership of Trigon Fraternity in the
Interfraternity Council be revoked. (Interfraternity Council Executive Committee,
1965, p. 1)

On August 21, the active members of Trigon met and came to the unanimous decision to
change the constitution and ritual rather than face expulsion from the IFC (Burton, 1965b). The
following day, active members and alumni met and voted (some by proxy) as a whole
organization to change the constitution and ritual. The fraternity came to the decision to change
the documents based on the desire to remain and be an active participant in the fraternity
community at U-M, and on the idea that they could make the changes while maintaining their
core identity as a Christian organization (Burton, 1965b). After two years of conflict with the
IFC over their membership selection process, Trigon acquiesced, and the conflict ended.

*The university’s role.* During the two years the IFC and Trigon were in conflict, the
University maintained a close watch. Fraternity Advisor and Assistant to the Vice President for
Student Affairs John Feldkamp communicated with the Vice President for Student Affairs
(Feldkamp, 1964b), the IFC (Feldkamp, 1965a), and the Trigon Grand Council (Feldkamp,
1965b) regarding the conflict. Additionally, alumni and concerned stakeholders reached out to
university officials including the president (Werder, 1965a) and members of the Board of
Regents (Werder, 1965b).
The university neatly avoided becoming directly involved with the Trigon case by passing questions to others and continually pointing to the IFC’s status as a voluntary student organization. In a response to a stakeholder, U-M President Hatcher politely acknowledged receiving a letter full of questions and concerns and then indicated that the Vice President of Student Affairs would send an answer (Hatcher, 1965). Regent Irene Murphy (1965) used a more direct approach and responded to Mr. Werder:

It was nice of you to write me about the Trigon Case.

As Regents, we have, of course, looked into this matter.

The Interfraternity Council is a voluntary association of the several fraternities on the campus for mutual interests. The University, as such, has no power or direction over it.

Unless we would dictate that University students could not enjoy the usual Constitutional privileges of free association, we have no authority over the Council. I think you would agree that we would not invade the privileges of voluntary association.

The Trigon fraternity has elected to be a member of the Interfraternity Council. If its group decisions are unacceptable to Trigon, it has, of course, the privilege of withdrawing from the Council. If such is the decision it does not affect Trigon’s relationship with the University.

I hope that you can work this matter out with the Trigon chapter-house at the University of Michigan. (p. 1)
Murphy’s letter makes a clear statement that the university did not get involved in this case because of the IFC’s status as a voluntary association for fraternities on campus and because of each fraternity’s voluntary association with the IFC. It was later acknowledged and confirmed by Vice President for Student Affairs Richard Cutler in a letter to university administrative officers that the university had indeed stood back and allowed IFC to manage this case. He wrote, “this is a small victory but none the less, a real one, and testifies to the wisdom of giving IFC the responsibility for managing the affairs of the fraternity system” (Cutler, 1965a).

**Panhellenic Association Membership Committee and national organization resistance.** While the IFC was gaining small victories through their own membership committee, the sorority community was still determining how to proceed. National sorority organizations continued to block attempts by the Student Government Council to review or change membership clauses in some organizations, and went further by even prohibiting their organizations from answering simple questionnaires created by the SGC Membership Committee (SGC Membership Committee, 1964a). Some national sororities even suggested that they would prefer their chapter at U-M to become unrecognized by the university and maintain national affiliation in order to maintain their practices (SGC Membership Committee, 1965b).

Two years after the Interfraternity Council had formed their membership committee, the Panhellenic Association still did not have any such structure. Additionally, they were not allowed to speak with the SGC Membership Committee (SGC Membership Committee, 1965c). This did not stop the Panhellenic Association from discussing the membership committee at their own meetings however. The main issue at hand was no longer explicit bias clauses contained within sorority’s constitutions, but instead, was the practice of obtaining letters of
recommendation. In a report to the Board of Regents, the Vice President for Student Affairs summarized this issue:

The question of the discriminatory nature of alumni recommendations was raised during the spring of 1965. It was pointed out that some groups are unable to pledge a girl if an alumni indicates her disapproval of that girl. No reason for the basis of this disapproval need be stated. Another method of alumni control over membership selection is the requirement that a favorable recommendation be on file before a girl may be pledged. Again, no reason need be stated for a refusal to write such a recommendation.

DEFINITION: “Binding recommendations”—an unfavorable recommendation on a rushee which prohibits the local chapter from pledging the girl even if they wish to. “Required recommendation”—a form which must be filled out (favorably) by a non-collegiate before a local chapter may pledge a girl, i.e., without such a recommendation the girl cannot be pledged. (Newell, 1968c, p. 5)

Meeting minutes from April 1, 1965, presented a discussion by the Panhellenic Association regarding how to proceed given that they were being told to follow different rules by their national organizations and the university. Two ideas that were discussed were the non-recognition of sororities by the university, allowing sororities to follow their national rules, or fully adhering to the university policies, risking a loss of affiliation with a national organization. It was determined that neither solution was optimal but that the women needed to be part of the discussion so they could have an input in the direction of their community (Panhellenic Association, 1965). This same sentiment was brought up by sorority presidents during an April
8, 1965, meeting: “This [non-discrimination policy] will not become a dead issue. We must begin action on it now because someone else will decide for us” (Rakocy, 1965a, p. 2). The SGC Membership Committee also wanted the sorority women to have a voice in the process. The committee felt that “the sorority chapters and their presidents should have more collegiate power. The committee felt that the greatest progress can be made through internal pressure by students” (J. Smith, 1965b, p. 1).

The pressure for sororities, and some fraternities, to determine whether to adhere to university rules or to their national rules was immense. Vice President Cutler explained this pressure in a letter to Regent Sorenson:

The difficulty here arises because the national organizations and Alumni of many of these groups have not kept pace with the progressive changes taking place at the local level. The locals are financially dependent upon the nationals and rely upon them for the benefits of national affiliation. It is not uncommon for local chapters on this campus to wish to pledge persons outside the white, Protestant group and to encounter virtually insurmountable barriers from their nationals. The threat of withdrawing a chapter’s charter and financial support is a dire one. It means, in effect, the destruction of the local chapter. Our local collegiate chapters therefore are in no position to undertake a test of power with the nationals unless someone else is prepared to assume the financial obligations of the house and to provide some substitute for the benefits of national affiliation. (Cutler, 1965b, p. 2)

Despite the unenviable position of the U-M fraternity and sorority chapters, Dr. Cutler explained in his letter that the Panhellenic Association did choose to stand up to their national
organizations. He wrote, “the Panhellenic Association recently voted 21-2 to take steps to assume a similar posture [to IFC], and in effect threw down the gauntlet to the National Panhel and the several national sorority groups” (p. 2). The Panhellenic Association did this by “requiring all sororities to file their recommendation forms with SGC Membership Committee by October 1, 1965” (Newell, 1968c, p. 5).

**Creating the Panhellenic Association Membership Committee.** Although the Panhellenic Association had voted to assume a stance similar to IFC, it was still not there. On October 5, 1965, the Panhellenic Association Executive Board meetings read,

> Panhel wants to assert its’ position through a Panhel Membership Committee. Because there are many contradictions in our Constitutions, we are in a bind. One house that did not submit their rec form, wrote many protest letters to their National. The Administration wants us to decide what to do, take initiative, and to act. (Rakocy, 1965b, p. 1)

These meeting minutes show that the sorority women were feeling pressure to act but still felt trapped between their national organizations and the university. Adding further pressure, as of October 14, 1965, multiple sororities had not sent the SGC Membership Committee any information or sufficient information and were being threatened with sanctions (J. Smith, 1965c).

The Panhellenic Association Presidents’ Council met again on October 26, 1965, and invited IFC President Rick Hoppe to discuss the IFC Membership Committee. During this meeting, Hoppe explained the structure of the IFC committee and how it was able to function the way it did, mostly due to the SGC Membership Committee allowing IFC to manage their own affairs and the national organizations of the IFC chapters not wanting to lose their chapters at U-
M through disaffiliation with the national organization or removal by the university (Rakocy, 1965d). The Panhellenic sorority presidents discussed what Hoppe had shared with them and their own ability to create a similar structure:

1. Structure of a Panhel Membership Committee would be similar [to the IFC Membership Committee].

2. In practice, the membership committee would work fairly close with the executive council.

3. Informational work would still be handled by SGC.

4. IFC Committee is in the process of an educational movement to keep the presidents well-informed.

5. Board of Regents has power to establish a committee and give the administrative authority to the members.

6. We are student organizations and if a sorority lost its’ recognition, it would no longer be approved as student housing.

7. NPC—We must clarify exactly what it is. It is only a conference and not a legislative body. They do meet and make resolutions but the only reasons why they are binding is because the individual members ratify the resolutions.

8. The most important people to deal with are those who are representatives of individual Nationals. The best way of going about it is to formulate the advantages and disadvantages and then writing letters to the Nationals.
9. The problem would be that some Nationals would refuse to recognize the Panhel Membership Committee and wish to deal directly with the Administration.

10. It could be the problem of loosing [sic] charter v. loosing [sic] recognition. However, this is not the type of risk we want to take. A lot depends on the individuals’ ability to communicate effectively with the Nationals. We must be able to be honest and present exactly how our Nationals feel.

11. We must see that we consider the short-term problems as well as the long-term plans of the University. The non-discrimination policy will eventually be upheld and the decision rests on whether we will work with it now. The whole idea must be put in proper perspective and we must consider the PROPER METHOD. (Rakocy, 1965g, p. 2)

Just days after this meeting, the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC) passed a resolution regarding “Unanimous Agreements” stating “The 26 member fraternities of NPC reaffirm their responsibility of upholding and honor the Unanimous Agreements and reaffirm their commitment to working together in a spirit of harmony and cooperation” (National Panhellenic Conference, 2014). Unanimous agreements, per the NPC, were “certain procedures and ethics that lead to the orderly and equitable conduct of their mutual functions” (National Panhellenic Conference, 2012, p. 28) and “unanimous agreements are binding on all member fraternities of the National Panhellenic Conference” (p. 28). Of these unanimous agreements, two pertained directly to the U-M Panhellenic Association’s attempts to create a membership committee or work with the SGC Membership Committee. The first (UA II.1.C.vi), stated,
A College Panhellenic Council shall take no action that infringes on the sovereignty, rights, or privileges of the individual NPC fraternities. Infringements include but are not limited to the following: Surveying to collect data that reflects a chapter’s internal information or requiring documents that are considered confidential material regarding the chapter’s internal operations. (National Panhellenic Conference, 2012, p. 29)

The second (UA II.1.C.x) forbade the Panhellenic Association from “voting to contradict an NPC Unanimous Agreement” (National Panhellenic Conference, 2012, p. 29). The NPC passing a resolution to reaffirm the unanimous agreements served as a reminder to the Panhellenic Association at U-M that violations could result in the loss of charters for member sororities (Rakocy, 1965e).

Understanding the potential consequences to their actions, the Panhellenic Association moved forward and created a proposal for a Panhellenic Association Membership Committee (Rakocy, 1965f). The proposed committee would consist of five members who would investigate matters pertaining to membership selection. This committee would present their findings to the Executive Council who would then assign sanctions to the offending sorority (Rakocy, 1965f). A second proposal was also presented in which cases would be presented directly to the Presidents’ Council rather than the Executive Council (Rakocy, 1965f). Both proposals were discussed with Vice President Cutler who expressed a favorable attitude to each. He indicated that having a self-regulatory body, like IFC, would be ideal and could lead to the dissolving of the SGC Membership Committee because it would no longer be needed (Rakocy, 1965g). At the final meeting of 1965, the Panhellenic Association Presidents’ Council discussed the plans again,
listing pro’s and con’s, and charged each member with communicating with their chapter and national organization to determine how to vote (Rakocy, 1965f).

Although the meeting minutes for the Panhellenic Association for 1966 have been lost, an article in the Michigan Daily (Kaplan, 1966) explained how sororities resolved the issue of a membership committee. The article explained that the women voted on a new bylaw to be added to the Panhellenic Association Constitution which would include a non-discriminatory clause and allow for the creation of a five-person membership committee. The bylaw, which needed two-thirds majority to pass, received 21 votes for, seven against, and three abstentions. It passed with exactly the amount of votes needed (Kaplan, 1966).

According to *The Michigan Daily*, the non-discrimination portion of the bylaw read, “It shall be the policy of the Panhellenic Association that member sororities shall select their members without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin or ancestry” (Kaplan, 1966, p. 1). The bylaw also established a membership committee of five women who would “investigate violations of the bylaw” and “seek compliance with this policy” (Kaplan, 1966, p. 1). The maximum penalty allowed by the bylaw was a loss of all sorority privileges.

Although the Panhellenic Executive Committee expressed great excitement at the passing of this bylaw, Lynn Lewis, Assistant to the Director of Student Activities and Organizations and Panhellenic Advisor, was less enthusiastic (Kaplan, 1966). She viewed the passing of this bylaw as a good step for the Panhellenic Association but was weary of the response by the NPC and individual sorority national organizations. Despite the weariness, and the formal objections made by most individual national organizations, only a few forbid their U-M chapters from voting on the bylaw. This was seen not as an acceptance of the new policy by the national organizations, but a willingness to tolerate it (Kaplan, 1966).
The Panhellenic Association Membership Committee was created on January 27, 1966, and began operating immediately with authority granted to them by the SGC (Newell, 1968c). With the national organizations tolerating the creation of this committee and with general support from sorority presidents, the committee operated as designed and without fanfare (Newell, 1968c). The issue of discrimination in sororities and the membership committee quickly became a secondary issue in 1966 as the Panhellenic Association sought to reduce its recruitment from two semesters to just Fall recruitment (Frost, 1966).

In March of 1967, the Student Government Council created a “Working Agreement with the IFC and Panhellenic on Membership” (SGC Membership Committee, 1967). This agreement delineated the responsibilities of each party in investigating and adjudicating violations of the regents’ bylaw pertaining to discrimination. It afforded the IFC and Panhellenic Membership Committees the power and responsibility to investigate issues related to their member organizations but created a direct reporting line to the SGC Membership Committee to review each investigation. This agreement established a formal connection between the three organizations (SGC Membership Committee, 1967).

**Binding and required recommendations.** Early in 1968, the Panhellenic Association, recognizing that binding and required recommendations were still a concern for many chapters, passed a resolution to remove them from all Panhellenic sorority chapters:

I. A sorority chapter, being a recognized student organization is subject to the regulations of Student Government Council concerning membership in that organization.
II. Included in these regulations is the refusal to accept as valid the veto of a non-collegiate (i.e. alumni) member based on race, religion, creed, or national origin in membership selection.

III. Because there is no way of assuring that the veto is not based on race, religion, creed, or national origin, and because there is no way of assuring that alumni base recommendations on valid criteria, there is no definite assurance that binding and required recommendation systems are in accordance with Regents By-law 2.14, nor the concurring Student Government Council regulations on membership.

IV. We, the members of the Presidents’ Council of the Panhellenic Association of the University of Michigan are committed to the elimination of binding and required recommendation mechanisms, and we shall work toward that goal.

V. It is recognized that a local chapter must make every effort to cooperate with its national and/or alumnae organizations as well as to comply with University regulations. Therefore, each chapter will sign by September 1, 1968 a statement signifying that it can comply with the University policy of non-discrimination in membership selection and will not, therefore, utilize a system of required recommendations or accept any recommendations as binding. (Panhellenic Association Presidents' Council, 1968)

Joan Ringel, the Panhellenic Advisor, wrote to Vice President Cutler on February 8, 1968, requesting support in this matter. She explained that many of the sororities would not be able to comply with the resolution because their national organizations would not allow it. Ringel asked Dr. Cutler, or another university representative, to reaffirm the regents delegation of authority to
the SGC and Panhellenic Association, and to reassure the Panhellenic Association that the regents would stand behind them if they were to remove an organization for failing to comply (Ringel, 1968).

Ringel’s fear that national organizations would not accept the Panhellenic Association regulation were proven correct by a letter written to Regent Cudlip on February 17, 1968, by the National President of Kappa Kappa Gamma Fraternity, Frances Alexander (Alexander, 1968). In her letter, Alexander claimed the actions of the Panhellenic Association to be illegal and in direct violation of the constitutions of each member organization of the National Panhellenic Conference. In her letter, she asked the Board of Regents to reject the regulation created by the Panhellenic Association and to protect the “constitutional rights of national organizations like ours” (Alexander, 1968, p. 2). Regent Cudlip, in turn, wrote to Vice President Cutler for an explanation of the situation (Cudlip, 1968).

Around that same time, on February 19, 1968, President Fleming received a letter from Panhellenic Association President Virginia Mochel describing the actions taken by the Panhellenic Association and why they were necessary. Mochel indicated that they wanted support from the university for their position, but also that the Panhellenic Association was seeking legal advice regarding their actions (Mochel, 1968). On February 29, 1968, the attorney general for the State of Michigan, Frank Kelley, wrote a letter in response to the question, “Can any university or college in the state of Michigan, that receives state funds, allow on its campus a fraternity or sorority that discriminates in their membership on the basis of race, creed, color or religion?” (Kelley, 1968). Kelley shared that even though fraternities and sororities were voluntary student organization, they were dependent upon the university for services and the university provided those services, which made the university responsible for them. Further, he
made the argument that fraternal organizations could be viewed as part of the educational experience, so a student being denied access to an organization based on race, creed, color or religion would be equivalent discrimination against them trying to obtain an educational opportunity. Kelley went on to say that legal precedent and the Constitution of the United States made discrimination on college campuses illegal, so universities were within their right reject organizations that practiced discrimination and to adopt policies prohibiting discrimination (Kelley, 1968).

On April 9, 1968, Vice President Cutler, having received information from Regent Cudlip and President Fleming regarding the Panhellenic Association regulation, produced an information item for the Board of Regents. It briefly explained the situation, how the university had acted previously concerning the Panhellenic Association, and included the letters written to President Fleming and the letter written by the Attorney General (Cutler, 1968a). Through his brief explanation of the situation and his inclusion of some letters and omission of others, he offered indirect support for the Panhellenic Association:

Panhellenic Association is a voluntary association of the various sororities at the University. In its Constitution, a provision exists which requires that local sorority chapters must be willing to abide by majority decision of the Presidents’ Council in order to maintain their membership in the Association. The action of Panhellenic is an effort to eliminate racial discrimination from the sorority system on this campus. As Miss Mochel’s letter indicates, there is strong reason to believe that the binding and required recommendation system has in fact been used as a means to prevent the pledging of minority group members to certain of the national sororities on our campus.
It has been the policy of the University to support actions taken by Panhellenic, as a voluntary association, by making membership in Panhellenic a condition of participation in rush, activities programming, etc. (Cutler, 1968a, p. 1)

The Board of Regents did not act on the information at that time and allowed the administration to act instead (University of Michigan, 1969).

Vice President Cutler issued a public statement concerning the Panhellenic Association on May 2, 1968 (Cutler, 1968b). It read:

Sorority matters have, for many years, been handled through the Panhellenic Association, to which each of the sororities belongs. Panhel has, during this period, exercised the power to place individual houses on probation for one offense or another deemed in violation of the rules of the organization.

On January 24, 1968, the Presidents’ Council of Panhellenic Association voted 14-6 to require sororities to abandon the practice of obtaining from alumnae binding and required letters of recommendations for rushees, on the ground that such letters can be discriminatory on the basis of race, creed, or ethnic origin.

The University of Michigan, as a public institution, is barred from engaging in discriminatory practices, and an opinion of the Attorney General of the State of Michigan states that discrimination on the part of fraternities and/or sororities falls within the ban. Quite apart from the legal requirements, The University of Michigan would not want to be a party to practices which discriminate on the basis of race, creed, or ethnic origin.
For the above reasons, the Panhellenic Association is deemed to have acted within its authority in voting on the use of letters of recommendation, and it is assumed that it may exercise its usual authority in requiring compliance.

(Cutler, 1968b, p. 1)

With this statement, the university declared its support for the Panhellenic Association.

In the months following the university’s public support for the Panhellenic Association, multiple sorority national organizations wrote to the university protesting the decision (Steel, 1968; Helms, 1968; Peterson, 1968; Newell, 1968c). By the September 1, 1968 deadline, only seven sororities had signed and filed the Panhellenic statement (Newell, 1968c). Vice President for Student Affairs Barbara Newell wrote of this and possible solutions in a memo to President Fleming dated October 3, 1968:

A number of the nationals refuse to act on the ground that Panhel and Student Government Council are student groups and do not represent or create University policy. Apparently the nationals have regulations that University rules are supreme to national regulations.

Student Government Council and Panhel are trying to force the issue perhaps by petitioning the Regents. It seems to me we have three alternatives.

1. Not to act—This will raise havoc with the students—Panhel, SGC, black students. The issue is about to bubble up.

2. Restate as a Regent or University Rule the sorority statement on binding letters…
3. Reaffirm the power of Panhel to regulate sororities. “The Regents of the University of Michigan have delegated the recognition and control of student organizations to student governments. Qualifications for University recognition of sorority groups is delegated to the Panhellenic Council and carry the sanctions of University regulations.”

I favor the third alternative along with a restatement of By-law 2.14. (Newell, 1968b, pp. 1-2)

Following the September 1 deadline, the Panhellenic Association Presidents’ Council met on October 9 and debated how to best enforce the new regulation. There were several objections to the discussed methods of enforcement. One report captured the heated nature of the debate:

> During the meeting members of Alpha Kappa Alpha and Delta Sigma Theta [each are historically black sororities] officially withdrew from Panhel, stating that they could not, in any good conscience, remain affiliated with an association which permits discrimination in any form. (Newell, 1968c, p. 6)

No decisions were made at that meeting but, one week later, the Presidents’ Council met and approved the “Winder Proposal.” This proposal set a deadline of January 9, 1969, for all sororities to comply with the regulation banning required and binding recommendations and indicated that chapters who did not comply would not be allowed to participate in recruitment during the winter semester (Newell, 1968c).

A report written one month later, on November 6, 1968, indicated that twelve sororities did not have binding or required agreements. Of those 12, only seven had signed the Panhellenic regulation. The other five refused because it violated the unanimous agreements of the National
Panhellenic Conference. Eleven sororities still utilized binding or required recommendations and risked losing the right to recruit new members the following semester (Newell, 1968c).

Vice President Newell and President Fleming, still supporting the position of the Panhellenic Association, sought assistance from the Board of Regents to settle the matter (Fleming, 1968; Newell, 1968a). Vice President Newell submitted an “action request” to the Board of Regents on November 6, 1968, which read:

Action Requested: Passage of a resolution supporting Panhellenic Action

Background: The Panhellenic Association has now taken action setting final dates for the use of binding and required recommendations. However, at least two-thirds of the national sororities refused to comply with Panhel’s decision, although the bylaw delegation of power to the Panhellenic Association is very explicit.

Since the issue of discrimination is one on which we all agree and the students need reassurance, I recommend that the Regents pass the following resolution:

WHEREAS: The Board of Regents has adopted Bylaw 2.14 stating a University policy against discrimination on the bases of race, creed, religion, or national origin.

WHEREAS: Panhellenic Association has examined the use of binding and required recommendations and finds that their use results in violations of Bylaw 2.14,
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: At the request of the Michigan Panhellenic Association, the Regents accept the finding of the Michigan Panhellenic Association that binding and required recommendations may result in violation of Bylaw 2.14, and therefore declare the further use of such binding and required recommendations to be in violation of Bylaw 2.14. (Newell, 1968a, p. 1)

The Board of Regents discussed this resolution at length and then it was approved (University of Michigan, 1969).

Following the action taken by the Board of Regents, all national sorority presidents, chapter advisors, and local chapter presidents were notified of the actions taken by the regents. Per the National Panhellenic Conference policy stating that university policy supersedes the policies of the conference (Newell, 1968c), most national sororities quickly complied with the Panhellenic regulation regarding binding and required recommendations (University of Michigan, 1968). As of December 18, 1968, only two sororities had not indicated that they would comply. The local chapter of Pi Beta Phi voluntarily withdrew from recruitment, stating that they did not want to recruit while having to use required or binding recommendations. The other sorority, Kappa Delta, had not received word from its national organization, who was working with Attorney L. D. Smith on the matter (University of Michigan, 1968). These were the only two sororities not permitted to recruit that year (Sororities and Fraternities, 1969).

**Changing relationships.** The period of time from 1949 to 1970 a time of change and political unrest at the University of Michigan. The bias clause and membership selection conflict featuring fraternities and sororities was only one of many activist movements on the campus in response to the national, political landscape of the time (Peckham, 1994). From the first attempt
in 1949 to address bias and discrimination in the membership selection practices of student organizations, it was apparent that the student body was different from previous generations.

This difference was reflected in the changing nature of student affairs at the university. Starting with Vice President for Student Affairs Dr. James Lewis in 1954, student affairs at the University of Michigan existed in a state of constant flux and reorganization (Peckham, 1994; Bentley Historical Library, 2018b). Between 1954 and 1971, the university employed four different Vice Presidents for Student Affairs and reorganized three different times in response to the changing student body (Bentley Historical Library, 2018b). The university was forced to respond as students wanted increased services related to activism and service. One way this was apparent was in the evolution of how student organizations, like fraternities and sororities, were managed.

At the start of this period of unrest, in 1949, fraternities and sororities each had an advisor who worked with them specifically. The organizations were generally free to operate independent of the university with the exception of certain housing rules and in the use of university resources (Peckham, 1994). As the campus community increased pressure on fraternities and sororities to change their membership selection practices and remove bias clauses from their governing documents, the university created entities to further regulate fraternities and sororities, which also created a tighter relationship between fraternal organizations and the university (Peckham, 1994). However, by the end of the 1960’s, as the issue of bias clauses and membership selection was being resolved, the university began questioning its close relationship with fraternities and sororities.
In 1968, while sororities were still working to resolve issues with binding and required recommendations, the university determined that fraternities no longer needed an advisor specific to their organizations:

The question of the relationship of the University to fraternities was brought up this year and has been dealt with in part by the transference of the person assigned as “fraternity advisor” to a position of research. Advising IFC or individual chapters will continue on a basis equivalent to the support and advice given any other student organizations. (Sororities and Fraternities, 1969, p. 23)

The same question was brought up in relation to sororities the following year. In the *Office of Student Organizations Staff Summary Report, 1969-1970*, the changing structure and work of the office is explained:

When reviewing operations of an office for a year end report, emphasis is usually placed upon what has been accomplished. Less frequently does such a report highlight what has been eliminated, what has been modified, what has been retained and what has been added. Such a focus, however, is appropriate with regard to the functioning and operation of the Office of Student Organizations during the year 1969-1970.

The process of assessing the priorities and functions of the office has been facilitated by the continued existence and operation of a student policy committee composed of representatives of eleven major student organizations, a member of the Student Relations Committee of SACUA, and the Director of the Office. The existence of this body has provided a structure which facilitates student input
regarding the operation of the Office. In this way, the services provided are hopefully more responsive to the needs of the organizations on campus.

**What Has Been Eliminated**

Based upon the results of a user survey of the Student Activities Calendar and the reassessment of the results of this publication, it was decided that continuation of this operation was inappropriate for the OSO and steps were taken to transfer the Calendar to a more appropriate office in the University. The basic aspects of the Calendar are now incorporated in the newly expanded *University Record*.

In continuation of the efforts to provide services more generally to all student organization as opposed to specific subgroupings of the, the role of advisor to sororities was phased out. In place of this role a staff member now has more general responsibilities with regard to all women’s organizations. This had been accomplished regarding fraternities and Interhouse Assembly the previous year. Some of the functions of these roles as they had been performed in the past have been assumed by the affiliated-associated housing staff in the Office of University Housing.

**What Has Been Modified**

Historically the OSO has provided services to organizations with a predominance of consultation with individuals or single groups. In the interest of greater utilization of scarce resources, the past year has seen a shift in emphasis to a more programmatic provision of services. Programs designed to speak to the
problems and needs of a number of groups simultaneously have been developed
and executed.

Also modified is the role previously performed with regard to Student
Government Council. In the past one staff member’s primary responsibility had
been to serve as advisor to and linkage person with SGC. The conception of this
role has been altered such that a staff member now has responsibilities with
regard to all student governmental groups; including departmental, school and
college, and University wide bodies.

What Has Been Added

The OSO continues to provide a wide variety of services and resources for
more than 400 organizations on campus. Among these are: Civic service and UM
concern groups, productions and publication, cooperatives, governing bodies and
steering committees, academic and professional groups, fraternities, hobby and
social groups, political groups, international groups, honor societies, dorm
governments, professional sororities and fraternities, religious groups, and
sororities.

Lists of organizations are maintained to enable interested individuals and
organization to find out what’s happening and how to get involved.

Consultation is available regarding various aspects of organizational
functioning, such as: membership, finances, communication, leadership, and
group problem solving.
Short term programs are designed with individual organization to speak to their own current issues.

Periodic workshops are held, which focus on general organizational problems. In addition, numerous other services: access to duplicating machines, linkage to other University and community resources, accounting services, etc. are available for use by student groups.

What Has Been Added

In the interest of providing services to all student organizations an additional position has been added. This position is that of a staff member whose primary responsibilities call for working with the predominately black organizations on campus. In addition to these duties this staff member also is expected to perform general staff functions. (Staff Summary Report, 1970, pp. 21-22)

The 1969-1970 report seems to indicate a decrease in resources for the office as well as a shift in the interests of students. Evidence of this change is shown in how the Office of Student Organizations sought to decrease roles for specific populations like fraternities and sororities while it added a staff member to work specifically with predominantly Black student organizations.

The 1950’s and 1960’s greatly impacted fraternities and sororities. Their reputation and standing at the University of Michigan was greatly diminished by the public conflict over bias clauses and membership selection (Peckham, 1994; Horowitz, 1987). At the same time, membership growth slowed and then started to decrease into the late 1960’s (Horowitz, 1987). In
a final blow to fraternities and sororities, the university pulled away from them as it became clear that the interests and needs of the student body were shifting. The change in relationship damaged fraternities and sororities significantly according to John Feldkamp (1970), the Director of University Housing and former advisor to fraternities:

The policy of disengagement between fraternities and sororities and the University over the past few years has gone hand in hand with the decline of these groups. Serious consideration should be given to either severing ties completely or re-establishing meaningful relationships that entail burdens and benefits for both these groups and the University. (p. 25)

It is impossible to say exactly what caused the decline of fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan. However, the conflict over bias clauses and membership selection highlighted how much relationships with fraternities and sororities on campus had changed. The relationship between the student body and fraternities and sororities shifted as students began to question the value of fraternal organizations (Horowitz, 1987; Peckham, 1994). As a result, university changed the nature of its relationship with fraternities and sororities to meet the needs and wishes of the campus.

**Conclusion.** Following World War II, fraternities and sororities at Michigan were asked—or told—to change. This process took nearly 10 years to complete, and took incredible efforts from students, staff, faculty, and stakeholders to accomplish. Committees were formed, policies challenged, and bylaws created. The action by the Board of Regents in 1968 effectively ended the period of time when discriminatory clauses and membership selection were a focus for fraternities and sororities. Although some opposition continued (Hallock, 1969), the issue was settled. The end of this period also served as a transition point for the relationship between the
university and the fraternity and sorority community. Whereas the 1960’s was a time of heavy involvement by the university, by 1970 the university had removed the fraternity and sorority advisor positions (Staff Summary Report, 1970), and was actively disengaging with the community (Feldkamp, 1970).

Although the landscape for fraternities and sororities changed, and would continue to change moving forward, the culture that had been established by fraternities and sororities would continue. These students “remained at war with their faculty, and only traitors went over to the other side” (Horowitz, 1987, p. 150). The war over the values of fraternal organizations and those of institutional actors continued.

**Second Era of Politicization: Ski Trip Incident, 2015-Present**

The Fraternity War at the University of Michigan began in 1845 when the first fraternities were established at the university. The original conflict was resolved when the university decided to allow fraternities to legally form and function on the campus. Over time, the university began to offer increased support to fraternities, and later sororities, by hiring dedicated staff to work with the students. Where there had once been a purely adversarial relationship between the university and fraternal organizations a partnership began to grow.

In the late 1950’s and 1960’s, conflicting viewpoints on membership selection processes caused the Fraternity War to start once again. This iteration of the war lasted nearly 10 years and involved students, staff, faculty, and other stakeholders. This conflict caused both the fraternity and sorority community and the university to create new rules, policies, and committees to address the issues. The end of this period also served as a transition point for the relationship between the university and the fraternity and sorority community. Up until this conflict, the relationship between fraternal organizations and the institution was a partnership with staff
supporting the students and students working with the university. Following the membership selection conflict, the university decided to distance itself from fraternal organizations, leaving them to survive on their own.

On a national scale, fraternities and sororities were experiencing change. The 1960’s saw a decline in the prestige of fraternal organizations as well as a decline in membership compared to overall enrollment on college campuses (Horowitz, 1987). The Civil Rights movement and Vietnam War greatly influenced what college students wanted from their campus experiences. Students came to college wanting to be active in social movements and viewed fraternities and sororities as frivolous ventures that were not worth their time (Horowitz, 1987).

This attitude would give way to the “Animal House” mentality in the 1970’s (Bird, 1979). As the Vietnam War ended and student activism waned, an increasing number of students began to seek more social activities and joined fraternities and sororities. Membership slow increased through the 1970’s but began to grow rapidly in the 1980’s. Fraternities and sororities were once again gaining popularity and prestige on college campuses (Horowitz, 1987). This led to an increase in risk management and liability concerns which would continue through the present day (Nuwer, 1999; Syrett, 2009).

The University of Michigan was not exempt from the membership growth, or the accompanying issues, in the 1980’s and beyond. Recognizing a need for increased relationships with fraternities and sororities, the university once again sought to create a partnership with these organizations. In 1995, two advisors were hired to work with the Interfraternity Council and the Panhellenic Association (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018a). For a period of time, the focus of the community was on reestablishing relationships with the university and managing risk and liability.
Then, in January 2015, the Fraternity War began again. Over the course of one weekend, six fraternities and sororities thrust Greek Life at the University of Michigan into the spotlight with bad behavior at two different ski resorts. Conflicting values between fraternal organizations and the institution forced the university to respond, again changing its relationship with fraternities and sororities. This incident would cause a series of events spanning more than three years which would result in significant changes to the university and to Greek life.

**The incidents: January 16-18, 2015.** On the weekend of January 16-18, 2015, multiple fraternities and sororities went on “ski trips” around Michigan (M.B. Seiler, personal communication, January 19, 2015). Most of these trips resulted only in students having a good time, but others created only destruction and devastation. On January 19, 2015, a resident of Gaylord, MI, emailed an employee in the Office of the President at the University of Michigan, writing,

I don’t really know if you are the person to speak with about this, but I needed to let someone at U of M know about the destruction caused by 300 U Of M [sic] students this past weekend at Treetops Resort in Gaylord, Michigan.

My children work at Treetops and had access to the hallways of the lodging where the U or M [sic] students stayed and took pictures of the vandalism—destroyed ceiling tiles, lights ripped off the hallway walls, doors pull off, holes in the walls.

Treetops is a vital part of our community—it is a local ski resort that employs many community members and is important to the economy of our town because of the visitors it brings to the area. This destruction by U of M students
affects future guests who had reservations at the lodge, and ultimately, affects the economy of our town.

They need to be held accountable. (L. Blake Jones, personal communication, January 19, 2015)

This was the first report of the events that had taken place at Treetops ski resort in Gaylord to the university.

Email records show that throughout the remainder of that day (January 19), the Dean of Students worked with the Office of Greek Life to determine what had happened, who was involved, and what would be done in response (L. Blake Jones, personal communication, January 19, 2015). It was determined that the organizations at the Treetops resort were Sigma Alpha Mu (SAM) fraternity and Sigma Delta Tau (SDT) sorority, and after a call to the resort, a summary was created for the Vice President of Student Life.

Sigma Alpha Mu (commonly referred to as Sammy) fraternity rented the property this weekend. Two specific student names are on file for the event…

The students were evicted on Sunday morning with State Troopers standing by during the eviction from the property. There is extensive damage that includes: broken windows, ceiling tiles and lots of other general damage estimated by the property representative on the phone to be between $50-60,000.

The fraternity representative agreed to be responsible for all damages incurred and this was witnessed by a State Trooper.
From looking at Facebook posts the staff believe that Sigma Delta Tau (SDT) sorority may have been the other organization staying with them there though the property representative stressed that all the arrangements were done by Sammy. We are in the process of confirming this.

The property manager indicated on the phone that the cleaning company had reported they also had a major clean up job at Boyne Highlands this weekend due to another UM group there. Greek Life is also looking into this with Boyne Mountain. I do not have specifics on that yet.

I have asked Greek Life staff to calling the two presidents immediately tomorrow. If we learn more about the other property those folks will also be called in as well. I have also asked that all the Presidents of all chapters be asked to report in on any trips this weekend and self-report any problems to us immediately. The national organizations will also be notified and this will be referred to GARP. (L. Blake Jones, personal communication, January 19, 2015)

At this point, the university was aware of one fraternity that was involved (SAM), a sorority that was possibly involved (SDT), and knew that another incident had occurred at Boyne involving other fraternities and sororities.

As more information was gathered about the events, further details emerged. On February 4, 2015, the Interfraternity Council (IFC) president and Panhellenic Association (Panhel) president submitted statements alleging violations of the Standards of Conduct for Recognized Student Organizations against Sigma Alpha Mu and Sigma Delta Tau for their activities at Treetops Resort, and against Chi Psi fraternity, Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity, Alpha Phi sorority,
and Delta Gamma sorority for their activities at Boyne Highlands (Krupiak, 2015a; Krupiak, 2015b; Krupiak, 2015c; Walsh, 2015a; Walsh, 2015b; Walsh, 2015c). These statements included details of all alleged activities.

At the Treetops Resort, the following occurred (Krupiak, 2015c; Walsh, 2015c):

- approximately 200 students involved from one fraternity and one sorority;
- damage estimated at $100,000;
- broken windows, furniture, walls, ceiling tiles;
- excessive trash;
- “engaging in a contest to see who could do the most damage to the property” (Krupiak, 2015c, p. 1);
- “moonning” families present at the resort (p. 1);
- having a designated “sex room” (p. 1); and
- excessive alcohol and drug use.

At the Boyne Highlands, the following occurred (Krupiak, 2015a; Krupiak, 2015b; Walsh, 2015a; Walsh, 2015b):

- approximately 250 students involved from two fraternities and two sororities,
- broken furniture and doors, and
- stains in the carpet.

Supporting the allegations of vandalism at Treetops Resort were multiple pictures sent to the university by guests who were at the resort that weekend (S. Cohen, personal communication, January 20, 2015). Five of the pictures are included in Figures 9-13.
Figure 9. Treetops: Trash

Figure 10. Treetops: Trash and furniture upended
Figure 11. Treetops: Broken window
Figure 12. Treetops: Broken ceiling tiles

Figure 13. Treetops: Damage in hallway
Over the course of one weekend, six fraternal organizations caused significant damage to two different resorts in northern Michigan. The cost of the damage exceeded $100,000 and caused significant harm to the communities where the damage occurred. The responses to these incidents were quick and harsh.

**Immediate reactions: January 19, 2015-February 10, 2015.**

**University response.** The university recognized the ski trip weekend was a major event that would garner significant attention and reacted accordingly. In an email to the director of Greek life on January 19, 2015, the Dean of Students requested as much information as possible by 9 a.m. the next morning (January 20, 2015) so she could share it with the Vice President of Student Life who was attending an executive officers meeting at 9:30 a.m. to talk about the ski trip incident (L. Blake Jones, personal communication, January 19, 2015). In response, the Office of Greek Life staff called the impacted resorts to gather additional information (Cohen, 2015a; Cohen, 2015b) and an email was sent by the director of Greek life to all fraternity and sorority presidents to determine which organizations had participated in ski trips during the weekend of the 16th-18th and if there were issues at any other locations (M.B. Seiler, personal communication, January 19, 2015).

The Office of Public Affairs & Internal Communications at the University of Michigan also sought to respond, gathering information from the Dean of Students and Office of Greek Life staff on the morning of January 20, 2015, to generate a statement by the university (R. Fitzgerald, personal communication, January 20, 2015). The statement was included in the 9&10 News article (the first article written about the ski trip weekend) published later that afternoon. University comments read:
We are very disappointed in the behavior of some of our students during a weekend visit to two northern Michigan ski resorts.

I want to assure you that the organizations and the individuals involved will be held accountable for their actions.

While we are still gathering information, we understand that the damage at Treetops Resort and Boyne Highlands is expected total in the thousands of dollars.

U-M staff members in the Office of Greek Life have begun meeting with the presidents of the fraternities and sororities involved.

We expect full payment for all damages.

The local Greek chapters are in the process of notifying their national organizations, which could bring their own sanctions.

We are confident the national organizations will take this seriously and will work through this situation in collaboration with the university.

Additionally, these incidents will be addressed through the Greek Life student judiciary process on our campus. (9and10news Site Staff, 2015)

A second statement was issued on January 22 by the Vice President for Student Life. This statement reiterated the disappointment of the first statement and sought to limit the scope of the
incident to those involved, reflecting that most U-M students in Greek life contributed positively to their campus and local communities. The statement said:

These incidents simply do not reflect the University of Michigan’s values or its expectations. The behaviors are a contradiction of what it means to be in and of a community, and we do not believe that being away from campus is a license to act in destructive and irresponsible ways.

The university is investigating this fully and those responsible will be held accountable. It is especially disappointing since this behavior does not reflect the broad majority of U-M students who participate in Greek Life and compromises the many valuable contributions these student organizations provide. (E. R. Harper, 2015)

University administrators continued to work on the ski weekend incident. Office of Greek life staff members “worked extensively with: Student presidents of responsible organizations, National Headquarters of responsible organizations, resort staff at Treetops and Boyne, Council Presidents of IFC and Panhel, concerned parties who reached out to the Office of Greek Life, and Michigan State Police” (Blake Jones, 2015i, p. 1). Much of the work with the presidents of the involved fraternities and sororities was in helping them to understand the serious nature of the ski trip weekend as well as how the university was going to respond (M.B. Seiler, personal communication, January 19, 2015). Additionally, staff stayed in constant communication with the students to support them (J. Kaplan, personal communication, January 26, 2015), understand what actions they were taking (M.B. Seiler, personal communication, January 22, 2015), and how their national headquarters were responding (J. Kaplan, personal communication, January 21, 2015). The support for the presidents of the organizations became increasingly important as
they reported how much of a toll the incident was taking on them: “Yeah this is terrible. I feel terrible physically… I just want to say it again that I am so sorry this even happened. For so many reasons” (J. Kaplan, personal communication, January 22, 2015). It was also impacting them in the classroom:

I heard from guys in my fraternity that our “situation” was discussed in a comm class earlier today. This is a learning experience for more than just those directly involved but I wanted you to know they felt uncomfortable. It is extremely deserved, just unfortunate that my guys are feeling this way in a classroom setting. (J. Kaplan, personal communication, January 26, 2015)

As the incident gained more attention on campus and in the classroom, the Dean of Students, among other actions, consulted with representatives from the schools and colleges who “indicated strong interest… in collaborating in the University response” (Blake Jones, 2015i, p. 2). In part, this collaboration involved determining which schools and colleges each student involved in the ski trips belonged to, so each could determine how to address them (Blake Jones, 2015h). The vast majority of students involved in the ski trips were students in the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts; the College of Engineering; and the Ross School of Business. Some of these students faced immediate repercussions for their actions including internships, gained through their school or college, being revoked for the following summer (Blake Jones, 2015h).

While the Dean of Students was communicating with the schools and colleges at the university, the Vice President for Student Life continued to share information at high-level meetings with upper level university administrators including the executive officers, President, and Board of Regents. These meetings were initially used to review actions taken in response to
the ski trip weekend and then to determine how the university would continue to move forward (Blake Jones, 2015). In the days immediately following the ski trip weekend, staff and faculty at all levels of the university were involved in response and follow-up efforts.

**Response from student body:** Just as faculty and staff were responding to the ski trip incident, so too was the student body. The Vice President for Student Life, Dean of Students, and Office of Greek Life staff engaged with the Central Student Government (CSG) and Greek life leadership to reinforce the seriousness of the situation. In response, the presidents of the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association released a statement on behalf of their executive boards:

We, the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association Executive Boards, acknowledge the events at Treetops Resort and Boyne Mountain the weekend of January 17-18, 2015. The actions of these individuals do not accurately reflect the values of the Greek community and we are taking immediate action.

The University of Michigan and the national organizations are taking these matters very seriously. National organizations have the authority to impose their own sanctions in addition to those from the Greek Activities Review Panel (GARP). Chapter presidents have been working collaboratively with university officials, the Office of Greek Life, and their respective national organizations.

GARP, the judicial governing body of Greek Life will be reviewing each case individually to determine the proper course of action. We expect the resulting sanctions to be punitive, educational, and restorative in nature. These may include, but are not limited to, community service, social probation and/or
participation in relevant programming educating students on topics such as risk management and community relationships. University of Michigan officials are in the process of taking action as well.

Not only will we ensure that the students financially compensate the resorts for the damages, but we as a Greek community will ensure the behaviors that caused these incidents are appropriately addressed.

We regret that the actions of members of our community have brought such negative attention to the Greek community and the University of Michigan. (Krupiak & Walsh, 2015)

Shortly after, the Vice President for Student Life engaged the CSG President in partnering with Greek life leaders to issue an open letter of apology to the public on behalf of the entire student body (Blake Jones, 2015i). Part of the letter, written by the presidents of the CSG, Interfraternity Council, and U-M Panhellenic Association, was posted in the Gaylord Herald Times on January 23, 2015 (Wagley, 2015). The full letter read:

An Open Letter of Apology:

This past weekend, during a January 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} stay at northern Michigan resorts, six of our Greek organizations caused substantial and extensive damages to resort properties. This terrible incident has been widely publicized across the nation, and rightly so: it was an act of shocking disrespect. We, as leaders and Greeks at the University of Michigan, do not tolerate these kinds of acts, nor do we let such behavior fall under the radar. We intend to handle this
situation with the utmost efficiency, and we will ensure that those responsible for the damage to the properties will be held accountable throughout this process.

Such vandalism or disrespect of any kind, especially to this degree, does not reflect the standards of our community. We value tradition, honesty, character, and above all, integrity. The events that occurred last weekend deface the honor we place upon each of these values, and we would like to express our regret that such unprincipled action reflects so poorly on our community. We are deeply sorry that the misbehavior of individuals has caused harm not only to the property, but to the communities at large.

In the weeks to come, the Greek community will utilize all of our internal processes to enforce accountability and justice. We will work to restore the good balance of our affiliates, and we will be looking for ways to begin repairing our relationship and trust with each resort as well as the communities in northern Michigan. Our long-term, positive interaction continues to be a priority for us moving forward, and we hope to make the changes necessary in order to fulfill that goal. (Dishell, Krupiak, & Walsh, 2015)

Although the apologies issues by the leaders of Greek life and CSG pointed to individual members or only certain organizations as being problematic, other students questioned whether there were deeper issues with the fraternity and sorority community. In a letter to the editor published in *The Michigan Daily*, a student at the university recognized that the actions that led to the vandalism in northern Michigan happened on a weekly basis on campus (Witus, 2015). The student wrote that he was unsurprised by the damage at the resorts: “These horrors seem to occur so regularly that, ironically, the true scandal for Greek life would be if one weekend there
were no binge drinking, violence, hazing or rape. The lack of ‘misconduct’ would constitute a true Greek life scandal” (Witus, 2015). Clearly, not everyone believed it when student leaders stated their intolerance for the misconduct that occurred in northern Michigan.


“I’d like to register our universal disgust with whatever houses had a part in it…” (J. Kozak, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

“It pains me to see when students bring shame and degradation to not only the University, but also further negative stereotypes regarding fraternities and sororities” (M. M. Staebler, personal communication, January 22, 2015).

In the days following the ski trip weekend, emails and calls from alumni flooded in to the university expressing their displeasure and outrage over the actions of the fraternities and sororities involved. In addition to anger and disappointment, the alumni demanded action by the university. One alumnae wrote, “Please do not sweep this under the rug and feed the popular notion that UM students—Greek students in particular—are all entitled trust fund babies who can write a check and get away with something egregious” (S. Koch, personal communication, January 22, 2015). Another demanded that the students involved “pay for those damages and then this summer go back and offer to do some landscaping, or offer to clean the fricking windows of the owner’s house or whatever” (G. VanHorssen, personal communication, January 22, 2015). Others demanded, sarcastically, the resignation of members of the IFC Executive Board who were members of the offending fraternities: “I am assuming 40 percent of the ifc [sic] board has either formally resigned or by virtue of their chapter charters being suspended as a
result of the bad ski trips are no longer on ifc [sic]” (D. J. Kavanagh, personal communication, January 26, 2016).

**Media response.** While the alumni responded with anger and disappointment, the media allowed the story to speak for itself. The story was first reported publicly on January 20, 2015, by local media in Northern Michigan (9and10news Site Staff, 2015) and in Ann Arbor (Freed, 2015). On January 22, 2015, the story reached national media outlets like the *Huffington Post* (Kingkade, 2015) and *USA TODAY* (Stafford, 2015). By January 30, 2015, over 100 news articles had been written about the ski trip incidents. The media coverage initially focused on the actual incident and the damage caused. Updated articles included estimated costs of repairs which grew from $50,000 initially to over $125,000 by January 29, 2015 (Krupiak, 2015c).

The media also gave voice to the resorts. The Treetops General Manager utilized the opportunity to tell his side of the story. He described the vandalism at the resort as “a malicious destruction of property” and said, “I mean it just kind of never ended” (Cappetta, Dunn, & Effron, 2015). The general manager also expressed skepticism about whether the fraternity would repay the resort for the damage. He said, “they [Sigma Alpha Mu] said they were going to make good on this, however they also said they would behave themselves… we have concerns about the integrity of their word” (Cappetta, et al., 2015).

Boyne Highlands Resort also spoke to the media. The spokeswoman for the resort indicated that this was the worst case of vandalism they had experienced in the nearly 50 years the resort had been hosting student groups. She said, “We host student groups like this all the time at our properties and it’s over 50 years old. This is certainly disappointing to us to see this kind of behavior and disrespectful treatment of our property” (Allen, 2015a). She also shared that
the resort would work directly with the university as well as the fraternities and sororities involved in the vandalism to seek restitution for the damages (Allen, 2015a).

In the week that followed the ski trip incident, the story of the vandalism at both ski resorts was rehashed repeatedly in the media. As time passed, attention began to shift away from the story and toward how each organization involved in the incident—the fraternities and sororities, the national organizations for the fraternities and sororities, the university, and the resorts—would respond. Would the fraternities and sororities who caused the damage actually be held accountable for their actions?

**Response by involved fraternal organizations.** In the days immediately following the ski trip incidents, the Office of Greek Life reached out to every fraternity and sorority to determine who had been involved (M.B. Seiler, personal communication, January 19, 2015). It was quickly determined that Sigma Alpha Mu fraternity and Sigma Delta Tau sorority had been at Treetops Resort, while Chi Psi fraternity, Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity, Alpha Phi sorority, and Delta Gamma sorority had been at Boyne Highlands. The most significant vandalism had occurred at Treetops Resort, and so Sigma Alpha Mu was the first fraternity to publicly respond.

On January 21, 2015, the president of Sigma Alpha Mu spoke with the Director of Greek Life and with the Executive Director of Sigma Alpha Mu regarding a statement the fraternity wished to make (J. Kaplan, personal communication, January 21, 2015). The statement was released a few hours later. It stated:

We are embarrassed and ashamed of the behavior of a few of our chapter members at Treetops Resort over the weekend of January 17-18. This behavior is inconsistent with the values, policies, and practices of this organization.
Our chapter accepts full responsibility for this incident and we will be working with the management of the resort to pay for all damages and cleaning costs.

We will work within our own organization and with university officials to hold those who are responsible accountable for their actions.

There will be no further comment from this chapter or organization regarding this matter. (J. Kaplan, personal communication, January 21, 2015)

The following day, January 22, 2015, the Sigma Alpha Mu Executive Director met with the chapter to share that the Octagon (Board of Directors) of Sigma Alpha Mu National Fraternity had temporarily suspended all activities of the U-M chapter of Sigma Alpha Mu. The chapter was not allowed to hold chapter events, meetings, philanthropy, recruitment, new member education, or any other activity related to the fraternity. The suspension was made indefinite, lasting until the following conditions were met:

1) Chapter provides the names and class years of all members in attendance at the Treetops resort over the weekend.

2) Chapter officers provide names and class years of those known to have damaged the hotel property. This information WILL be shared with the university.

3) Chapter will prepare and distribute an approved public apology to the UM Greek community and the UM General community. Draft must be sent to me [Leland Manders] before January 31, 2015 for editing and approval.
4) Other disciplinary and educational requirements will be developed and imposed in cooperation and coordination with university officials. These will be communicated with you in the next few weeks.

5) There will be no “Winterfest” event held or hosted or sponsored by the chapter this year under any circumstances.

6) There will be no chapter social functions, including at third party locations.

7) You will attend the UM Leadership Conference that is scheduled for this weekend.

8) Successful completion of a full investigation by the university and fraternity officials.

9) Fully payment for all charges levied by the hotel in this case. (Manders, 2015)

He described the suspension meeting as “productive and worthwhile” and indicated that chapter members did not fight the suspension and wanted to know how they could “make this right” (L. Manders, personal communication, January 23, 2015).

Each of the five other fraternities and sororities that participated in the ski trips were suspended, (E. R. Harper, 2015; Chi Psi Fraternity, 2015) called “cease and desist” by some (Buck, 2015; DiTommaso, 2015), by their respective national organization by January 24, 2015. The meaning of the suspensions varied by organization. Some chapters were unable to participate in any activities related to their organization (Manders, 2015b; DiTommaso, 2015)
while other chapters were only unable to host social functions but were still able to meet for fraternity or sorority business (Buck, 2015). The purpose of these suspensions was to allow the university and each national organization to conduct investigations and to determine appropriate sanctions (E. R. Harper, 2015).

Some chapters sought to mitigate their situation during their suspensions and prior to additional sanctions being levied. Chi Psi fraternity wrote a letter to Boyne Highlands on January 20, 2015 expressing “utmost apologies for the inappropriate and out-of-character behavior and ensuing damages that occurred” (Franze, 2015). Two days later, on January 22, 2015, Chi Psi issued a public statement:

The University of Michigan holds its students, student organizations, and other affiliates to high standards in academic excellence, but also in respect, integrity, and accountability. So too does Chi Psi Fraternity, both locally and nationally.

Chi Psi at the University of Michigan failed to uphold our highest standards this past weekend during a visit to Boyne Highlands Resort. Through poor planning and an attempt to keep costs low, our members overcrowded the Resort’s condominiums to the point of creating wear and damage.

We already have begun conducting an internal review to ensure that such reckless behavior does not occur again. Quite simply, we failed to plan and prepare adequately, and we did not address issues promptly as they arose over the course of the weekend. We are embarrassed that our organization and its embers played any role in damaging the Resort, and we apologize and fully accept responsibility for these actions.
The Fraternity has already pledged to do our utmost to be cooperative with all parties involved over the coming days and weeks in assessing and remunerating the approximately $4,000 in damages caused by our members.

The damages to the Resort are not representative of the values of Chi Psi Fraternity as a whole, or here at the University of Michigan. Our leadership and members will learn from this unfortunate experience and avoid this kind of incident from happening in the future. (Chi Psi Fraternity at the University of Michigan, 2015)

Sigma Alpha Mu, already having issued a public statement, began working with Treetops Resort and the City of Gaylord to make amends. The Sigma Alpha Mu Executive Director explained the actions the fraternity was taking in an email sent to the Treetops General Manager on January 27, 2015:

Thanks again for speaking with me today. Glad that our guys have been in touch and are sending the $25,000 check to you. …please let me know when it arrives.

I appreciate you mentioning to some local Gaylord leaders our chapter’s desire to do some community service work in town. I know that [the fraternity president] will be contacting the mayor’s office (maybe even today sometime) very soon to start the process of planning the project.

Thank you also, for mentioning these things to the media in your interview earlier today. Of course, we’ll see if they report anything positive, but who knows? One can only hope!! (L. Manders, personal communication, January 27, 2015)
The executive director, in a letter to parents on January 29, 2015, further explained that the chapter would be required to pay full restitution to the resort, and that the national organization would hold members accountable although he hoped to not close the chapter (Manders, 2015b). That same day, in an attempt to keep his promise to hold chapter members accountable, he provided a list of all 115 members of Sigma Alpha Mu who attended the ski trip at Treetops Resort (L. Manders, personal communication, January 29, 2015).

University administrators expressed a desire to work with the Sigma Alpha Mu headquarters on holding individual members of the fraternity accountable for their actions at Treetops Resort. As such, a request was made of the local chapter on February 4, 2015, to provide a list of members who were responsible for the damage (J. Kaplan, personal communication, February 4, 2015). The chapter president, however, expressed hesitation in complying with this request. In an email to the Dean of Students, the chapter president initially stated that the chapter would “be fully cooperative…” (J. Kaplan, personal communication, February 4, 2015), but went on to explain that he wanted to meet with the Dean of Students to talk more about how they were to compile the list. His expressed that it might be impossible to actually determine who had done all of the damage and that there was an open criminal investigation being conducted by the Michigan State Police, which created concern over sharing names (J. Kaplan, personal communication, February 4, 2015).

While awaiting the list of individuals responsible for the damage at Treetops, the Dean of Students and Sigma Alpha Mu Executive Director continued to discuss appropriate sanctions for the fraternity (L. Manders, personal communication, February 6, 2015). The executive director insisted upon a “comprehensive approach to rehabilitating our chapter at UM which provides for intensive educational programming and community service work” (L. Manders, personal
communication, February 6, 2015). The chapter advisor also provided his thoughts to the Dean of Students, providing 10 reasons why the chapter should not be closed:

1. This act will create a rogue organization that will operate without any rules or oversight. Our National Fraternity does not have the power to do anything about it. They have encountered this exact situation on other campuses and have not been able to stop it.

2. The concept of closing the chapter and then permitting it back some years later is an extremely difficult situation. Starting back up from scratch takes a tremendous amount of luck and energy. We did it back in 2003, but it was only because a few outstanding young men took the chance of building a fraternity instead of joining one of the many existing ones. Even with that, it took 4 or 5 years before the organization was truly viable.

3. Our House Corporation board consists of 7 former Michigan Sammies. We are the caretakers of the owners of the house—all 1,400 living Michigan Sammies. We have a $3 million investment in the house at 800 Oxford, and the loss of $256,000 in annual rent will obviously place a sever burden on our financial situation and our mortgage with Ann Arbor State Bank. On our Board are Dr. Winfield, Dr. Paul Lichter, and Dr. Sheldon Markel, all of whom spent their entire careers with the U of M. There is no doubt that these 3 men (along with 100’s of our alumni) are still in shock over the events up North. I have even heard from Joel Tauber, one of my fraternity classmates in the 1950’s, whose grandson is a current sophomore and a member of SAM. All of us are reeling
from being blindsided by this terrible event, and we are trying to make things right with the University in any way that we can.

4. The financial impact on our National Fraternity is also very serious. Our chapter is one of the largest in the system, and the dues and initiation fees that they pay makes up a significant contribution to the revenue side of the National’s budget. In addition, this chapter pays close to $25,000 annually for liability insurance. The co-op insurance company will have to spread that loss of revenue to all of the other SAM chapters.

5. The chapter suffered from the fact that Bob Winfield was certainly preoccupied with his own personal issues, and during the entire 2014 year was unable to perform his normal duties as local chapter advisor. I have no broached the subject with him, but I hope that once he gets through the Summer, he will be able to step back in to that role.

6. I have made a definite decision to hire and install a resident house director, a mature male who will have had no previous connection to the fraternity. He will be well-paid for his services.

7. I have only recently learned about various complaints that have emanated from the “senior houses.” I do not have direct control over those houses, but I intend to exercise whatever control I can to reduce the issues. I can state, however, that the only complaint we have ever had at 800 Oxford is from one contiguous neighbor who is located near our 8 cubic yard dumpster. I built a
fence to screen off the dumpster and 2 years ago hired a man who comes by
several times per week to clean up around it.

8. I know you have heard part of what comes now, but the record is clear.
The Chapter has had the highest GPA among all fraternities (possibly among all
U of M groups) for the past 8 semesters, including the recently completed Fall
semester. Among all 51 SAM chapters, they have been awarded the coveted
Founders Cup 5 out of the past 7 years. One year they finished 2\textsuperscript{nd} due to a
judge’s clerical error, and the other year a close 2\textsuperscript{nd}. This Cup is awarded based on
their performance on 11 different criteria. In the 105 years that the Cup has been
awarded, there has never been close to such a streak of success.

9. The National Fraternity will, in the next few days, be imposing a series
of educational and disciplinary sanctions. This list will be made available to your
office.

10. The final item could be the most important one. The end result of this
is that it is going to be a hard lesson that is well learned. The odds of something
like this, or even remotely close to like this, happening again is very slim. In the
past 9 years, I do not recall any violations handed down by the IFC or the
University. To the best of my knowledge, all of their social events have been
properly registered and all rules were complied with. Those members who survive
this are certainly unlikely to misbehave in the future, and this “story” will be
repeated to each class of candidates during their education process for years to
come. (A. Greenberg, personal communication, February 4, 2015)
Clearly, Sigma Alpha Mu did not want the chapter to close.

Despite pleas to the university, on February 6, 2015, Sigma Alpha Mu headquarters staff issued a letter to the parents of the local chapter members expressing their fear that the chapter may be closed (Manders, 2015e). The letter explains that no individual chapter members had taken responsibility for the vandalism at Treetops, and the chapter, to that point, was unwilling to provide names. In the letter, the Sigma Alpha Mu Executive Director wrote to parents, saying, “we would strongly encourage all of you to advise your sons to be as forthcoming and transparent as possible” (p. 2) to prevent the chapter from being closed. He also explains in the letter that the Michigan State Police and university were interested discovering who was responsible for the vandalism:

- Hotel management indicated that they intend to press criminal charges against those responsible (and possibly against all 115). Indeed, we know that the Michigan State Police is investigating and they have met with university officials several times. They are particularly interested in identifying those specific individuals who are responsible for the damage.

- Hotel management indicated that they will do what is necessary to receive full restitution, which could include civil actions aimed at these young men, their assets and/or any personal liability insurance that may be involved. Please note that the Fraternity’s liability insurance policy excludes coverage for vandalism and violations of our risk management policy, which this incident clearly did.
In our discussions with the University, we have been told that individual consequences (in addition to closing the chapter) are possible—up to and including individual expulsions/not graduating/not getting diplomas remain on the table, pending resolution of this problem. We’ve continually told the members that they face harsher punishment if they hide or “circle the wagons.” (Manders, 2015e, p. 2)

In the letter to the parents, the executive director explained that the national fraternity was going to conduct a membership review in an attempt to determine who was responsible for the vandalism (Manders, 2015e). The membership review would involve each member meeting privately with a team of senior-level staff from the fraternity headquarters. They would be asked about their involvement in the fraternity and their knowledge of the ski trip (Manders, 2015e). He also stated that any member who failed to participate in the membership review would be “immediately, permanently suspended” (Manders, 2015e, p. 2).

Although the membership review was scheduled to begin on February 11 (L. Manders, personal communication, February 6, 2015), it would not take place for two weeks after. After announcing that the membership review would be completed, the Sigma Alpha Mu headquarters received numerous calls and emails from parents and their legal counsel expressing concern over students potentially revealing information that would expose them legally (L. Manders, personal communication, February 10, 2015). Some members were so concerned that they officially resigned from the fraternity (D. Mikaelian, personal communication, February 9, 2015). Sigma Alpha Mu headquarters consulted with their legal counsel and insurance underwriters and received strong encouragement to postpone the membership review to avoid any potential issues with the criminal investigation (L. Manders, personal communication, February 10, 2015). On
February 10, 2015, Sigma Alpha Mu officially postponed the membership review for two weeks to “all the Michigan State Police and the university to make more progress in their respective investigations about the incident at Treetops Resort” (L. Manders, personal communication, February 10, 2015). While the fraternity waited to conduct its membership review, the university began its judicial process to determine responsibility and appropriate sanctions for each organization involved in the ski trips.

**Judicial process and sanctions.** Per university policy, student organizations that violated the *Standards of Conduct for Recognized Student Organizations* (*Code of Conduct; Campus Involvement, 2015b*) could be held accountable through the “Student Organization Advancement & Recognition Accountability Procedure” (*SOAR; Campus Involvement, 2015c*). Violations of the *Code of Conduct* included (but were not limited to) threats to health and safety, hazing, inappropriate use of university funds, and discrimination (*Campus Involvement, 2015b*). Any enrolled student, faculty member, or staff member was able to submit a complaint against a student organization that they felt had violated the *Code of Conduct* (*Campus Involvement, 2015c*).

Following the ski trip incident, the IFC and Panhellenic Association presidents each wrote complaints against the fraternities and sororities (respectively) that participated in the vandalism (*A. Krupiak, personal communication, February 4, 2015; M. Walsh, personal communication, February 4, 2015*). Prior to officially submitting the six complaints, each was reviewed by the Office of Greek Life, Dean of Students, and Office of General Counsel. The purpose of the review was not to “wordsmith” but to review them “merely for substance at a high level” (*P. Petrowski, personal communication, February 5, 2015*). After each complaint was
reviewed and edited, they were submitted to the Center for Campus Involvement (CCI) per the SOAR Process (Campus Involvement, 2015c).

Each of the complaints submitted to CCI included those rules which the organizations were alleged to have violated, a summary of how the organizations violated those rules, recommended sanctions, and a list of news articles pertaining to the incidents (A. Krupiak, personal communication, February 4, 2015; M. Walsh, personal communication, February 4, 2015). All six fraternities and sororities were charged with violating Article 4 Section B of the Standards of Conduct for Recognized Student Organizations. Specifically, it was alleged that each violated conduct rules related to health and safety, violating their own constitutions, and adhering to the law. Recommended sanctions for the chapters who had been at Boyne Highlands Resort included:

- adhering to recommended sanctions from each individual fraternity or sorority’s national headquarters;
- paying for the damage that was caused;
- holding individuals accountable through the Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR);
- participating in educational sessions covering bystander intervention, risk management, and sexual misconduct prevention;
- requiring community service for each individual member (Krupiak, 2015a; Krupiak, 2015b; Walsh, 2015a; Walsh, 2015b).

For Sigma Alpha Mu and Sigma Delta Tau (Treetops Resort), recommended sanctions included all those suggested for the organizations at Boyne Highlands Resort with the additional
recommendation of a membership review for Sigma Delta Tau (Walsh, 2015c) and temporary suspension from the Interfraternity Council for Sigma Alpha Mu (Krupiak, 2015c).

The hearings for all six chapters occurred on February 11 and 12, 2015 (three each day). A student panel, comprised of members of the Greek Activities Review Panel (GARP), presided over each hearing with oversight from Center for Campus Involvement staff (Campus Involvement, 2015a). Prior to the hearing, each chapter had the opportunity to provide a written response to the complaint against them. During each hearing, the accused chapter was given time to provide an opening statement, provide witnesses, and present a closing statement (Campus Involvement, 2015a).

Alpha Phi, Chi Psi, Delta Gamma, and Pi Kappa Alpha all accepted full responsibility for the damage done at Boyne Highlands Resort and agreed to the recommended sanctions (Fitzgerald, 2015). Sigma Alpha Mu accepted responsibility as an organization for the acts of vandalism at Treetops Resort but refused to provide names of the individuals responsible (Blake Jones, 2015a). Sigma Delta Tau refused to accept any responsibility for the vandalism at Treetops Resort. They claimed that there was no evidence they actually did any of the damage. Additionally, they stated that the ski trip was not a sorority activity but individuals from their sorority went on the trip, so the organization should not be held accountable (Blake Jones, 2015f).

In a further act of denial of any wrongdoing, Sigma Delta Tau sought legal representation from the Manley Burke firm and its Fraternal Law practice group (Kamrass & Burke, 2015). Following the SOAR hearing for Sigma Delta Tau, Manley Burke sent a letter to Vice President and General Counsel for the University of Michigan, stating that the university had violated Sigma Delta Tau’s rights by not providing enough advanced notice of information being shared
at the hearing and by admitting second hand information (Kamrass & Burke, 2015). Although no legal action was taken at that time, the letter indicated that legal action would ensue if they felt that Sigma Delta Tau’s members were “unjustly punished as a result of numerous defects in the hearing” (Kamrass & Burke, 2015, p. 3).

Following the hearing, the student panel was given three business days to deliberate. They were to provide a judgement on whether each organization was responsible or not and then provide sanctions appropriate to the actions of each organization. After making their findings, the panel would then provide their rationale to the Dean of Students, who would have ten business days to determine if there were any discrepancies in the findings or proposed sanctions. The Dean of Students had the power to change sanctions if she felt they were too lenient or too harsh given the actions of each organization (Campus Involvement, 2015a).

While awaiting the university decision on the fate of the chapter, the Sigma Alpha Mu headquarters continued to keep parents apprised of the proceedings. Although the Michigan State Police began their investigations on February 18 (R. Neumann, personal communication, February 17, 2015), the Sigma Alpha Mu Executive Director indicated in his letter to parents on February 18 that the fraternity headquarters was going to conduct its membership review on February 25 and 26 (Manders, 2015c). He again expressed his hope that the chapter would be allowed to continue at the University of Michigan but shared his belief that the membership review would be an important aspect of showing the university that the fraternity was serious about changing the culture and committed to being a positive part of the campus community (Manders, 2015c).

The same day that Sigma Alpha Mu started the membership review process (February 25), the University of Michigan President provided his first public statement on the incident in an
interview conducted in Lansing. When asked about possible legal action against fraternity members, he said, “If they committed violation of the law, of course, they should be prosecuted” (E.R. Harper, personal communication, February 25, 2015). He refused to comment on the university sanctions which would follow two days later.

On February 27, 2015, the Dean of Students provided sanction letters to each of the accused fraternities and sororities (Blake Jones, 2015a; Blake Jones, 2015b; Blake Jones, 2015c; Blake Jones, 2015d; Blake Jones, 2015e; Blake Jones, 2015f). All four fraternities and sororities that had gone to Boyne Highlands were found responsible and were given the following sanctions:

- accept and adhere to any and all sanctions given by the individual fraternity or sorority’s national organization;
- pay for damages at the resort;
- allow individuals to be held accountable by the University of Michigan, national organization, and Michigan State Police where applicable;
- complete three different types of educational sessions covering bystander intervention, risk management, and sexual misconduct prevention;
- complete 15 hours of community service per member during the Winter 2015 semester;
- adhere to social probation for the remainder of the semester;
- apologize to all four Greek councils;
- complete all requirements of the Achievement Expectations program (minimum standards program for all fraternities and sororities); and
• agree to not participate in any further off campus, overnight joint fraternity/sorority events indefinitely (Blake Jones, 2015b; Blake Jones, 2015c; Blake Jones, 2015d; Blake Jones, 2015e).

These sanctions were proposed by the student panel and accepted by the Dean of Students.

Sigma Alpha Mu and Sigma Delta Tau were also found responsible for the damage done at Treetops Resort (Blake Jones, 2015a; Blake Jones, 2015f). The Greek Activities Review Panel recommended all the same sanctions for Sigma Alpha Mu as they did for the Boyne Highlands fraternities and sororities in addition to the following:

• accept suspension from the Interfraternity Council until the Winter 2016 semester;
• complete a volunteer project to benefit Treetops Resort or the Gaylord community;
• conduct a membership review; and
• make an educational presentation regarding their actions and what they learned at the Fall 2015 IFC and Panhellenic Social Meeting (Blake Jones, 2015a).

In her written statement, the Dean of Students acknowledged the efforts of the student panel to provide thoughtful and well-reasoned sanctions but decided that the sanctions did not fully address the seriousness of the situation. Given the nature of the incident, the university adopted sanctions that included the de-recognition of the fraternity by the university and restorative measures. Additionally, the university requested that the national fraternity remove the charter of the fraternity. The fraternity would be allowed to apply for recognition again after a four-year period assuming they accepted full responsibility for their actions and completed restorative measures similar to those proposed by the student panel (Blake Jones, 2015a).
The student panel recommended similar sanctions for Sigma Delta Tau but did not recommend suspension. Using the same reasoning as with Sigma Alpha Mu, the Dean of Students acknowledged the work of the student panel but adjusted the sanctions to reflect the serious nature of the incident and failure of Sigma Delta Tau to accept responsibility for their actions. She wrote:

While the sanctions GARP [the student panel] outlined… may have been sufficient and appropriate in a situation where the individuals involved were taking responsibility or, where chapter officers were providing information about individual accountability to the University, this is not true in this instance. In addition, representatives of Sigma Delta Tau sorority have continued to attempt to distance themselves from group accountability in this situation. This action on part of the sorority has served to magnify concerns about the organization. (Blake Jones, 2015f, p. 6)

Because of the failure of the sorority to accept any responsibility, the sanctions given by the university included a two-year disciplinary suspension and restricted activity until the Fall 2017 semester and chapter leaders would have to meet with the Dean of Students and the Dean and/or Associate/Assistant Deans of each of their respective schools and colleges “to discuss University expectations of leadership and accountability” (p. 6). The suspension meant that the sorority would not be an active member of the Panhellenic Council, so they could not participate in council activities like recruitment and social activities. The chapter would be required to stay engaged with the council, however, as a non-voting member. The sanctions included an opportunity for Sigma Delta Tau to request the suspension be lifted if they complied with a variety of conditions, including: accepting responsibility, pay restitution to the resort, participate
in educational sessions, and conduct community service at Treetops Resort or in the Gaylord community (Blake Jones, 2015f).

A month and a half after the damage at the Boyne Highlands and Treetops resorts was reported, each of the six fraternities and sororities that were involved were sanctioned. With this, the first part in the ski trip saga ended. The second part explores how each organization, the university, and the fraternity/sorority community attempted to move forward.

**Moving forward (or not…).** Immediately following the sanctions being made public, people began to react. The media reacted with no fewer than 17 news articles in the hours immediately following the sanctions being announced (R. Fitzgerald, personal communication, February 27, 2015). Similarly, some parents contacted university staff to express their thoughts. One parent expressed his frustration that Sigma Delta Tau had been sanctioned in an email to the Office of Greek Life:

I am writing to you as a parent of a SDT student. I truly believe that SDT sorority is being railroaded regarding this suspension. Even though they attended that weekend at the resort, there is no concrete or hard evidence that any member of SDT caused any of the damage at the resort. If there is, as a parent, I would like to see it or know what it is.

It is my opinion that the sorority is being grouped in with the fraternity and it was the fraternity did all the damage. I believe the girls are getting a raw deal here.

What steps can I take to turn this around and make sure the young ladies of SDT are absolved of this mess [sic]
Please advise me as to what the next step is that I can take. (J. Bergman, personal communication, February 27, 2015)

Even as the parents of some students were upset about the sanctions being too harsh, some of those impacted by the actions of the fraternities and sororities were upset that the sanctions, and reasoning behind those sanctions, did not punish the offending organizations more. The owner of one of the damaged properties at Boyne Highlands wrote to various university officials expressing her displeasure in how the offending fraternities and sororities were sanctioned. She wrote,

I am shocked to learn the university’s stance on what occurred over MLK weekend. The sororities and fraternities staying at Boyne Highlands did “not engage in malicious destruction of property?” As one of the condo owners at Boyne Highlands, I beg to differ. (N. Barry, personal communication, February 28, 2015)

In her email, the condo owner expressed frustration at what she saw as a mischaracterization of the damage as not malicious and questioned why the fraternities and sororities who had done the damage had not been punished in the same way as those fraternities and sororities that were at Treetops Resort (N. Barry, personal communication, February 28, 2015).

The fraternities and sororities that were sanctioned reacted in a variety of ways. Alpha Phi, Chi Psi, Delta Gamma, and Pi Kappa Alpha all accepted the sanctions and set out to meet the conditions and requirements set forth. The advisor for Delta Gamma called the sanctions “reasonable and fair… some restrictions, an opportunity for atonement, an opportunity for education, and an opportunity to give back to the community” (M. Grimes, personal
communication, March 1, 2015). Sigma Alpha Mu and Sigma Delta Tau, both sanctioned much more significantly than the other four organizations, each responded in their own way.

**Sigma Alpha Mu response.** Sigma Alpha Mu lost its right to be a fraternity at the University of Michigan because of the actions of its members at Treetops Resort. Following the decision to remove recognition of the fraternity, individual members did not appeal or reach out to university staff members. It appears as if they either accepted the result of the hearing or felt that they did not have grounds to appeal.

Parents of Sigma Alpha Mu chapter members also seemed to accept the outcome of the hearing. One mother wrote that she was angry that a number of individuals ruined an entire fraternity experience for every other chapter member (A. Greenberg, personal communication, March 5, 2015). Another mother compared the fraternity’s inability to stop the damage at the resort or to name the individuals responsible to the inaction of the world that led to the Holocaust (F. Gordon, personal communication, March 11, 2015). No parents contacted the university to fight the derecognition of Sigma Alpha Mu.

The chapter advisor for Sigma Alpha Mu also expressed his frustration and devastation over losing the chapter in an email to parents. In the letter, he explained that the chapter could have lived on had individual members come forward to accept responsibility or had the chapter decided to present those members to be held accountable. Instead, chapter members chose to “circle the wagons” and the chapter was the price they paid for it (A. Greenberg, personal communication, March 5, 2015). He expressed a desire for the chapter to return to the university at some future date but indicated that would only be possible by removing the chapter members from the chapter facility and leasing it to another group (A. Greenberg, personal communication, March 5, 2015).
On March 12, less than two weeks after the university de-recognized the fraternity, the national headquarters of Sigma Alpha Mu officially revoked the charter for the Michigan chapter of Sigma Alpha Mu (A.M. Ahitow, personal communication, March, 12, 2015). In a letter written to the members of the chapter and their parents, the Supreme Prior for Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity indicated that the decision to revoke the charter was based on the chapter failing to comply with directives to accept responsibility as an organization and individual and to pay restitution to the resort. As a result of the charter being revoked, all members of the chapter were given alumni status but were not allowed to participate in any further Sigma Alpha Mu-related activities, wear anything with the Sigma Alpha Mu letters on it, and were still expected to pay full restitution to Treetops Resort (A.M. Ahitow, personal communication, March, 12, 2015). The decision to close the chapter was made public on March 17, 2015 (Manders, 2015d).

Two months later, on May 13, 2015, Sigma Alpha Mu headquarters wrote to each of the students who had been active members of the Michigan chapter of Sigma Alpha Mu when it was closed and informed them that they were to be expelled from the fraternity (Manders, 2015a). Each student was given the opportunity to appeal to the headquarters to retain their alumni status with the fraternity. As of August 5, 2015, only three students submitted written defenses of their membership (L. Manders, personal communication, August 5, 2015). One of those three students was reinstated as an alumnus of the fraternity, while the other two defenses were deemed “grossly inadequate” and were denied (L. Manders, personal communication, August 5, 2015). No other students submitted appeals, and so each other student that was a member of the fraternity when it was closed was officially and permanently expelled from Sigma Alpha Mu (L. Manders, personal communication, August 5, 2015). This effectively ended the relationship between Sigma Alpha Mu and the University of Michigan.
**Sigma Delta Tau response.** Sigma Alpha Mu, on both the local and national levels, accepted the university sanctions. The chapter was closed, and members were removed from the organization. Sigma Delta Tau chose a different path.

Shortly after the sanctions were announced, Sigma Delta Tau began questioning the sanctions they received. The first sign of dissention came on March 2, 2015, when the Director of Greek Life said to the Dean of Students via email, “I spoke to Marissa Gottfried from SDT who wanted clarification about ‘limited recruitment’… she actually admitted to agreeing with most everything except the recruitment piece” (M.B. Seiler, personal communication, March 2, 2015). Two days later, on March 4, 2015, multiple university staff members received a litigation hold notice asking each to preserve any documents they possessed related to Sigma Delta Tau’s participation in and sanctions resulting from the ski trip incident (Jastrzembsowski, 2015).

Around that same time (exact date unknown), the Sigma Delta Tau National President issued a statement on the Sigma Delta Tau national website regarding the sanctions:

In January, many members of the Chi Chapter attended a ski trip to the Treetops Resort in Gaylord, Michigan with the Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity. This was not a sorority-sponsored social event. Allegations were made that extensive damage was done to the hotel while our members were present. We investigated the matter and found no evidence that our women were responsible for the damage and destruction. A complaint was filed against the chapter and the matter went before the University of Michigan Greek Activities Review Panel (GARP), the judicial body for the Greek Councils. GARP’s recommended sanctions including educational sessions, community service and six weeks of social probation was then sent to the Dean of Students. The Dean of Students agreed with GARP’s
recommendations, but also imposed substantially more severe sanctions including a two year Disciplinary Suspension (no recruitment or social activities) for the chapter. While we support the majority of GARP’s recommendations, we strongly believe that the university’s additional sanctions are unreasonable due to the lack of specific evidence linking our chapter members to the allegations. It is Sigma Delta Tau’s opinion that our women did not play a part in the destruction and vandalism on site. Additionally, we feel that the women attempted to intervene as they saw fit. The National Organization has supported the chapter throughout the process. We positioned a National Consultant on site, as well as sent a Past National President to participate in the GARP hearing on behalf of the chapter.

We have been working with legal counsel throughout the process and will continue to do so as we determine the next steps. (Carlson, 2015)

Sigma Delta Tau accepted GARP’s recommended sanctions but did not accept responsibility for the actions of its members.

On March 13, 2015, Sigma Delta Tau submitted an appeal to the university’s sanctions (Vandervort, 2015). The sorority raised two issues: “1) the severity of additional sanctions imposed by the [Dean of Students]; and 2) procedural defects in the GARP hearing” (Vandervort, 2015, p. 2). A University of Michigan Clinical Professor of Law was designated by the Vice President for Student Life to determine whether or not the appeal had merit. The Clinical Professor of Law found that

Sigma Delta Tau abandoned its procedural objections to the proceedings before the GARP. I further find that the [Dean of Students] had sufficient authority and
reason to impose additional sanction on the Sigma Delta Tau Sorority. Finally, I find that in the extraordinary circumstances of this case those additional sanctions were warranted. I therefore find that there is no merit in The Sorority’s Appellate Request. (Vandervort, 2015, p. 4)

No further appeals would be heard for this case.

The appeal was the last effort of Sigma Delta Tau to change the sanctions during the 2014-2015 school year. Although they did not agree with all of the sanctions, they did strive to complete them. By August, 2015, an apology was written to be presented to the other fraternity and sorority councils (J. Klein, personal communication, March 23, 2015) and the chapter attempted to complete all of the Achievement Expectations requirements (M. Kubik, personal communication, May 28, 2015). The chapter also completed various educational sessions, complied with social probation, and chapter officers met with the Associate Deans of their schools/colleges to discuss the impact their actions had on the university (Blake Jones, 2016b). Having complied with the sanctions levied against them, representatives of Sigma Delta Tau, including the national president, chapter president, and two parents, presented an appeal to the Vice President for Student Life, Dean of Students, Director of Greek Life, and Panhellenic Advisor to allow the chapter to participate in recruitment for Fall, 2015 (Blake Jones, 2016b). The appeal was denied but with the understanding that it could be reconsidered during Winter 2016.

After the appeal was denied, the Dean of Students sent a letter to all parents of Sigma Delta Tau explaining that their sanctions would continue (Blake Jones, 2015g). Parents of Sigma Delta Tau chapter members were not pleased that the chapter would not be able to recruit during the Fall 2015 semester. Seventeen parents either called or emailed the University President, Vice
President for Student Life, and/or Dean of Students, indicating that they were upset (K. Demas, personal communication, August 18, 2015). One parent wrote an email with the subject, “We need to have different resolution on SDT rush now! Our tuition bills are due so we need a compromise by 9/1 as well…” (E. J. Hornstein, personal communication, August 15, 2015; all emphasis, grammar, and spelling are original to the email):

Dear President and Vice President,

I am writing today very upset to hear that this situation is still not being compromised. I myself have been supporting this college as an out of state student almost 30 years ago! I was a GREEK member (AEPi) class of 88’ and I can honestly state that is was the BEST time of my life! After traveling the world, marrying my wife and having three kids, and starting my own business my memories at MICHIGAN centered around my Football and my Fraternity. It sound like you all never were involved in GREEK life and that was your shortcoming. Don’t continue to think that being GREEK is anything NEGATIVE, it is the BEST thing a student can do especially with the size of Michigan.

My memories of Michigan are doing stupid and crazy things with my friends, traveling to away games, going to Canada, formals etc… My BUSINESS that I started actually is a continuation of all the Products I use to sell on campus to the many GREEK organizations! To this day 30 YEARS later over four years of class’s still have a GROUP email going! I even had a fraternity brother from Florida invest in our business this year!
I told ALL of this to my daughter and she worked her tail off to get accepted. Now this terrible act happened far way by some stupid and disrespectful boys. Did I want my 100 pound daughter to fight with a 250 drunk guy and suffer consequences… NO… they did the RIGHT thing. Didn’t the hotel have security guards!

What your are doing to these innocent bystanders of SDT is NOT Right. Sure they were there, sure they have been punished and sure they have done a lot of community service to get on your good side. It is time though to COME UP with a COMPROMISE! It is YOUR turn.!!

As a member of a GREEK organization Rush is CRUCIAL to the Survival of the house. You cannot BAN them unless they were somehow implicated in doing something wrong and under law. These girls were bystanders and have NOT been named in any lawsuit? So why is it your business to crush this house and shutter the only Jewish House on Campus. (by the way MOST of your out of state NJ/NY students are JEWISH and paying these BIG $55,000 tuition bills)

Change it now!

Here is MY suggestion so you can say you still are PUNISHING this house but yet not Crushing them and forcing them to shutter the house forever. It is called a compromise to make all parties happy.

A) Have their rush limited to 70 percent of their normal draw. The house needs 65 to fill but maybe with 40 or 45 they can do it financially…
B) Continue with certain philanthropy that you as a board deem necessary.

C) Limit SDT social involvement in some way that you as a University can SAY you punished them this fall!

Please do not force these very upset parents to go other routes: Media, Courts, Attorney... (they have plenty as alumni..)

I cannot believe that you all have NOT thought of a COMPROMISE! These girls are the SMARTEST (GPA) on Campus, they have worked hard to gain your respect.. Please give them YOUR RESPECT!

I can be reached at my office if you want me on some committee to move forward.

Thank you for your time with this. Please respond within days as we are running out of time! You want our out of state tuition by 9/1 so I want an answer soon as well. (E.J. Hornstein, personal communication, August 15, 2015)

Another parent wrote (all emphasis, grammar, and spelling are original to the email):

I am a parent of a incoming sophomore who is in Sigma Delta Tau as well as a 1993 MBA graduate from the University of Michigan. I have previously contacted Laura Blake Jones regarding my outrage at the decision to suspend SDT from campus for two years for the events that occurred at The Treetops Resort. Since there has been no change in the position of the University on this matter, I am writing again to express my disbelief and frustration that you could take such
a harsh an inequitable position in the face of facts that show SDT members were not responsible for the events that occurred.

Since my last letter, a thorough police investigation was completed and a 319+ page police report does not implicate any member of SDT. The members of SDT have worked diligently for months to achieve the goals requested of them by the school, only to see no relief from the sanctions. This is a stall tactic, a bait and switch and entirely unfair. In addition, the punishment being imposed on SDT is disproportionate to the slap on the wrist received other fraternities and sororities for damaging another hotel on the same weekend.

I think the events that occurred at Treetops are awful and embarrassing to the entire University of Michigan community. Those responsible should be severely punished. While I believe that SDT should receive some punishment for not being a more proactive bystander as events unfolded around them, not allowing the sorority to conduct rush is an irrational and extreme position that I believe is based on reaction to media coverage and University politics. Not allowing SDT to conduct rush this fall, cuts at the lifeblood of the sorority and sets it back for many years; a very unfair outcome.

Additionally, I do not think it is beneficial to the University of Michigan community to draw attention to and suspend one of the last remaining Jewish sororities on campus during a time of heightened anti-Semitism on many college campuses across the United States. It should be important to the University that SDT have a strong presence on campus.
SDT chapter leadership, SDT National and certain parents of SDT members have worked constructively with the University for months to demonstrate to the school that SDT is a positive force on campus but you have not shown any willingness to compromise even as more information about the vents has shown no direct involvement by SDT members. At this stage, the parents are organizing as a group to consider commencing legal action, a public relations campaign as well as other approaches. I ask again, in the interest of fairness, that you reconsider the severity of the sanctions against Sigma Delta Tau and allow the sorority to conduct rush for the fall semester to ensure SDT’s continuity. (G. Moross, personal communication, August 15, 2015)

Despite the pleas and outrage expressed by the parents of Sigma Delta Tau, the university did not relent and allow the chapter to recruit during the 2015-2016 school year.

On April 25, 2016, the National President for Sigma Delta Tau wrote a letter to the Dean of Student once again requesting that the university show the chapter leniency and allow it to recruit new members during the Fall 2016 semester (Carlson, 2016). The National President explained that the chapter had, since the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year, accepted responsibility for their role at Treetops and had worked exceedingly hard to show that it was a positive contributor to the University of Michigan campus. In addition to the work the chapter had done, she also explained all the steps that the national organization had taken to support the chapter, including making multiple visits to the campus, placing a national consultant with the chapter for extended periods of time, and working closely with the Office of Greek Life during the entire process (Carlson, 2016).
On April 28, 2016, the Dean of Students responded to Sigma Delta Tau’s request to regain recruitment (Blake Jones, 2016c). Citing the positive work of the chapter, including conducting leadership training, bringing a national expert on bystander intervention to campus, and completing all remaining educational sanctions (Blake Jones, 2016b), she formally reinstated Sigma Delta Tau’s recruitment privileges for the Fall 2016 semester (Blake Jones, 2016c). These privileges were reinstated with the stipulation that the chapter would remain on probation for the 2016-2017 school year and any further violations of university policies or their sanctions would result in losing their recruitment privileges once again (Blake Jones, 2016c). Sigma Delta Tau did not have any further violations during their probationary period, and the chapter was reinstated as a full member in good standing of the Panhellenic Association as of the 2017-2018 school year (Fraternity & Sorority Life at the University of Michigan, 2018a).

**Criminal and civil charges.** The university formally worked with the chapters from the time the ski trip incident was first reported until Sigma Alpha Mu was closed and the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year for Sigma Delta Tau. However, the legal process started just after members of Sigma Alpha Mu had being given alumni status in March 2015. Shortly after this change in membership status, Sigma Alpha Mu learned that some members of the chapter would be charged criminally for their actions at Treetops Resort (R. Fitzgerald, personal communication, March 19, 2015). This was confirmed on March 20, 2015, when the Otsego County Prosecutor shared with the media that charges were being issued against several members of the fraternity (Allen, 2015b). Later that day, the Prosecutor issued a press release titled “Press Release Regarding January 16-18, 2015, Treetops Resort.” It read:

> Following an extensive investigation by the Michigan State Police into the property damage incidents alleged to have occurred at the Treetops Resort in
Gaylord, Michigan, during the time period of January 16th through 18th, 2015, involving members of the Sigma Alpha Mu fraternity, several charges involving members of the fraternity, including their president, treasurer, and another member, have been issued by the Otsego County Prosecutor’s Office.

These charges include the offense of Drug/Alcohol—Consumption By Minors on Premises, contrary to MCL 750.141a(2) for which warrants have been authorized against the fraternity’s president and treasurer, as well as a felony charge for Malicious Destruction of Building over $1,000, But Less Than $20,000, contrary to MCL 750.380(3)(a), which has been issued against another member of the fraternity.

Upon the receipt of additional identification information, it is anticipated that additional malicious destruction of building charges will be issued against several other members of the Sigma Alpha Mu fraternity, and steps are being taken to obtain information on their identities and specific actions.

In order to protect and respect the privacy of their guests Treetops Resort did not have active cameras in the common areas of the resort at the time of the fraternity’s stay.

Due to the significant number of students attending at the time of the event in question determining the identities and specific actions of other individuals believed to be involved has been hampered, however additional steps are currently being taken to have them held accountable, and also to see to it that
persons who were not involved in any of the alleged criminal activity are not falsely accused. (Rola, 2015)

Although over 100 students from the fraternity attended the ski trip weekend at Treetops Resort, only three were initially charged (Allen, 2015b). Over a year later, on May 5, 2016, the seventh and last member of the former Sigma Alpha Mu chapter was charged (Johnson, 2016). According to a news report, the prosecutor was prepared to close the case following this last member being charged, saying, “It’s not a matter of me hoping to shut the door… we’ve exhausted all avenues for trying to find individual persons accountable. You’re talking a year and a half of investigations” (Johnson, 2016).

Separate from the criminal charges brought against individuals of the fraternity was a civil suit filed against the University of Michigan chapters of Sigma Alpha Mu and Sigma Delta Tau. The University of Michigan Office of Greek Life was served with a subpoena on April 8, 2016, directing them to produce

the entire investigative file(s) associated with any investigation into Sigma Iota Chapter of Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity and/or Chi Chapter of Sigma Delta Tau Sorority, associated with the destruction at Treetops Resort over the weekend of January 16-18, 2015. This includes, without limitation, any reports, memoranda, findings, notes, and/or disciplinary action generated by and/or associated with said investigation. (Dillon, 2016)

Over the course of the week following the subpoena request, staff in the Office of Greek Life worked directly with the University of Michigan General Counsel to gather appropriate materials
to be reviewed and provided to the prosecutor (D. Berghorst, personal communication, April 15, 2016).

The civil case was first heard in the Otsego County Circuit Court but the defendants, Sigma Alpha Mu and Sigma Delta Tau, argued that the case should be referred to a bankruptcy court because Treetops Resort had filed for bankruptcy in November, 2014, and they believe this case fell under bankruptcy jurisdiction (Treetops Acquisition Company, LLC, v. Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity, Inc et al., 2015). The judge found that the case should be referred to bankruptcy court, so the case passed from the Otsego County Circuit Court to the Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of Michigan (Treetops Acquisition Company, LLC, v. Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity, Inc et al., 2015). The case against Sigma Alpha Mu and Sigma Delta Tau was terminated in bankruptcy court on November 10, 2015 (Treetops Acquisition Company, LLC v. Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity, Inc. et al., 2015).

Although the damage done to Treetops Resort was significant, only seven men were charged for their actions. No students from Sigma Delta Tau were charged criminally, and neither organization was found responsible legally because of Treetops bankruptcy filing. Boyne Highlands did not press any charges. After the seventh student was charged for his actions at Treetops Resort, all legal processes against individuals and organizations involved in the Treetops incident were conclude. The legal fight against the chapters was over, but there was still much to be done with significant changes to come at the university level.

**University deals with aftermath of ski trips.** As Sigma Alpha Mu and Sigma Delta Tau were dealing with the legal system, the university was left to deal with the aftermath of the ski trip incidents. The work with individual chapters was only one aspect of the work that was still to come. From violations of sanctions like former members of Sigma Alpha Mu throwing a party at
the former chapter house (A. Greenberg, personal communication, March 29, 2015) to creating talking points for orientation leaders (J. Colangelo, personal communication, May 15, 2015), the aftermath of the ski trip incident continued to require time and effort from university staff members.

*Call to action and collaboration.* Recognizing that the work yet to be done to address all the ills of the fraternity and sorority community was going to take a Herculean effort, the university decided to ask for help.

On July 11, 2015, the Office of Greek Life and Dean of Students hosted a “Call to Action” Conference. Fraternity and sorority alumni and advisors were invited to this conference to discuss action steps the Office of Greek Life, Dean of Students Office, and Alumni/Advisors could take moving forward to better the fraternity and sorority community. As a result of this conference, participants agreed to meet on a more regular basis and to increase communication via email and phone. It was generally agreed that increased contact and communication between all parties would be beneficial to the community as a whole (M.B. Seiler, personal communication, July 21, 2015).

The theme of increased communication and partnerships continued on July 27, 2015, when the University of Michigan hosted a meeting which included representatives from every fraternity and sorority that had a chapter at U-M at the time. The University President, Vice President for Student Life, and Dean of Students all attended the meeting as well. The purpose of the meeting was to further develop partnerships between the university and the national organizations, and to brainstorm how everyone present could work towards a better future for fraternities and sororities (Berghorst, 2015). Various topics were discussed throughout the day, including what was and was not working with the current partnership model, how partnerships
could be strengthened, what trends with fraternities and sororities could be addressed at U-M, and the possibility of a national Greek Life summit being hosted by U-M (Call to Collaboration, 2015).

**Community meeting.** Having held meetings with alumni, advisors, and national organization representatives, the university decided to hold the first ever Greek Life Community Meeting on September 10, 2015 (Kinery & Moehlman, 2015). This meeting brought together every active fraternity and sorority member to discuss the state of the fraternity and sorority community at the University of Michigan. Speakers at the event included the University President, Vice President for Student Life, Dean of Students, and representatives from the College of Engineering; Ross School of Business; and College of Literature, Science, and Arts. During the event, the president told the crowd that they needed to think about the value of not only their degrees, but those of the alumni who came before them:

> The value of their degrees are gonna go down because the reputation of the University of Michigan won’t be the excitement in the Big House or our teams doing well under our fantastic new coach… It’s not gonna be the kids who receive the Rhodes Scholarships and the Fulbright Scholarships, and the famous professors who do the work that you’re going to get reflected on for, or the National Medal for the Arts that our faculty won this past week. It’s going to be the ‘Shmacked’ videos. So it’s really up to you what the value of your education is going to be, what the reputation of this institutions’ going to be. (Kinery & Moehlman, 2015)

Students at the community meeting did not respond well to the messages being delivered. At one point during the president’s speech, many students in the audience began coughing loudly as he
continued to point out where the community had fallen short. This behavior was called out by the final speaker of the night, the IFC President:

Think for a second about how much your chapter means to you… I know it means a hell of a lot to me… But when students sit here and blatantly disrespect the leaders of our University and fellow students like myself and the three behind me, it’s flat-out embarrassing to say I’m a member of Greek life today. (Kinnery, 2015)

Although the community meeting was not as well received as was hoped it would be, the Dean of Students was optimistic about the impact the meeting might have on the community. During her portion of the night, she said to those gathered in the crowd:

I’m hoping tonight will be remembered as a turning point when the Greek community came together, reinforced and recognized its positive attributes, contributions and influence and was willing to thoughtfully reflect and consider the need for significant changes in the community. (Kinery & Moehlman, 2015)

This period of reflection would come shortly after the community meeting.

Greek life task force. Only a few months after the community meeting, the past-IFC President and Dean of Students, along with past-Panhellenic Association President, formed a Greek life task force. In January 2016, 30 people were invited to join the task force, including 11 students; four staff members from the Office of Greek Life; eight other university staff members; and three external members including a parent, a sorority national president, and a fraternity executive director. The task force was charged with
reviewing preliminary ideas, historical information, data, trends, reports and proposals developed by student leaders and staff during the summer of 2015 (as well as continuing work completed by sub-committees this term) to make recommendations to the Vice President for Student Life regarding how fraternity and sorority life at the University of Michigan can be fully restored to achieving its historic potential. (L. Blake Jones, personal communication, January 6, 2016)

Throughout the Winter 2016 semester, the task force as a whole met nine times. Eight subcommittees co-chaired by student leaders and staff members also met during that time and were charged with making comprehensive recommendations to the Task Force in eight key areas including:

1. Public Relations and Values Promotion
2. Management of Chapter Environments and Risk
3. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion within the Greek Community
5. Coordination and Expansion of Educational Activities and Programs
6. Exploring Options for the Timing of Recruitment
7. Working with Disaffiliated and Rogue Groups
8. Engaging Parents of Greek Students as Partners. (Blake Jones, 2016a, p. 1)

As a result of the efforts of all involved, the task force offered 10 recommendations:
1. Rename the Office of “Greek Life” to the U-M Office of “Fraternity and Sorority Life” while simultaneously exploring the feasibility of donor naming opportunities for the department.

2. Establish a formal evaluation strategy for all Greek chapters to be reviewed on an annual basis.

3. Augment existing advising structures for chapters ensuring robust local advising and mentorship; consider providing stipends, as needed.

4. Expand the use of live-in advisors within chapter facilities; seeking donor supported funding to incentivize groups.

5. Explore options for incorporating existing U-M academic, professional, and pre-professional fraternities within Greek Life via a fifth governing council.

6. Implement sub-committee recommendations highlighting those that: improve values congruence, sustain the engagement of junior and senior members, achieve diversity, equity and inclusion goals, enhance risk management procedures, expand hazing prevention efforts, align educational and leadership development efforts with learning outcome data and encourage active engagement with (inter)national organization staff members and parents of Greek students in sustained active partnerships in this work.

7. Begin recruitment activities as late as possible during the fall semester for IFC and Panhel groups, without encroaching on midterm exams and remaining deferent to religious holidays and constraints posed by the home football schedule and plans for chapter expansions.
8. Implement procedures for strategically working with disaffiliated and rogue groups beginning with efforts to advise the lone currently disaffiliated fraternity to immediately enact changes that would allow them to petition for future recognition by IFC.

9. Develop the financial infrastructure to fund and position the fraternity and sorority life program at the University of Michigan to be a model national program.

10. Sustain the existence of the Greek Life Task Force over the next four years holding fall and winter semester meetings in November and April to monitor ongoing progress with these goals. (Blake Jones, 2016a, p. 2)

The most substantial change that came from the task force recommendations was increased funding and staffing for the Office of Greek Life. The ski trip incident and task force report, along with the lobbying by the Dean of Students and Director of Greek Life, were enough to convince the university that more funding and staff were needed for the Office of Greek Life. Up until 2014, almost all of the staff salaries in the Office of Greek Life (five full-time staff, two graduate assistants) were paid for from student fees collected by the four governing councils (Berghorst, 2015). By the 2017-2018 school year, the staff had grown to six full-time staff, one part-time staff member, and three graduate assistants. Not only did the staff grow, but the director position was elevated to Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Greek Life (University of Michigan Greek Life, 2018d). Additionally, monetary contributions to the Office of Greek Life from the university nearly tripled providing money to help pay for some staff salaries and programing such as the Michigan Greek Leadership Institute Presidents’ Weekend, a leadership retreat for fraternity and sorority presidents (Kulka, 2017a).
Other recommendations may have been in the works but were put on hold for a brief period of time due to the next series of major events to happen to the fraternity and sorority community. A self-suspension, the announcement of deferred recruitment, and a new city ordinance would set forward a new set of challenges to be addressed. And so, the fraternity war continued.

**Concerns about the fraternity and sorority community.**

**IFC self-suspension.** At a November 2017 meeting of the Interfraternity Council, the executive board announced a suspension of all fraternity social activities due to a pervasive culture of excessive alcohol and other drug use, hazing, and sexual misconduct (Slagter, 2017). Several allegations of misbehavior were reported to have led to this suspension, including claims of sexual misconduct cases involving fraternity brothers, six incidents of reported hazing, more than 30 hospital transports for students during the weekend of the football game against Michigan State as well as seven called during Halloween weekend, an unauthorized “Champagne and Shackles” event—in which dates at a party are handcuffed to one another until the two people finish a full bottle of champagne—which transpired this past weekend, multiple allegations of drugging members in undisclosed fraternity chapters and three specific hazing allegations reported this week where fraternity members were put in alleged near-death situations. (Harmon, 2017, p. 1)

This suspension was self-imposed by the council and only directly impacted operations of IFC fraternities. Included in the suspension was a halt to all social activities as well as recruitment and initiation activities (Harmon, 2017).
When asked about the IFC self-suspension, the Dean of Students said:

I certainly do not condone or am not proud of any of the actions that might have caused IFC to take that action, but when they step forward to take strong self-governance action when they have concerns about things happening in the community, that didn’t surprise me and quite frankly, I was proud of the leadership they showed. (Slagter, 2018c, p. 1)

The Vice President of Student Life echoed the Dean of Students’ sentiments:

Any time young people and student leaders decide to self-regulate or decide that, “I’m seeing something that is contrary to who we say we are” and do a time out, we’re pretty proud. Because these are 17, 18, 19-year-olds providing leadership and self-governance for more 17, 18, 19 and 20-year-olds. So, for us, it’s this balance between concern about the behavior they’re seeing, that they want to check or have stopped, and pleased that they would take that kind of leadership.

So, it’s a push-pull for us. (Slagter, 2018c, p. 1).

That both were proud of the actions of IFC did not mean that they allowed the council to move forward without guidance. In an interview with MLive, both the Dean of Students and Vice President for Student Life shared that university resources, staff, and processes would support the IFC in working to address these negative behaviors moving forward (Slagter, 2018c).

Following the self-suspension, the Interfraternity Council took eight weeks to review and assess the council to find where processes and practices could be improved. Policy changes included removing hard alcohol from all IFC-sanction events, reducing the days when social events could take place, and increasing the number of sober monitors at each event (U-M
Interfraternity Council, 2018a). Additionally, a review of every IFC member fraternity was conducted, which resulted in the creation of individual action plans for each to regain social privileges (U-M Interfraternity Council, 2018a). The suspension of recruitment and initiation activities was lifted on January 3, 2018, for all chapters. The social restrictions were also lifted for some chapters at that time while social privileges were reinstated for others as they completed their individual action plans over the course of the Winter 2018 semester (U-M Interfraternity Council, 2018a).

**Deferred recruitment.** Just two months after the IFC lifted its self-suspension the University of Michigan announced that it was seeking to “strengthen the first-year experience for students on the Ann Arbor campus and support Student Life’s strategic plan for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion” (University of Michigan Public Affairs & Internal Communications, 2018). This would be accomplished over a period of five years as the Division of Student Life would seek to “implement several efforts to strengthen the programing devoted to first-year students and improve student engagement… this will include a shift to a winter recruitment practice for all Greek Life organizations beginning in January 2020” (University of Michigan Public Affairs & Internal Communications, 2018). The statement explaining the move to deferred recruitment did not address concerns with the fraternity and sorority community but focused solely on strengthening the experience of first-year students (University of Michigan Public Affairs & Internal Communications, 2018).

Student leaders from the Interfraternity Council and Panhellenic Association took exception to the announcement that their recruitment process would be changed without their input. On March 22, 2018, they released a joint statement:
As University of Michigan students, we take pride in the University’s promise to uphold our rights to take initiative and pursue self-development. This promise is outlined in the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities and Standard of Conduct for Recognized Student Organizations, granting all students and Recognized Student Organizations explicit rights and freedoms. This includes ‘the right of students to freely associated and freely express themselves without coercion or undue influence from the University.’ The University’s recent decision to restrict opportunities afforded to first-year students during their first semester directly infringes upon these basic rights guaranteed to Wolverines and Recognized Student Organizations.

We believe that having open access to a plethora of opportunities is vital for students to develop the life skills, support system, and community necessary to thrive in their first year and beyond. The University of Michigan prides itself in offering this diverse array of opportunities to students of all backgrounds, experiences, and interests. This decision not only undermines this unique feature that the University takes pride in, but sets a dangerous precedent for the University to interfere with internal decision making processes of Recognized Student Organizations. Further, failing to include student input devalues the partnership that Recognized Student Organizations have had with the University for decades.

As student leaders, we acknowledge and support the need for an enhanced first year experience in the form of expanded resources and programs. In the future, we hope to collaborate with the Division of Student Life to ensure that
each Wolverine has an impactful first-year experience filled with academic success and positive personal growth. However, we do not believe that these necessary developments should interfere with the rights of students and Recognized Student Organizations.

Recognized Student Organizations are fortunate to enjoy the privilege of having a cooperative and constructive relationship with the University. The University must respect this collaborative relationship to ensure the future success of all Recognized Student Organizations. We urge the administration to reconsider and work collaboratively with student leaders to best align positive first-year experiences with continued student and Recognized Student Organization efforts. We are optimistic about potential solutions that collaboration between the University and students will foster. (U-M Interfraternity Council and U-M Panhellenic Association, 2018)

Similarly, the North-American Interfraternity Conference, an umbrella organization for all IFC fraternities, expressed its concern:

The University of Michigan’s unilateral decision to defer recruitment places unnecessary restrictions on student choice and harms first-semester freshman seeking a special community to make a college of 30,000 students feel like home. Studies show how students who join fraternities in their first semester show greater gains in growth, learning and development, as well as how the loneliness freshmen commonly feel can be combatted through the connection and support found in fraternities. We urge the UM administration to work in partnership with
key stakeholders toward an alternative that respects the right of students to choose which student organization best meets their needs. (Goldman & Basha, 2018)

The Dean of Students provided a more hopeful tone which indicated that students would be able to provide some input in how deferred recruitment would be implemented: “In partnership with our Greek Life community student leaders, we are committed to working together to develop an implementation plan that ensures this recruitment timeline adjustment strengthens our entire community” (Goldman & Basha, 2018). This was further indicated in the original release about strengthening the first-year experience which stated, “A transition team representing the Greek Life community and chaired by [the Dean of Students] will be created to identify key considerations and make recommendations for implementing the change” (University of Michigan Public Affairs & Internal Communications, 2018). Before the transition team could be implemented, however, another event caused further disruption to the fraternity and sorority community.

**Ann Arbor housing ordinance.** In July 2018, the City of Ann Arbor approved changes to part of the city’s zoning code which regulated fraternity and sorority houses. The changes required all “prospective fraternity and sorority houses to maintain university affiliation for case-by-case permit consideration” (Slagter, 2018a). The newly created rules did not apply retroactively, but only to future permits granted by the city. In practice, this new rule would prevent new fraternities or sororities from forming without recognition by the university and would create conditions where if a future fraternity or sorority lose university recognition, it could also lose its zoning exemption through the city (Slagter, 2018a). This would not apply to existing fraternities and sororities.
Advocates for this zoning rule change believed that it would help to protect Ann Arbor neighborhoods from bad behavior and give the city a way to address potentially problematic fraternity or sorority houses. City Council members cited the need to protect neighborhoods where fraternities and sororities have chapter facilities while also saying that the new rules were “modest” and not unreasonable (Slagter, 2018a). One Council Member said of the new rules:

This is modest. This is something that will be a benefit in the long run and I think a simple solution to this is for all those new fraternities and sororities to stay in affiliation. Don’t do things that make you lose your affiliation. It feels like a rather low bar (Slagter, 2018a)

Not everyone agreed that the change was modest. Citing the changes to the city zoning ordinance, along with the implementation of deferred recruitment, six IFC fraternities decided to disaffiliate from the Interfraternity Council and forego their voluntary student organization status with the University of Michigan (U-M Interfraternity Council, 2018b). Each of the six chapters did this with the backing of their national organization as well as the North-American Interfraternity Conference (Slagter, 2018b). The Executive Director for Psi Upsilon Fraternity explained his organizations decision to sever ties with the university:

This decision to disaffiliate was—and still is—about preserving our property and association rights in response to a recent Ann Arbor zoning change and the University’s announcement to restrict first-semester students from joining fraternities. We seek to find solutions with the city and university that address our concerns and will continue to work with our interfraternal partners to do so.

(Slagter, 2018b)
The Chief Communication Officer for the North-American Interfraternity Conference also expressed concern over the ordinance and decision to defer recruitment:

All of our member fraternities with chapters at UM—whether affiliated or in the Ann Arbor IFC [newly formed “IFC” for disaffiliated chapters]—are concerned about the impact of the city’s new zoning ordinance and the University’s decision to restrict students’ association rights… The NIC will continue to advocate for all of its members as we work with City and University to find reasonable solutions that address the critical issues in the community and fraternities’ concerns.

(Slagter, 2018b)

The six disaffiliated fraternities formed their own governing council called the Ann Arbor IFC (AAIFC). This new council was created to assist its member organizations in creating a safe environment for chapter members and guests, as well as continuing to work with the city and university to find resolution to concerns about the city zoning rules and deferred recruitment (Slagter, 2018b). While operating outside of the scope of the university, member fraternities of the AAIFC would not be granted any university resources or support outside normal support given to individual students. Further, if any of those fraternities wanted to rejoin the IFC at the University of Michigan, the IFC would have the autonomy to make that decision but it would not be an automatic acceptance back (Slagter, 2018b). As of October, 18, 2018, seven fraternities (six that had disaffiliated because of the city zoning rules and deferred recruitment, and one that had previously lost recognition due to behavioral concerns) remained disaffiliated from the university and from the IFC (U-M Interfraternity Council, 2018c).

Conclusion. The ski trips event began a month’s long process in which the University of Michigan determined how best to respond. This incident cast a negative portrayal of the
university and gained national attention. Multiple stakeholders were involved in the discussions, and as the news spread more widely and gained increased attention, the discussion shifted from mid-level administrators to more senior-level administrators. Per university policy regarding student organization conduct, a student panel was convened to hear the case regarding the incident with oversight from staff members. A set of sanction recommendations was made by the students and finalized by the Dean of Students. Among other sanctions, Sigma Alpha Mu lost university recognition and Sigma Delta Tau lost the ability to recruit new members for two years. Sigma Alpha Mu and the four fraternities and sororities who went to Boyne Highlands accepted responsibility. Sigma Delta Tau did not and continued to fight the sanctions until they were granted recruitment privileges one year earlier than anticipated. In addition to the judicial process conducted by the university, there was a concurrent legal process in which seven fraternity men were charged criminally.

The impact of the ski trip incident was not limited to the fraternity and sorority involved. The incident also resulted in University of Michigan President questioning the ability of fraternities and sororities to persist at the university. He stated, “[unless] the students moderate some of the risky behavior… they may naturally wither, and people may want to stop joining them. There is a culture problem not only among students of Greek Life but significantly inside of Greek Life having to do with the overuse of alcohol, which really does need to be moderated” (Jesse, 2015).

The years following the ski trip weekend focused on reform in the community. In an effort to spur on this reform, among other things, a task force was convened by the Dean of Students to explore various issues in Greek Life. The task force was comprised of university administrators, students, and stakeholders. Members were asked to serve on various committees
to focus on specific areas of improvement like risk management, public relations, and diversity, equity, and inclusion. From this task force came many recommendations, including hiring additional staff and support for the Office of Greek Life. The university did provide increased funding and staff to the Office of Greek Life to provide additional support and education for students in the fraternity and sorority community, but the issues did not stop.

The aftermath of the ski trip incident continued into the last part of 2017 as the Interfraternity Council implemented a self-suspension on all social, recruitment, and initiation activities. Then, in March 2018, the university announced that it would strengthen the first-year experience for students by creating a system of deferred recruitment starting in 2020. Finally, changes to the City of Ann Arbor zoning rules were enough to make six fraternities decide to disaffiliate from the university entirely. This brought the total number of fraternities and sororities lost to the ski trip incident up to seven.

The ski trip incident represented a turning point in how the university viewed fraternity and sorority life. After turning away from the Greek community in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, the university was ready to recommit to fraternities and sororities. Both monetary and staff resources were provided to support these organizations as the university realized that ignoring the community did not prevent it from harming the reputation of the institution. A new era of university and fraternity and sorority relations had started and the Fraternity War rages on.
Chapter 5: Analysis of Three Eras of Conflict

In his study, Dr. Jeremiah Shinn (2013) sought to “understand the organizational functions of student-affairs at Indiana University” (p. vii). He found that “student-affairs at Indiana University emerged as a set of managerial activities in response to various conflicts and environmental demands over time” (p. 218). Shinn concluded that student-affairs provided four key functions for the organization: “To privatize conflict, to maintain [students], to buffer the technical activities from environmental influences and to provide symbolic reassurance to the cultural environment” (p. 218).

Shinn’s study demonstrated that student affairs professionals, who are situated within the managerial level of an institution, are responsible for boundary spanning, bridging, buffering, and boundary setting activities. Boundary spanning activities, like bridging and buffering, help insulate the technical core of an organization from environmental influences while also securing resources for the production of outputs. In this way, these activities provide the institution with the ability to exist (Shinn, 2013; Thompson J. D., 2003).

As the managerial level of an organization must span boundaries between the organization and the environment, it must also help to set those boundaries. Boundaries assist in determining what actually constitutes an organization through the inclusion and exclusion of certain activities (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Individuals are not considered when setting boundaries because activities can be independent of individuals (i.e., individuals leave the organization, but the activity continues). Boundaries are also fluid in the sense that organizations can chose which activities to include and which to exclude.

This study sought to build from Shinn’s findings about the functions of student affairs professionals and the activities they engage in by examining how student affairs professionals,
situated in the managerial level of the organization, engage in boundary spanning and boundary setting when faced with conflict. Additionally, the nature of conflict itself was examined as an aspect of the relationship between fraternities and sororities and the University of Michigan. This chapter provides an analysis of each of the three critical incidents described in Chapter 4 and Chapter 6 explores conclusions drawn from these analyses.

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan and the implications it had on student affairs.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework for this study drew from areas pertaining to conflict (Schattschneider, 1975) and organizational theory (Thompson, 2003; T. Parsons, 1960).

**Organizational theory.** The literature suggests that organizations have three levels of structure: technical, managerial, and institutional (T. Parsons, 1960). A fourth level, described by Muwonge (2012) and then built upon by Shinn (Shinn, 2013), deals with the cultural level of an organization. The environment that the organization exists in is also considered on three levels—the task environment, institutional environment, and cultural environment. This is represented below in Figure 14.
Technical level. At the center of every organization is its “core process” or its “basic method of transforming raw materials into finished products” (Bolman & Deal, 2017, p. 65). For an institution of higher education like the University of Michigan, the technical levels, or core processes, is research. The university’s central function is to develop new, innovative research. Organizations seek to create rationality, or “a style of behavior that is appropriate to the achievement of given goals, within the limits imposed by given condition and constraints” (Simon, 1972, p. 161). Plainly, institutions of higher education want students and the research process to act in accordance with the goals of teaching and producing research. In reality, both are complex functions that may be impacted by forces within the organization and from the environment (Thompson, 2003).

Managerial level. To mitigate these outside forces, and to bring rationality to the core processes, universities create structures, process, and policies to control or diffuse internal and external forces acting on the institution. The managerial level acts to mediate between the technical level and those who use it. Additionally, the managerial level gathers resources and
materials necessary for the technical level to function (Thompson, 2003). In essence, the managerial level allows the technical level to operate in an open system and gives it the ability to function, while also protecting it from outside forces.

Two ways which the managerial level acts to protect the technical level is through buffering and bridging. Buffering is used under norms of rationality when organizations, “[surround] their technical core with input and output components” (Thompson, 2003, p. 20). This allows organizations to prepare for fluctuations in their market by reducing any impact from the task environment. For an organization such as the University of Michigan, buffering may take the form of creating systems to mitigate environmental factors before they can impact the teaching and research done by faculty.

Whereas the managerial level utilizes buffering against the task environment in an attempt to maintain a closed, rational system, bridging is used when operating in an open-system. In this case, it is recognized that the organization must rely on the environment to maintain its meaning and legitimacy, and also to gain resources (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2005). For an institution of higher education this may be accomplished by creating partnerships or joining associations with other like institutions or strategic partners, or by imitating practices found in the environment (Shinn, 2013).

**Institutional level.** While an organization attempts to establish a closed, rational system in the technical level, it is being impacted by the environment in which it is situated at the institutional level (Thompson, 2003). At this level, the meaning or purpose of the organization is determined by its context (Thompson, 2003). The University of Michigan is situated in the context of higher education, as a public institution in the State of Michigan, and is perceived as a prestigious institution producing high-quality research. These contexts help provide purpose and
meaning to the organization at the institutional level. In gaining this meaning, or legitimization, the institution is able to gather resources from the environment in which it is situated but, at the same time, is impacted by the environment. So, while the organization remains independent to control what it does, it is also fairly dependent on the environment to gain resources and legitimacy (Thompson, 2003).

**Cultural level.** In his study exploring theocratic governance and divergent Catholic cultural groups in the USA, Muwonge (2012) explains that the culture of an organization, and how it orients itself within the cultural environment, is different, but just as important, from the institutional activities of an organization:

Data showed that institutional and cultural demands on the organizations were not necessarily the same and, in some cases, institutional and cultural demands stood in contradiction. To survive, organizations had to attend to the demands of one without compromising the other. (Muwonge, 2012, p. 371)

The cultural level of an organization “entails dressing centrally dictated… tenets in cultural garb in ways that can be understood by members of specific subcultures” (p. 371). In plain terms, the cultural level deals with the values and beliefs (e.g., language, activities, rituals) of the organization.

**Task environment.** The environment must also be considered. While the term environment can literally mean “everything else” (Thompson, 2003, p. 26), Thompson adopts the concept of the “task environment” from Dill (1958) to focus on what is relevant, or might be relevant, to the technical level and goals of the organization (Thompson, 2003). Exploring the
task environment limits the scope of analysis to factors and organizations which might impact the organization in question.

Organizations are dependent on their task environment in proportion to their needs for resources from the environment and based on their ability to provide or find those same resources in other spaces (Thompson, 2003). Organizations also provide resources and services to their environments. In this way, the power of the organization in relation to its environment is determined by inputs and outputs. If an organization is overly reliant on its environment for inputs and does not provide the same level of outputs to the environment, then the environment has power over the organization. The opposite is also true. If an organization provides more to the environment than it needs from it, or if the organization has more than one source of resources and does not have to rely on one source, it will have some power. It is important to note that organizations and their environment can also grow in power together as interdependence grows (Thompson, 2003).

Institutional environment. The institutional environment is a second environment an organization must navigate. It represents an organizations right to exist or its source of legitimacy: “Organizations receive support and legitimacy to the extent that they conform to contemporary norms—as determined by professional and scientific authorities—concerning the ‘appropriate’ ways to organize” (Scott, 2003, p. 137). This environment consists of rules and regulations which organizations have to adhere to maintain their support and legitimacy (Scott & Meyer, 1983). For the University of Michigan, the institutional environment consists of external entities like the State of Michigan, the NCAA, federal offices for grants, and similar institutions of higher education.
**Cultural environment.** The third environment to consider is the cultural environment: “The cultural environment determines what, in the eyes of a specific culture, are considered legitimate… practices” (Muwonge, 2012, p. 371). This environment is the values and beliefs of those around the organization. For the University of Michigan, this environment consists of the values and beliefs of external entities like the people of the State of Michigan, parents of students attending the university, and alumni.

**Conflict & the privatization/socialization of conflict.** Conflict plays a significant role in the political organization (Birnbaum, 1988; Bolman & Deal, 2017; Schattschneider, 1975). Schattschneider (1975) states that conflict is not only inevitable, but it is also highly contagious. Using a fight as an analogy, he explains that conflict involves those who are directly involved in the fight but also includes the audience. The audience can influence the direction of the fight by getting involved in the fight and backing one fighter or the other. To this end, Schattschneider believes the outcome of conflict is dependent on the scope of it. The number of people involved in the conflict can determine how it resolves. Factors such as who is included and excluded also play a significant role (Schattschneider, 1975).

Conflict is often managed through privatization or socialization. The privatization of conflict occurs when conflict is resolved privately, or between the original “combatants” in the fight. Socialization of conflict occurs when the conflict is broadened to include other players, or the audience, to help sway the outcome (Schattschneider, 1975). Schattschneider (1975) indicates that the original participant in the conflict that has the best chance of winning often seeks to privatize the conflict, or to control it so that it does not grow. The participant that stands to lose the conflict will seek to socialize the conflict to sway support to its side. One way that participants in a conflict seek to privatize or socialize conflict is by changing it to gain support.
from the audience. The shift of conflict can create new battlegrounds and, eventually, render the original conflict obsolete. Through the constantly changing nature of conflict—changing participants, fluctuating scope, introduction of new elements, etc.—the participants often find themselves coming to the middle to resolve the conflict (Schattschneider, 1975). This model of conflict is depicted in Figures 15 and 16 using conflict between a fraternity community and the university as an example.

Organizations seek to privatize conflict, when possible, to maintain a state of stasis (True, Jones, & Baumgartner, 2007) or quiescence (Iannaccone, 1982), where policymaking is stable and incremental. When these conflicts socialize, however, periods of crisis, or dissatisfaction, can occur where there becomes a divide between the governance of an organization and the demands of the people impacted by it (Iannaccone & Lutz, 1978; True, et al., 2007). Iannaccone (1982) indicates that these periods of quiescence and politicization are cyclical. He states, “High politicization and expanded political conflict alternate with longer periods of quiescence…” (p. 3). Periods of politicization are characterized by policymaking that is “more abrupt, less consistent, and sometimes contradictory” (p. 5). Periods of quiescence stand in contrast to politicization. Generally, a state of quiescence features incremental change that builds off of previous policy. Where policymaking during a period of quiescence builds on previously
established policy, periods of politicization can challenge the process of policymaking itself, focusing instead on the ideological aspects of policy. In this way, previously established policies can be disregarded in favor of completely new policies (Iannaccone, 1982; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1978; True, et al., 2007).

Institutions like the University of Michigan are in the business of teaching and producing research. When other factors impact their ability to conduct these processes, or take attention away from them, they will act in a way to reduce the impact of those factors. This is why institutions respond to conflicts like critical incidents. Critical incidents create threats to the core process of the institution, which causes actors within the institution to create units, policies, and procedures to be utilized by the managerial and institutional levels.

**First Era of Politicization: Analysis of the Fraternity War, 1845-1851**

The events of the Fraternity War firmly established and legitimized fraternities at the University of Michigan and set the stage for future student organizations to grow and develop by establishing a sense of self-governance among students (History of secret organizations, 1896). The stage for this conflict was set as fraternity men rebelled against the values set forth by the faculty of the university and vice versa. Where there had once been a relationship defined by the domination of students by the faculty, the Fraternity War established the rights of students to organize and function within the institution largely independent from university control. This revolt by the fraternity men also forced the university to explore alternative methods, structures, and sub-units for working with students (Peckham, 1994).

**Summary of findings: The Fraternity War, 1845-1851.** The beginning of the Fraternity War at the University of Michigan took place from 1845 to 1851. This conflict came about because of incongruent values between the fraternities trying to establish their place on campus
and the university which was trying to establish legitimacy in the realm of higher education. Further, the men wishing to establish these fraternities came to the university wishing to pursue their ambitions (Horowitz, 1987), become men free from their parents (Ten Brook, 1875), and partake in hedonistic behaviors previously denied them (Peckham, 1994). On the other side of the conflict were the university faculty members. These men brought both religious (Methodist and Baptist) and cultural (German) values to the university. Additionally, faculty believed in the core purpose, to shape young men intellectually and morally, and politics, to establish an elite university in the State of Michigan. These personal and university values led the faculty to establish an authoritarian regime at the university in which they controlled nearly every aspect of their students’ lives. This strict value by faculty clashed with the values brought to the university by those fraternity men wishing to engage in self-regulated behaviors. The relationship between the two groups was primed for conflict from the start.

The Fraternity War conflict started as a seemingly simple bout between the faculty and the fraternities but, over time, evolved to include many other participants. Eventually, the tension from the conflict dissipated, but the consequences of the Fraternity War were many. Faculty members lost their jobs, the Board of Regents was changed, the university hired its first university president, and fraternities were allowed to officially organize on campus. The results of the conflict would change the governance structure of the university.

**Pre-conflict university.** Just prior to the start of the Fraternity War in 1845, the University of Michigan was in a state of relative quiescence. As an organization it consisted of the Board of Regents, the faculty, and the students. Although the Board of Regents technically served as the managerial level of the institution, there to bridge or buffer the technical core from the environment, they often left the actual administration of the university to the faculty,
including managing student affairs. Prior to the Fraternity War conflict, each environment surrounding the university acted upon the institution equally as shown in Figure 17. During this time, the institution was gaining students and the state was accepting of the knowledge being created by the university (task environment). The institution gained legitimacy through state legislation and by adopting the ways of elite institutions of higher education it aspired to emulate (institutional environment). It also lived in relative harmony with the culture of the state and the surrounding community (cultural environment). As the values and wishes of each of these environments aligned with the values and wishes of the university, the organization was relatively balanced and existed in a state of quiescence.

![Figure 17. Balanced Environments: Quiescence](image-url)
Beginning of the Fraternity War: Conflict begins. From 1845 to 1846, three fraternities were established in secret at the University of Michigan. While their existence remained a secret, the relationship between the student body and faculty remained peaceful. Then, one night in 1846, a university professor discovered the existence of fraternities on campus.

The idea of fraternities existing in secret was an affront to the values and rules set forth by the university faculty members. Furthermore, the existence of these fraternities threatened the control the faculty had established over the student body. What the faculty knew of fraternities at the time came from their colleagues at institutions like Harvard and Yale (Horowitz, 1987), as well as German institutions which the university was modeled after (Ten Brook, 1875). The stories they heard often involved drinking, playing cards, and smoking (Peckham, 1994). How could the faculty potentially allow students to participate in immoral activities, and how could they control students if they did not know what they were doing and when? The balance and quiescence that had previously existed within the university would quickly shift to a state of politicization as the values of the fraternity men clashed with those of the faculty members.

Faculty also believed secret societies threatened the legitimacy of the organization. The University of Michigan aspired to be an elite institution like Harvard and Yale. Rule 20, a rule adapted from these institutions and approved as part of the university by the State of Michigan, provided legitimacy to the university from the institutional environment. Secret societies establishing at the university were a direct affront to the rules established and actions taken by the university to create legitimacy. In this way, the institutional environment began to have greater influence directly on the faculty members, or the managerial level of the institution (Figure 18).
The faculty members were concerned with maintaining their control of the institution and believed that could only be accomplished by fighting against fraternities and by reestablishing a boundary between the institution and fraternal organizations. The faculty attempted to regain control over the student body by trying to eliminate them gently. They offered to allow each of the fraternities to continue at the university, but they would not be allowed to recruit or take new members. In time, this would mean the end of each of the fraternities and would once again give faculty control over the student body.

The proposed elimination of fraternities over time was a way for the faculty to buffer the institution from the incongruent values brought in by fraternities. Although each of the fraternities accepted the faculty’s offer to remain in exchange for not accepting new members, all three continued to recruit new men in secret. For a very brief period of time, the faculty believed
that the university had returned to a state of quiescence. Faculty members thought they had quashed the rebellious actions and values of the fraternities. In reality, those actions and values remained, but out of sight of the faculty members.

**The Fraternity War continues: Conflict is socialized.** After a brief respite from conflict, the Fraternity War continued, and the conflict widened. Faculty members discovered, once again, that fraternities were operating in secret and accepting new members. The control of the faculty was once again threatened by the actions and values of the three fraternities.

Fearing the loss of control and institutional legitimacy that fraternities signified for the faculty members, they took steps to expel individual students who were known to be members of fraternities. Their actions were in direct contradiction to the culture and values stakeholders within the environment (students, community members, other stakeholders) wanted for the university. These stakeholders wished for students to be granted the freedom to act and associate.

Additionally, the act of expelling students impacted the resources from the task environment by decreasing the number of graduates from the university and souring the public’s perception of the institution. Faced with a decision to change at the managerial level by conceding to the cultural demands of current and incoming students, or to allow the managerial level to be influenced only by a fear of retaining institutional legitimacy, faculty members ignored the cultural and task environments and placed more importance on their values, the governance structure of the university that they had established, and the institutional environment surrounding it, allowing the conflict to continue (Figure 19).
As the faculty took further steps to buffer the institution and expel fraternity members for their continued acts of revolt, more and more participants joined the conflict on the side of the fraternity men. Fraternity men from outside the university, including alumni from other institutions and members of non-collegiate organizations like the Freemason’s and Odd Fellows, saw the actions of the faculty as attacking the right of fraternities to freely associate on college campuses. Other participants, including community members and parents of students, saw the university expelling students for wanting to have a good time and join a club with their friends.

Expelling students further harmed the task environment of the institution by damaging its financial standing and public image: “The damage in lost students and unfavorable publicity remained. Whereas, the graduating class in August 1849 numbered twenty-three, the next four Commencements saw only ten to twelve graduate” (Peckham, 1994, pp. 29-30). Losing students also meant the university was losing revenue. During that time, student fees were the university’s only source of income other than interest on land sales (Peckham, 1994).
Where influences from the institutional environment had worked directly on the managerial level of the institution previously, at this stage of the conflict, pressures from the cultural and task environments were having a greater influence. The values and beliefs of those in the cultural environment were starting to impact the managerial level. The faculty, feeling pressure, sought assistance from the Board of Regents but received no help. The impact of expelling students on the task environment also provided pressure on the faculty in the managerial level as the institution lost students and prestige, hurting its ability to exist (Figure 20).
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*Figure 20. Cultural and Task Environments Influence Technical Level*

*End of the Fraternity War: Fraternities become institutionalized.* As the toll of the Fraternity War mounted, including fewer newly admitted students and fewer students graduating, the conflict again widened. The community members who had joined the cause of the fraternity men took the case to the Michigan State Legislature. As a result, a state constitutional convention was called, and the question of the university leadership and governance was debated. The legislature joined with the fraternity men in calling for change at the university.
As a result of the state constitutional convention, the Board of Regents, which had previously been appointed by the state governor, became a board of elected officials. Additionally, the university was tasked with hiring a president to oversee the administration of the institution. The constitutional convention changed the governance structure of the university. In this way, actions from the institutional environment once again worked directly on the structure of the managerial level of the institution (Figure 21).

Figure 21. Institutional Environment (State Legislature) Influences Managerial Level (Governance Structure)

As the conflict drew to a conclusion, the faculty made one last effort to socialize it to their benefit. A subset of students, former fraternity members who were upset that they had been expelled while others had not, joined the cause of the faculty members. This proved to be too little, too late as a large portion of the faculty would soon realize that the conflict was lost, and they needed to find resolution.

While there was still a core of faculty members who staunchly opposed fraternities, most had seen that their cause was lost. As actions from the intuitional environment were forcing the
university to change its structure, further supporting the actions of the fraternities, the remaining faculty joined the side of the fraternity men, wishing to end the tension caused by the conflict and get back to doing their job of teaching and creating knowledge. Those faculty members who remained opposed to fraternities were then terminated or resigned, minimizing the tension from the conflict.

For the university as an organization, this represented a shift in the governance structure back toward a more balanced relationship between the various environments (Figure 22). The institutional environment still influenced the organization through rules and regulations, but the organization was also responsive to the values and beliefs of the cultural environment as well as the resource requirements of the task environment. No longer could the faculty in the managerial level operate effectively while openly ignoring important parts of the environment.

*Figure 22. Managerial Level Shifts toward Cultural and Task Environments*

*Aftermath of the Fraternity War.* This conflict created significant change to the institutional structure of the University of Michigan. When the conflict started, the university
was governed by the Board of Regents, which was appointed by the Governor of the State of Michigan and managed by faculty members. By the end of the conflict, the Board of Regents had become elected officials, faculty members had been fired for their role in the Fraternity War, and the university had hired a president to take on management responsibilities previously held by faculty.

The conflict also changed the nature of the relationship between faculty members and students. Prior to the Fraternity War, faculty members exhibited complete control over the student body and were able to align their values and those of the institution with the values of the environment. The Fraternity War brought the values of the faculty members in direct conflict with the values of the students and various stakeholders. In the end, the pressure exerted on the institution by the students and stakeholders, as well as the loss of incoming and graduating students, caused the university to shift its values and change its policies to be more accepting of the rights of students.

Prior to the Fraternity War, the university existed in relative quiescence as its values were in alignment with those in the environment. The faculty in the managerial level were responsible for the core work of the institution as well as responding to the environments. When the wishes, needs, and values of each environment were in alignment with the managerial core, there was no conflict. The faculty were able to set and maintain a boundary between the internal aspects of the university and the environment outside of it. They controlled all that was within the boundary and buffered that which was outside it.

When, however, the wishes, needs, and values of the various environments and the managerial level of the university fell out of alignment at the start of the Fraternity War, a period of dissention and politicization began. To return to a state of quiescence, the governing body of
the institution, the Board of Regents, shifted to an elected board responsive to the cultural environment of the state (elected by the people) rather than the institutional environment (being appointed by the governor), and the faculty were forced to relinquish their administrative control of the institution to a university president, representing the beginning of student affairs at the university. These changed and strengthened the managerial level of the institution, shielding the technical level from the environments surrounding the institution (Figure 23).
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**Figure 23. U-M Organizational Structure**

**Conclusion.** The Fraternity War at the University of Michigan was a period of politicization for the institution (Iannaccone, 1982). There was discontent among those students who wished to establish fraternities at the university, which triggered change in the institution. The Fraternity War started due to conflicting values between the faculty and students, and then became socialized when multiple parties were involved. In the end, the only way for the university to return to a state of quiescence was to remove those faculty members who opposed
Fraternities, change the governance structure of the institution, and create rules and regulations, which altered the relationship between the university and students and allowed fraternities the right to exist within institution. The boundary set by the faculty of the university which initially prohibited the existence of fraternities shifted to include them as part of the structure of the university. Fraternities had become institutionalized within the university. Following the Fraternity War, the university returned to a period of quiescence, but over time, the social structure and boundary established from this conflict would be challenged, once again creating discontent, and the conflict would be reopened, starting the Fraternity War once again.

Era of Quiescence: Analysis of Bias Clauses and Membership Selection, 1949-1969

The original Fraternity War at the University of Michigan highlighted how conflicting values between the organization and its environment could create a period of politicization which led to change within the institution and shifting boundaries around it. During the original conflict, faculty members in the managerial level of the institution ignored elements from the environment in an effort to maintain their control over the university. Thus, they allowed the conflict to escalate and socialize forcing them to change. To that end, the governance structure of the university was altered, and the University of Michigan Board of Regents hired the first university president to oversee students and the administration of the university, freeing faculty to focus on research and teaching. In addition, student organizations, like fraternities, that were formerly not allowed to exist at the university, were allowed to establish and operate legitimately within the structure of the institution.

The next critical incident of the ongoing Fraternity War explored in this study was over bias clauses and membership selection spanning a period of time from 1949 to 1969. Whereas the original Fraternity War showed how conflict and a state of politicization changed the
boundaries the faculty had set around the institution, bringing fraternities within the bounds of the university, the next incident show how effectively privatizing conflict could help maintain a state of quiescence, and forcing unwanted or problematic entities, like fraternities and sororities, to the margins of the institution. In this critical incident, changes in the cultural environment caused changes to aspects of student affairs at the university as student affairs professionals sought to privatize various conflicts and influences within the institution and from the environment.

**Analysis of bias clauses and membership selection, 1949-1969.** The late 1940’s and early 1950’s featured significant cultural change and, thus, change in student bodies on college campuses. In previous decades, students had been focused on the “college experience,” which often included fraternity or sorority membership. As World War II concluded, however, a more diverse set of students attended college and sought different experiences that aligned with their changing values. These students were more interested in politics and civil rights movements and had little time for frivolous activities like fraternities and sororities which they viewed as discriminatory, exclusive, and part of the “establishment” (Horowitz, 1987).

For institutions of higher education like the University of Michigan, the changing student body created changes in both the cultural and task environments. Students who the university was recruiting (task environment) wanted a University of Michigan experience that aligned with their interests. The values and beliefs of those students and other stakeholders (cultural environment) about what the college experience should be also shifted. The late 1940’s through the 1960’s were a time of activism, protests, and social consciousness. The university was forced to conform to the expectations of universities at the time or face the prospect of losing students, funding, and legitimacy (Scott, 2003).
Nowhere was the influence of these changing times more evident at the University of Michigan than in the Division of Student Affairs. Between 1954 and 1971 the university employed four different Vice Presidents for Student Affairs and reorganized three different times in response to the changing values and expectations of the student body. Students during this time asked for more services related to activism and service, and fewer services for traditional activities like fraternities and sororities. This analysis will explore how the evolving student body changed both the fraternity and sorority community and student affairs at the university.

*First attempt to establish anti-discrimination rules.* As the student body of the University of Michigan became more aware of discriminatory practices within student organizations on campus, the joint faculty and student Committee on Student Affairs sought to pass two regulations it thought would address the issue in 1949. By 1950, it was clear that the committee was targeting fraternities and sororities with the new rules. The committee passed both regulations as well as a motion indicating that fraternities and sororities had to remove discriminatory clauses from their membership selection process by 1956.

The creation of these new regulations was a result of shifting values and beliefs in the cultural environment and its impact on the perception of universities in the institutional environment. Changing norms regarding the acceptance of discriminatory practices influenced the Committee on Student Affairs to begin looking at the rules and practices of the institution pertaining to student organizations. The targeting of fraternities and sororities was also pressured from students, faculty, and staff in the cultural environment as attitudes about fraternal organizations, and the culture those organizations held, were changing across the nation. Where these organizations were once seen as prestigious and desirable, they were quickly becoming symbols of discrimination and representing the “establishment.”
Although the Committee on Student Affairs voted and approved both new regulations in 1951, they were vetoed by President Ruthven. His rational for vetoing the regulations was that he did not want the new rules to inadvertently take away rights from students on campus. The Committee on Student Affairs once again tried to pass these two regulations removing discriminatory clauses a year later in 1951 under a new university leader, President Hatcher. He too vetoed the regulations sharing that he would rather use educational means to remove discriminatory practices from student organizations instead of coercive ones.

Although university rules did not change as a result of these proposed regulations, change did occur in fraternities and sororities. In 1952, in response to environmental pressures, U-M fraternities and sororities proposed an anti-bias clause to the Big Ten Panhellenic and IFC Conference. The clause recommended that individual fraternities and sororities act to remove discriminatory clauses from their constitutions. It passed with no dissenting votes. This set the cultural norm and expectation that fraternities and sororities would work to remove discriminatory practices and language from their organizations.

Incrementally changing rules and structures. In the mid-1950’s, facing changing expectations and needs from students, the university began the process of changing its structures for governing student organizations. This restructure replaced the Committee on Student Affairs, made up of students and faculty, with the Student Government Council (SGC), which was comprised of only students. In addition, the Board in Review was created, which had students, staff, and faculty represented, to review challenges made to SGC decisions. The university gave students an increased role in the governance of student organizations with oversight by student affairs staff.
This structure change was met with some resistance from fraternities and sororities. They viewed their relationship to the university as one with the institution itself, tied to institutional rules, regulations, and policies. Student Government Council being given authority over fraternities and sororities seemed to the fraternal community as if the university was removing formal ties with fraternal organizations and giving authority to students, shifting the rights of fraternities and sororities from solid ground within the institution to the whims of what students believed was appropriate. As such, student authority over fraternities and sororities was challenged as illegitimate by local fraternities and sororities as well as their national organizations and alumni. At the time, this challenge was dismissed by the university in favor of retaining the new SGC structure, but it was the beginning of a conflict that would last throughout the remainder of the 1950’s and 1960’s.

Then, in 1959, following the Board of Regents affirmation of the institutions commitment to non-discrimination by adopting Bylaw 2.14, the SGC adopted a similar regulation that prohibited discriminatory behavior in student organizations. To implement and administer this regulation, the SGC created the Committee on Membership in Student Organizations. This represented a symbolic gesture by the university that they were against discriminatory behavior and would take action against it. It was also a necessary move by the university to conform to the expectations of an elite university in order to retain legitimacy (Figure 24).
The Committee on Membership in Student Organizations wasted little time before requiring that all fraternities and sororities submit their constitutions to be reviewed for discriminatory membership clauses and practices. First requested in the fall of 1960, it was not until early 1962 when the committee began to see success in gathering any useful information. Although most fraternities and sororities had submitted documentation, many were found to be in violation of the SGC regulation prohibiting discriminatory membership clauses and practices. The committee also discovered that some of the local fraternities and sororities were powerless to change their governing documents because of their relationships with their national organizations who controlled their right to exist as chapters of that national fraternity or sorority. The National Panhellenic Conference went so far as to vote not to allow its collegiate members to work with SGC or its committees because it was comprised of elected students, some from major student organizations and most from the general student body, and with no administrators.

By this point, in 1962, most local fraternity and sorority chapters wanted to work with SGC to eliminate discriminatory membership language and practices from their chapters’
governing documents. Most chapter leaders and the leaders in their governing councils, the Interfraternity Council (IFC) and Panhellenic Association (U-M Panhel), realized that their goals and SGC’s were generally aligned and decided to work together. Other local fraternities and sororities, their national organizations, and alumni did not feel in alignment with SGC and chose to engage in conflict with the university and SGC. They fought against the notion that SGC should be allowed to have governing authority over fraternal organizations and their membership practices by claiming that they did not discriminate and that it was not up to a student group to determine the membership policy of a nationally affiliated, and governed, organization.

In response, SGC requested assistance from the university, particularly the Board of Regents, to clarify their authority over fraternities and sororities. University administrators heard SGC’s plea and developed the Harris Proposal which was adopted in 1963. This proposal, approved by the Board of Regents, clarified previously created policies by specifically giving the SGC authority over all student organizations including fraternities and sororities (explicitly stated in the proposal). The Harris Proposal served to affirm student control over student organizations and to further privatize the conflict between fraternities and sororities and SGC.

Following the approval of the Harris Proposal, all IFC member fraternities submitted the documentation required by the Committee on Membership in Student Organizations, symbolically agreeing to remove bias clauses and discriminatory membership practices from their governing documents. The national organizations did not attempt to stop them from doing so. For U-M Panhel, it was a different situation. As the Committee on Membership in Student Organizations worked to create mechanisms for holding student organizations accountable to the SGC regulation on discriminatory membership practices, 10 sororities, represented by an attorney, again presented a challenge. They argued that the Board of Regents was not allowed to
cede authority to a student committee and that the rules created by the committee created a
conflict of interest and were coercive. They ended by requesting that the Vice President for
Student Affairs veto the new rules and reconsider the role of the Committee on Membership in
Student Organizations.

The Vice President for Student Affairs convened the Committee on Referral to review the
veto request. The committee reviewed the rules created by the Committee on Membership in
Student Organizations and determined that they were acceptable but offered some slight changes
to remove possible conflicts of interest. These were accepted by the Vice President and the veto
was not granted.

The attorney representing the sororities then went to the Board of Regents to request that
they reconsider the Harris Proposal. The board voted 5-3 to affirm the previous vote on the
Harris Proposal instead. For a period of time, this settled the conflict over whether the SGC had
authority over fraternity and sorority membership practices. University leaders, continuing to
privatize the conflict, successfully navigated the attempts by the sororities to shift or win the
conflict by continuously affirming the right of students to oversee student organizations and their
membership selection processes (Figure 25).
Conflict in the environment.

**IFC and Trigon.** Following the decision of the Board of Regents to affirm the Harris Proposal, the IFC created its own membership committee to review and oversee the membership practices of its member organizations. Understanding that the SGC maintained authority over fraternities, the IFC sought to take back some power by doing the work of the Committee on Membership in Student Organization for its own member organizations. The SGC allowed this to happen but maintained the right to intervene if it thought it was necessary to do so.

One situation the IFC membership committee had to manage was the case against Trigon Fraternity. The conflict between the IFC and Trigon lasted two years and, for the most part, did...
not involve the university. The IFC alleged that Trigon’s membership clause was discriminatory, and Trigon attempted to dissuade that notion by arguing that any person could join as long as they would say the oath (which contained overt Christian language). In the end, this conflict had significant ramifications for Trigon Fraternity as it forced the organization to alter its membership selection process and fraternity ritual.

This conflict was of particular importance for university leaders like the President and Vice President for Student Affairs during the 1960’s because it demonstrated that the university did not have to be involved in fraternity affairs. Although university administrators observed the conflict unfold and communicated with the parties involved, it did not become directly involved in the conflict. When participants in the conflict, particularly from Trigon, attempted to pull the university into the conflict, university administrators (including the Vice President for Student Affairs, President, and members of the Board of Regents) privatized the conflict by affirming IFC’s right to govern its members, and Trigon had the right to leave the IFC and exist as an unaffiliated fraternity if it chose to do so. This case gave the university further confidence in its decision to give authority to students to govern student organizations.

_U-M Panhel and NPC._ The ability of the institution to privatize conflict was further tested by the conflict between U-M Panhel and the National Panhellenic Conference (NPC). The NPC, the umbrella organization for the national organizations within U-M Panhel, was determined to block attempts by the SGC to interfere with its member sororities membership processes and practices. To do this, the NPC and its member national organizations refused to allow its collegiate members to work with SGC on membership issues.

U-M Panhel fought back against NPC, beginning the process to create its own membership committee, similar to the IFC. As it became apparent U-M Panhel was going to try
to create its own committee, the NPC voted to affirm its unanimous agreements, one of which prohibited U-M Panhel to take any action that would impede or alter the rights of a member sorority to recruit members. U-M Panhel moved forward with a plan to create a membership committee anyway and officially created it in 1966. The NPC and its national organization members did not stop U-M Panhel from implementing this new committee, and the SGC allowed the U-M Panhel membership committee to exist and operate like the IFC membership committee. In 1967, the SGC created a formal working agreement with both the IFC and U-M Panhel membership committees giving the two committees official oversight over their membership processes and establishing a reporting line to the SGC for its membership committee to review each investigation done by IFC and U-M Panhel. This agreement also created a mechanism which would further privatize conflicts over membership selection.

Similar to IFC’s case with Trigon, university administrators maintained a watchful eye over the conflict between U-M Panhel and NPC but refused to participate directly. The Vice President for Student Affairs was responsible for updating the Board of Regents throughout this conflict, and even offered his encouragement to U-M Panhel during the conflict, but he did not engage with U-M Panhel in the process of creating the committee or with NPC in fighting it. This case again proved that students could be responsible for the management of conflict involving student organizations.

**Conflict in the environment requires university intervention.** After establishing its own membership committee, U-M Panhel passed a resolution in 1968 to remove binding and required recommendations from all of its member sororities. This resolution was seen as the symbolic last step in removing any formal ties to discriminatory language or practices in sororities. The advisor to U-M Panhel knew that national sorority organizations would not allow their local
chapters to remove these recommendations from their recruitment practices, so she requested assistance from the Vice President for Student Affairs. She insisted that the university reaffirm the regents delegation of authority to SGC and U-M Panhel to oversee the student organizations in their purview.

The advisor was correct in thinking that national organizations and NPC would respond negatively. Upon learning that U-M Panhel wanted to remove binding and required recommendations, many stakeholders from national sororities and their alumnae reached out to the university seeking assistance in protecting their organizations’ rights to regulate their membership processes. These stakeholders attempted to socialize the conflict by obtaining assistance from the institution to protect their interests.

U-M Panhel also reached out for assistance. The Panhellenic Association President wrote to the University President asking for support. She also sought advice and support from the State of Michigan Attorney General to ascertain their legal standing in the matter.

Initially, the university tried, once again, to privatize the conflict by remaining only a spectator. The Board of Regents and President asked the Vice President for Student Affairs to gather information about the conflict and provide information on how similar conflicts were managed. It was determined that previous conflicts were left to students to manage and the university had supported their right to do so. The Board of Regents did nothing with this information but allowed the vice president to make a public statement affirming U-M Panhel’s right to remove the binding and required recommendations.

National sororities and their alumnae took exception to the university supporting U-M Panhel and began to put pressure on the university to withdraw its support from U-M Panhel and
side with the national organizations instead. This pressure intensified when U-M Panhel passed a proposal for how to enforce the removal of binding and required recommendations. The new proposal created rules whereby if a sorority did not remove binding and required recommendations from their membership practices, that sorority would not be allowed to recruit new members. National sororities and NPC recognized this new proposal as a threat to recruitment, and by extension, their right to exist, and continued their campaign to gain university support to block U-M Panhel from imposing these rules.

Still supporting U-M Panhel, the Vice President for Student Affairs submitted an action request to the Board of Regents, formally asking them to support U-M Panhel. The Board of Regents approved this action request making the university support for U-M Panhel official and indicating that binding and required recommendations would be in violation of the Regents By-Law 2.14. This institutionalized and legitimized the U-M Panhel policy. The national sororities and NPC acquiesced to this new policy and allowed their local chapters to remove the recommendations.

This case began in a similar fashion to both the Trigon case and the U-M Panhel membership committee case. It began to shift, however, as the conflict between U-M Panhel and their national sororities began to socialize and cause increased pressure on the university to act. For example, when the State of Michigan Attorney General became involved, the university may have foreseen the conflict growing into a legal struggle which may have threatened the university’s legitimacy as an elite institution. Or the conflict could have grown and shifted to include national fraternities, who may have fought for similar rights to those that the national sororities were fighting for. Instead, university administrators took matters into their own hands and sought to privatize the conflict by institutionalizing and legitimizing the U-M Panhel policy.
which removed binding and required recommendations from membership selection processes (Figure 2).
Summary. In just under 20 years, fraternities and sororities witnessed their membership selection processes challenged and changed, were placed under a governance structure administered by students, and in the end, lost all formal ties with the university other than their status as voluntary student organizations. The perception and value of fraternities and sororities had changed so that the university no longer felt it necessary to provide specific support to those organizations. Those in the cultural environment viewed fraternities and sororities as elitist and exclusive, which threatened the legitimacy of the institution if it did not address those concerns and conform to the expectations of an elite institution. Additionally, prospective students in the task environment wanted the university to provide what they desired and needed from their collegiate experience to draw them to the university. The collective pressure from the environment was enough to shift how the university managed student organizations like fraternities and sororities.

If the first Fraternity War battle demonstrated how much impact pressure from environmental actors could have, this second battle showed the importance of privatizing conflict to minimize implications for the institution. For nearly 20 years, actors in the cultural environment challenged the institution to address discriminatory practices, creating conflict in the process. University leaders were successful in privatizing these conflicts, so they did not grow or shift. Throughout this period of time, the university maintained a period of quiescence by pushing conflict into the environment. Incremental changes were made to existing policies and practices to symbolically show that the university did not tolerate discrimination.

The first critical incident of the Fraternity War arguably changed the trajectory of the university by fundamentally altering the governance of the university because of the inability of the faculty to privatize conflict. This second critical incident displayed how student affairs
professionals and other U-M leaders could privatize conflict by affirming certain rules and policies as a symbol of the university’s commitment to non-discrimination, creating institutional legitimacy. A significant difference between the two critical incidents was the ability of educational leaders to privatize conflict. In the first critical incident, the faculty lost control of the conflict and, thus, were unable to maintain the boundary they had created against fraternities. As a result, fraternities were institutionalized and legitimized, creating a need for the university to change the way it viewed and governed student organizations. During the second critical incident, educational leaders successfully privatized conflict and pushed fraternities and sororities to the margins of the institution and away from the technical core.

**Second Era of Politicization: Analysis of Ski Trip Incident**

When conflict arose again in 2015, the university was no longer able to avoid being involved as it did during the bias clause and membership selection era. Additionally, unlike during the Fraternity War, student affairs administrators were able to take advantage of this second period of politicization to expand various areas of student affairs at the university. The third analysis displays how student affairs responded when a conflict which became socialized led to a period of politicization.

**Introduction to ski trip incident, 1995-present.** For over 25 years following the dismissal of the fraternity advisor in 1968 and sorority advisor in 1969, the University of Michigan viewed fraternities and sororities only as voluntary student organizations without a designated staff member to advise them. For a time, membership declined, but in the late 1970’s and 1980’s, the fraternity and sorority community began to increase in both membership and popularity (Horowitz, 1987). In 1995, the university recognized the need to support this growing student population (task environment) and shifted its stance on fraternities and sororities. To
address the growing needs of fraternity and sorority students, the institution chose to bolster the managerial level of the organization by hiring two advisors to work with the Interfraternity Council (IFC) fraternities and Panhellenic Association (U-M Panhel) sororities. From 1995 to 2015, the university expanded and redefined the relationship with fraternities and sororities by adding staff, creating new rules and regulations to support the fraternal community, and trying to minimize risk and institutional liability associated with fraternity and sorority activities. The increased support and hiring of new staff also served as a condensation symbol (Edelman, 1985b) to the public that the institution was committed to creating and maintaining a safe and supportive environment for its students.

**Analysis of the ski trip incident.** In spite of this increased support, the weekend of January 16-19, 2015, three fraternities and three sororities caused significant damage at two different ski resorts in northern Michigan. This event triggered a period of politicization at the university. Immediately following the weekend, each resort, as well as some of the impacted guests, contacted the university expressing their outrage over the student behavior at the resorts. In the days that followed, U-M students and alumni, including fraternity and sorority members and non-members, implored university administrators to act against the offending fraternal organizations. The media, both local and national, covered the story and questioned how the situation would be dealt with. Each of these actors provided pressure on the institution to act (Schattschneider, 1975).

Unlike in the 1960’s, student affairs professionals were unable to privatize the conflict and allow the environmental pressure to be managed outside the organization. From the moment the institution learned of the ski trip incident, university administrators began engaging in attempts to privatize and control the conflict. Staff in the Office of Greek Life gathered
information for the Dean of Students and Vice President for Student Life. The vice president convened with the executive officers of the university, including the university president and provost, to determine how the university would respond to the ski trip incident. Publicly, the university initially responded by releasing statements from both public affairs and the Vice President for Student Life.

Both statements acted as initial buffers (Figure 27) to those in the cultural environment who wanted immediate action by expressing regret over the behavior of the offending fraternal organizations, stating those fraternal organizations would be held accountable, and indicating that it was only a limited number of U-M students who did the damage and that they did not represent the entire fraternity and sorority community. Furthermore, these public statements acted as condensation symbols (Edelman, 1985b), providing reassurance that the institution had heard the concerns from those in the cultural environment and would utilize all its resources, rules, policies, and structures available to address those concerns. By reassuring those in the cultural environment that the university was going to act, thus declaring that they were on the side of those in the cultural environment, the university shifted the conflict. Whereas the initial conflict was between actors in the cultural environment and the university, it had shifted to be the university and those in the cultural environment against the responsible fraternities and sororities (Figure 28).
Further attempts to buffer pressure from those in the cultural environment were made by the Central Student Government, Interfraternity Council, and Panhellenic Association with assistance from student affairs professionals. The student leaders of these organizations issued apologies on behalf of the fraternity and sorority community as well as the student body in
general. The student leaders committed to working with the impacted resorts, communities, and the university to hold those fraternities and sororities responsible for their actions and to repair the harm that was done through financial restitutions and community service. This too provided symbolic reassurance that action would be taken.

Despite the attempts to control the situation through various promises of action, the pressure from those in the cultural environment was intense. Many students involved in the ski trip incident were enrolled in the College of Literature, Sciences, and Arts; College of Engineering; or the Ross School of Business. Each school or college perceived the ski trip incident as damaging to their academic reputation and brand, threatening their status and legitimacy, and were eager to be involved with the university response. Student affairs professionals worked with faculty and staff within those schools and colleges to begin holding students accountable for their actions, including removing some from internship opportunities gained through their school or college. The ski trip incident had socialized so that professionals from academic schools and colleges were forced to get involved in the conflict with student affairs professionals to create buffers to insulate and protect the core of the institution.

This intense pressure from the cultural environment also created conditions for continuing conflict. Although the university had shifted the conflict initially so that it was with those in the cultural environment against the responsible fraternities and sororities, the conflict quickly shifted again. The cultural environment became set against the university over how to respond to the incident. Even as some individual students were being held accountable by their schools and colleges, actors in the cultural environment also requested immediate punishment for the responsible fraternities and sororities. Student affairs professionals were unable to take action quick enough as they were still investigating the incident to determine who was responsible and
the best course of action to take. Attempts to privatize the conflict by describing it as an isolated incident perpetrated by only a few fraternities and sororities were initially unsuccessful, and it instead quickly became socialized as actors in the cultural environment shifted the conflict to be an indictment of the entire fraternity and sorority community at the University of Michigan.

Thus, student affairs administrators in the managerial level of the university sought partners from the environment in response to the growing conflict. Early in the conflict, student affairs professionals such as the Vice President for Student Life, Dean of Students, and Office of Greek Life staff bridged with the various national organizations of the fraternities and sororities who were involved in the ski trip incident. The goal was to legitimize the response of the university by partnering with these national fraternal organizations to hold their local chapters and members accountable. While each national fraternal organization held their local chapters accountable according to their own policies, the same group of student affairs professionals at the university were able to focus on the U-M student organization accountability process. Further, working with these national fraternal organizations assisted these administrators in privatizing the conflict by highlighting the offending organizations and distancing the rest of the student body and fraternity and sorority community.

**Accountability process.** To begin the process of holding the responsible fraternities and sororities accountable, organizational rules and policies were enacted. It was alleged that each of the involved fraternities and sororities had violated the *Standards of Conduct for Recognized Student Organizations*. Therefore, each was subject to the “Student Organization Advancement & Recognition Accountability Procedure.” This process involved a student hearing panel, staff members to advise the process, and the Dean of Students to review sanctions recommended by the student hearing panel to issue the final sanctions against each organization.
The hearings were held in accordance with policy and five of the six fraternal organizations accepted responsibility. Four of the fraternities and sororities that had been at Boyne Highlands Resort were given educational and restorative sanctions by the student panelists, which were approved by the Dean of Students, and were allowed to maintain their relationship with the institution. Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity accepted responsibility as an organization but refused to provide the names of the individual fraternity members responsible for the damage at Treetops Resort. The student panelists recommended a period of suspension for the fraternity as well as educational and restorative sanctions. The Dean of Students, however, deemed that the fraternity’s lack of cooperation holding individuals accountable was a significant offense that required separation from the university. As such, the fraternity lost recognition as a student organization for a period of at least four years.

The de-recognition of Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity may have been avoidable if the chapter had provided the names of individual fraternity members who had damaged Treetops Resort. However, the local chapter was impacted by its own institutional environmental pressures. While the university accountability process was occurring, the Michigan State Police were also investigating the fraternity. Although the national organization for Sigma Alpha Mu was strongly encouraging the local chapter to provide names in order to maintain the chapter’s affiliation at the university, the local chapter chose to protect individuals from legal ramifications by withholding their names. The legal pressure on the fraternity outweighed the pressure from student affairs professionals in the managerial level, the rules of the university in the institutional level of the university, and pressure from the national organization for the local chapter. The result was that the chapter lost university recognition and was closed by its national organization.
The sixth fraternal organization, Sigma Delta Tau sorority, denied any responsibility for the damage done at Treetops Resort and hired attorneys from Manley Burke to help them fight any allegations of wrongdoing. The sorority, with the backing of its national organization, alumnae, and attorneys, alleged that the university accountability process (institutional level) was conducted improperly and that the sorority had done nothing wrong. However, these challenges to the process did not prevent the sorority from being sanctioned. The student panelists recommended educational and restorative sanctions for Sigma Delta Tau Sorority. When, after the Dean of Students proceeded to review the recommended sanctions, she adjusted them to include a two-year disciplinary suspension, which meant the chapter could not recruit new members for two years, and scheduled meetings between chapter leaders, the Dean of Students, and their school or college deans or associate deans to discuss their role in the incident and how it impacted the institution.

The policies and procedures utilized in this process, from the institutional level of the university, allowed student affairs professionals in the managerial level to address the initial conflict over how the university would respond to the ski trip incident. All six of the fraternities and sororities involved in the incident were held accountable, which minimized tension from the initial conflict. However, the university was not done dealing with the ski trip incident.

*New conflict emerges: Sigma Delta Tau.* Along the way to holding the responsible chapters accountable, a new conflict was created. Sigma Delta Tau sorority did not accept the sanctions levied against the chapter. The sorority argued that a two-year suspension impacted their ability to recruit new members, thus threatening their ability to survive as an organization. They alleged that the university was impinging upon their right as an organization to exist and that there was no evidence of wrongdoing.
Two particularly strong actors for Sigma Delta Tau were its national organization and parents of chapter members. The national organization released public statements expressing their disagreement with the sanctions and sought legal options against the university. Parents of chapter members pressured the university to reconsider the sanctions by contacting university leaders, including the President, Vice President for Student Life, and Dean of Students, and threatening to withhold tuition or donations to the university, potentially impacting the task environment, or ability of the university to exist.

The conflict between the university and Sigma Delta Tau sorority threatened many aspects of the institution. Not only was the institutional level challenged as the sorority questioned the ability of the university to create rules and policies prohibiting recruitment, the task environment was also threatened as parents suggested they would withhold tuition dollars potentially impacting the ability of the university to exist. In spite of the challenges, student affairs administrators did not immediately allow Sigma Delta Tau to begin recruiting again.

In year two of the sanctions, however, repeated pressure from Sigma Delta Tau caused the university to reconsider the sanctions. Not only did the parents and national organization for Sigma Delta Tau sorority continue to challenge the authority of the university to limit recruitment for the sorority, the local chapter completed nearly all of the assigned sanctions, giving further credence to their plea for reinstating their recruitment privileges. The university eventually did succumb to the pressure and allowed Sigma Delta Tau sorority to recruit once again. The sorority remained under disciplinary probation, but no further action was taken against the organization.

Aftermath of ski trip incident: Boundary setting and spanning. The tension from conflicts directly related to the ski trip incident had been minimized, but the work to move
forward after the incident was still ahead. After student affairs professionals were finished working with the fraternities and sororities involved in the incident, they turned their attention to the fraternity and sorority community as a whole. The pressure to address the incident itself had abated, but there remained pressure from university leadership to address the perceived issues of the fraternity and sorority community which allowed the ski trip incident to happen.

The Board of Regents and executive officers of the university (e.g., Provost, VP for Student Life, General Counsel, Chief Financial Officer) determined to protect the institution from another incident like the ski trip incident, charged the Division of Student Life with creating new policies, procedures, and structures. To start, the Vice President for Student Life, Dean of Students, and Office of Greek Life reached out to fraternity and sorority alumni and advisors to request their assistance addressing the behavior of their chapters. A similar request was directed at national organizations for all the fraternities and sororities represented at the University of Michigan. These efforts to establish partnerships between the institution and stakeholders were undertaken to make it easier to create and enforce rules and policies, and to assist and protect fraternities and sororities, and the students impacted by them. These partnerships also represented both a mechanism for privatizing conflict and a symbolic gesture that the university cared about its students as well as fraternities and sororities.

Next, university administrators, including the President, Vice President for Student Life, Dean of Students, and various academic deans, attempted to reach every member of the fraternity and sorority community at the university. A “community meeting” was convened to address the ski trip incident, state of the fraternity and sorority community, and what would happen moving forward. This community meeting attempted to convey to the students the seriousness of the state of the community and to symbolically show that the university was going to be involved in
efforts to change it. Some students responded negatively to the effort, while other students recognized the need for change within their community and the value in partnering with the administration.

*Greek life task force: Strengthening the managerial level.* Continuing to address the charge to manage conflicts within the fraternity and sorority community from the Board of Regents and executive officers, the Dean of Students then convened a Greek life task force. The task force utilized some of the newly created partnerships to bring outside stakeholders from the cultural environment, including national organization staff members and alumni, to the table. The task force was charged with reviewing the community and then proposing new rules, policies, and processes to bolster the institutional and managerial levels of the university based on historical data, benchmark data, and proposals made by student leaders, staff, and other stakeholders. After a semester of meetings, 10 recommendations were offered. Each presented a new rule or policy, or strengthened an already existing rule or policy, including: recommending adding funding and staff for the Office of Greek Life, and creating new policies about the timing of recruitment. In essence, these recommendations were condensation symbols (Edelman, 1985b) which sought to reassure the cultural environment that a stronger relationship between the university and fraternal organizations was being developed.

In addition to providing multiple recommendations for managing conflict in the fraternity and sorority life community, the Greek life task force assisted in changing the attitudes and beliefs about fraternities and sororities at the university. Although university leaders in the managerial level were not operating under the belief that fraternities and sororities should be kept at an arm’s length as it had in the 1970’s and 1980’s, until the ski trip incident occurred, there was still a sense that fraternal organizations should be left to manage their own affairs. The ski
trip incident, and the subsequent involvement of many internal and external stakeholders in the Greek life task force, fostered a shift in values within the institution leading to the belief that the fraternity and sorority community should be supported by the university. The work of the Greek life task force created a significant shift in beliefs that allowed the Division of Student Affairs to provide increased attention, support, and accountability to the fraternity and sorority community.

One way the Greek life task force recommended adding support for the fraternity and sorority community was to change the structure of the Office of Greek Life. The task force suggested adding staff to the Office of Greek Life and reclassifying the director position to give it increased legitimacy. It was believed that that more staff members could better manage the fraternity and sorority community and support specific aspects of the community such as community service, educational programming, etc. Similar to the addition of the fraternity and sorority advisors in 1995, the task force thought adding staff to the Office of Greek Life would also serve as a symbolic gesture by the university showing its commitment to keeping students safe and addressing the perceived issues with fraternities and sororities.

Thus, the managerial level of the university was expanded as new positions were created, and new staff members were hired to support the work of the Office of Greek Life. Around that same time, the Director of Greek Life retired, prompting a national search for a new director. In an effort to elevate the candidate pool and increased legitimacy to the role, the director position was reclassified to be the “Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Greek Life.” To further privatize conflicts related to fraternities and sororities, the university allocated additional funds to the Office of Greek Life to pay for the increased staffing and programming efforts. This was a significant step as staff salaries and programs hosted by the Office of Greek Life had previously been paid for out of student dues.
Despite increased support, concerns persist. Even with increased support and funding, issues with the fraternal community persisted. In late 2017, the IFC issued a self-suspension on the IFC community in response to allegations of hazing, sexual misconduct, and a pervasive culture of alcohol and other drug use within the community. Although this suspension was managed by the IFC, student affairs professionals provided staff advisors and resources for the student-led council. Student affairs administrators sought to privatize the conflict by allowing the students to manage the conflict in their community, minimizing the impact of the suspension on the institution.

Just like the preceding eras of politicization, the Fraternity War, and quiescence, the bias clause and membership selection era, the conflict is never truly resolved. As an example, current conflicts exist between the university and fraternities and sororities over the implementation of deferred recruitment and a new city zoning ordinance which impacts fraternity and sorority housing. These new issues are perceived as threats to the rights of fraternities to recruit members and exist on campus. They are the genesis for the next great conflict.

Summary of the ski trip incident. The first critical incident of the Fraternity War created conflict over the right of fraternities and sororities to exist and for students to freely associate with them at the university. That initial conflict demonstrated how the influence of the cultural, task, and institutional environments could create a period of politicization which forced changes to the managerial and governance structures of the institution and lead to new rules and policies in the institutional level. This second era of politicization of the Fraternity War also featured conflict over the right of fraternities and sororities to exist at the university and for students to freely associate with them which caused another period of politicization. Unlike the first critical incident, however, the ski trip incident revealed that the managerial level of the
university could respond proactively to environmental pressure and leverage conflict by creating new policies, procedures, and structures.

This second era of politicization was also different from the era of quiescence featuring bias clauses and membership selection. In bias clause and membership selection era, the managerial level of the university was able to disengage from fraternities and sororities by allowing fraternities and sororities to manage their conflicts on their own, thus maintaining a period of quiescence. University administrators in the managerial level observed these conflicts and provided little input. From the start of the ski trip incident to the present time, however, student affairs professionals in the managerial level of the university took more direct actions with fraternities and sororities. Immense pressure from the cultural, task, and institutional environments created by the ski trip incident caused the university to reexamine its existing beliefs, rules and policies, and structures governing fraternities and sororities.

The ski trip incident led to significant change in how the university viewed and related to fraternities and sororities. Change occurred in the cultural level of the institution as the university adopted the belief that it should maintain a closer relationship with fraternities and sororities. New rules were adopted, changing the institutional level of the organization, regarding the timing of recruitment to better support students. The managerial level of the institution also changed as new positions were created and staff were hired in the Office of Greek Life, expanding the sub-unit to enable better privatization of conflict.

**Fraternity War (again).** As a result of these institutional changes, the original fraternity conflict has emerged again. Fraternity and sorority stakeholders in the cultural environment view the university’s shift to a more supportive relationship with fraternities and sororities, new rules about the timing of recruitment, and new managerial role as a potential invasion into the rights of
fraternal organizations. Student affairs professionals in the managerial level of the university view the closer relationship as a way to protect the technical core of the institution and its students (task environment) from a community that can be potentially harmful to both. In short, fraternities and sororities were drawn closer to the core of the institution which gave the university more control over fraternity and sorority activities but this felt threatening to the rights of fraternities and sororities to exist.

In 1850, faculty members at the University of Michigan provided eight reasons why fraternities were a problem; (a) the history of the organizations was one of breaking rules; (b) fraternities required the Faculty to submit to their requests; (c) the organizations were exclusive and created divides in the student body; (d) members were immature and trapped in membership; (e) meetings were likely to devolve into problematic behavior; (f) the financial obligations of the organizations were too much for many poor students; (g) literary societies were being harmed by fraternities; and (h) fraternities were sources of issues, would multiply, and distract from the mission of the institution (G. P. Williams, et al., 1928). In 2019, the University of Michigan, at every level of the institution, still holds many of those same concerns. The first era of the Fraternity War was resolved when the governing structure of the university was changed, and the university agreed to allow fraternities to exist on campus and to recruit new members. This created a social norm that would be the bedrock of the relationship between the university and the fraternity and sorority community until the present time.

During the ski trip era, the university devoted more resources to privatize conflict related to fraternities and sororities, creating condensation symbols to reassure the cultural environment that the university heard their concerns and cared enough to act on them. Through the process of providing reassurance, the new beliefs, rules, and mechanisms that were created by the university
threatened the social norm established at the end of the Fraternity War. As such, the Fraternity War, which started in 1845 due to conflicting values between the university and fraternities and sororities, continues in 2019, and like other great conflicts, such as gender or age conflict, this conflict may be unresolvable.
Chapter 6: Summary of Study and Conclusions

Since Phi Beta Kappa started the fraternal movement in the United States (Phi Beta Kappa Society, 2017a), there have been many calls for the removal of fraternities and sororities on college campuses. The calls have been due to hazing (Ruffins, 1997), alcohol and sexual misconduct (Eberhardt, Rice, & Smith, 2003), and deaths related to fraternity activity (Barron, 2017). These critical incidents impacted the lives of the students involved in them as well as the campuses where the incidents happened. Despite these challenges, fraternities and sororities persist and colleges and universities continue to adapt to accommodate them.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan and the implications it had on student affairs. This study was conducted by analyzing three distinct eras (two eras of politicization and one era of quiescence). Each era featured conflict between fraternal organizations and institutional actors (e.g., faculty, staff), and was analyzed to determine what, if any, implications there were for student affairs at the University of Michigan.

The three conflicts and their corresponding eras of politicization or quiescence were selected to be analyzed following a review of the history of fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan as well as completing a literature search of national fraternity incidents from the New York Times (Fraternities and Sororities, 2017). These three eras were chosen due to their significance for the fraternity and sorority community at the University of Michigan, their placement in time relative to the national fraternity and sorority movement, and for the richness of data available to be analyzed. The three eras represented the founding of fraternities at the University of Michigan, changing views of discriminatory membership practices, and a ski trip incident.
The conceptual framework applied concepts from areas pertaining to conflict (Schattschneider, 1975; Edelman, 1985b; Iannaccone, 1982) and organizational theory (Scott, 2003; Thompson, 2003; T. Parsons, 1960). These concepts were informed by research about political organizations (Birnbaum, 1988; Bolman & Deal, 2017).

Conflict has a significant role in the political organization (Birnbaum, 1988; Bolman & Deal, 2017; Schattschneider, 1975). Schattschneider (1975) stated that conflict is not only inevitable, but it is also highly contagious. Using a fight as an analogy, he explained that conflict involves those who are directly involved in the fight, but also includes the audience. The audience can influence the direction of the fight by getting involved in the fight and backing one fighter or the other. To this end, Schattschneider (1975) believed the outcome of conflict is dependent on the scope of it.

Conflict is often managed through privatization or socialization (Schattschneider, 1975). The privatization of conflict occurs when conflict is resolved privately, or between the original “combatants” in the fight. Socialization of conflict occurs when the conflict is broadened to include other players, or the audience, to help sway the outcome (Schattschneider, 1975).

Organizations seek to privatize conflict, when possible, to maintain a state of stasis (True, et al., 2007) or quiescence (Iannaccone, 1982), where policymaking is stable and incremental. When conflicts socialize, however, periods of crisis or discontent can occur where there becomes a divide between the governance of an organization and the demands of the people (Iannaccone & Lutz, 1978; True, et al., 2007). Periods of quiescence are contrasted with periods of politicization. Generally, a state of quiescence features incremental change that builds from previous policy. Where policymaking during a period of quiescence builds on previously established policy, periods of politicization can challenge the process of policymaking itself,
focusing instead on the ideological aspects of policy. In this way, previously established policies can be disregarded in favor of completely new policies (Iannaccone, 1982; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1978; True, et al., 2007).

**Research Questions**

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the relationship between fraternal organizations and the University of Michigan and the implications it had on student affairs. Given that purpose, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Describe three eras of politicization/quiescence.
2. Describe conflict in each era of politicization/quiescence.
3. Describe the implications for student affairs from each era of politicization/quiescence

**Summary of the Results**

The results of this study are summarized and are organized by era (first research question), with the subsequent research questions addressed within each section.

**First period of politicization: The Fraternity War.** The Fraternity War at the University of Michigan was an era of discontent among those students who wished to establish fraternities at the university and the faculty who opposed them. The Fraternity War started due to conflicting values between the faculty and students and then became socialized when multiple parties were involved. In the end, the only way the university returned to a state of quiescence was to remove those faculty members who opposed fraternities, changed the governance structure of the institution, and established new rules and regulations, which altered the relationship between the university and students and allowed fraternities the right to exist within institution. The boundary set by the faculty of the university which initially prohibited the
existence of fraternities shifted to include them as part of the structure of the university, institutionalizing them within the university.

Era of quiescence: Bias clauses and membership selection. From 1949 to 1970, fraternities and sororities witnessed their membership selection processes challenged and changed, were placed under a governance structure administered by students, and in the end, lost staff dedicated to advising fraternal organizations. The perception and value of fraternities and sororities changed so that the university no longer provided specific support to those organizations. Those participants in the cultural environment viewed fraternities and sororities and their membership practices as elitist and exclusive. This perception of fraternal organizations threatened the legitimacy of the institution if it did not address those concerns from the cultural environment and conform to the expectations of an elite institution. Additionally, prospective students in the task environment wanted the university to provide the services they desired and needed from their collegiate experience to attract them to attend the university. Although there was significant pressure from the environment, the university privatized and controlled each conflict during this era and maintained a state of quiescence.

Second period of politicization: Ski trip incident. In January 2015, six fraternal organizations caused significant damage at a ski resort, creating conflict between the cultural environment and the university. This second era of politicization of the Fraternity War featured conflict over the right of fraternities and sororities to exist at the university and for students to freely associate with them, similar to the first era of politicization. Unlike the first critical incident, however, the ski trip incident revealed that the managerial level of the university responded proactively to environmental pressure and leveraged conflict by creating new policies, procedures, and structures. The ski trip incident led to significant change in how the university
viewed and related to fraternities and sororities. Change occurred in the cultural level of the institution as the university adopted the belief that it should maintain a closer relationship with fraternities and sororities. New rules were adopted, impacting the institutional level of the organization, regarding the timing of recruitment to better support students. The managerial level of the institution also changed as new positions were created and staff were hired in the Office of Greek Life, expanding the sub-unit to better manage conflict.

**Conclusions.** The first period of politicization of the Fraternity War featured conflict over the right of fraternities and sororities to exist and for students to freely associate at the university. That conflict demonstrated how the influence of the cultural, task, and institutional environments, when unchecked, changed the governance structure of an institution. The organizational structure was changed by the Fraternity War when the faculty were unable to privatize the conflict with fraternities, eventually succumbing to pressure from the cultural, task, and institutional environments as the conflict became socialized. As a result, the university’s governance structure was changed, the first university president was hired, and fraternities were institutionalized.

Unlike during the Fraternity War, during the bias clause and membership selection era of quiescence, the managerial level of the university privatized and controlled the conflict. By refusing to participate in conflicts in the cultural environment, the university drove fraternities and sororities to the boundary of the institution where they resolved their own conflicts with little direct involvement from the managerial level of the university or impact on the technical core of the university.

Similar to the first period of politicization, the ski trip era featured conflict over the rights of fraternities and sororities to exist at the university and to freely associate. Unlike the first
period of politicization, however, during the ski trip era, student affairs professionals at the university used condensation symbols to reassure the cultural environment and eventually privatize the conflict. Through this era of politicization, student affairs professionals created new policies and procedures and expanded their sub-units. Through these changes, a closer relationship was created with fraternities and sororities.

The conflict that started in 1845 over the rights of fraternities to recruit new members was initially tempered by the creation of new rules and norms at the university. An agreement existed that fraternities would be allowed to exist and recruit new members. The era of conflict over bias clauses and discriminatory membership selection processes reopened the conflict as new rules were created that limited the ability of fraternities and sororities to select new members in the way they saw fit. This conflict was never socialized, and the university controlled it by reaffirming previously created policies and implementing new structures to complement those policies. These actions drove the conflict into the environment and sent fraternities and sororities to the margins of the institution. Then, in 2015, the ski trip incident created institutional change that once again threatened the ability of fraternities and sororities to exist and recruit new members, reopening the original conflict. Thus, the conflict that began in 1845 continues.

**Implications for Educational Leaders**

This study provided multiple implications for educational leaders. The first is the importance of understanding the nature of conflict, how it evolves, and the cyclical nature of conflict. Following that is a discussion of the significant role of student affairs professionals in managing conflict. The third is that educational leaders can use conflict to expand the role of student affairs and its various sub-units.
**Understanding the nature of conflict.** Georg Simmel (1904) described conflict as “the resolution of the tension between the contraries” (The Sociology of Conflict. I, p. 490). In his description of the sociology of conflict, Simmel explained how contrary forces create social structure as a means of easing tension. One outcome of conflict can be peace, but it can also result in repudiation or dissolution of social relations. When there is resolution, an equilibrium is formed in which the tension is still present but does not strain the relationship to the point of conflict (Simmel, 1904). In these periods of reduced tension and little or no conflict, organizations exist in a state of quiescence where policy making is stable and consistent (Iannaccone, 1982). When, however, conflict is socialized and social relations are strained, organizations exist in a state of politicization where policy making becomes abrupt and often creates significant change to an organization (Iannaccone, 1982).

Lewis Coser (1957) stated that conflict creates new norms and institutions. These new norms form out of conflict between groups within groups:

Any social system implies an allocation of power, as well as wealth and status positions among individual actors and component sub-groups… there is never complete concordance between what individuals and groups within a system consider their just due and the system of allocation. Conflict ensues in the effort of various frustrated groups and individuals to increase their share of gratification. Their demands will encounter the resistance of those who previously had established a “vested interest” in a given form of distribution of honour, wealth and power. (p. 203)
Conflict occurs when one sub-group wishes to change the established social structure to gain more power or gratification for themselves. In essence, conflict occurs between groups when their values no longer align, and relationships become strained.

Applied to the three conflicts described in this study, Simmel, Coser, and Iannaccone provided powerful implications for educational leaders. For example, the conflict in the Fraternity War resulted from two groups, the faculty and fraternity men, who stood contrary to one another based on their values. The fraternity men socialized the conflict by gaining support from outside stakeholders, and the faculty were unable to successfully privatize it. As the conflict became socialized and tensions grew, the university entered a period of politicization.

Throughout the conflict, each group tried to establish new norms and regulations to ease the tension; the faculty initially sought to allow fraternities to exist but not accept the new members and then tried to prevent them altogether, and fraternities sought to exist without supervision from the university. As the university was in a state of politicization, more significant change was in order, including a restructuring of the governance structure of the university. At the conclusion of the Fraternity War, a generally accepted norm was presented as a means of easing tensions and returning to a state of quiescence—fraternities were allowed to exist with supervision and approval from the organization. Those who opposed the new norm were removed from the institution, and fraternities became institutionalized at the University of Michigan.

The end of the Fraternity War created a social structure, or equilibrium, where fraternities and institutional actors existed in relative peace putting the organization back into a state of quiescence. Coser’s (1957) concept suggested that, over time, one group would become frustrated with the social structure and seek increased gratification by attempting to modify the
existing norms or create new ones. Eventually, the values of fraternities and university administrators would come into conflict again, and in a renewed conflict, neither side would prevail. Rather, a new period of politicization would begin, and the new conflict would end when those who opposed peace were removed and new or modified norms could be established to return to a state of quiescence. This process is visualized in Figure 29.
Figure 29. Cycle of Conflict
For educational leaders, this is a lesson on conflict between contrary parties who have similar levels of power and resolve. When two equal parties meet in conflict which becomes socialized, a period of politicization ensues. This conflict will only end when those two parties agree to norms that create equilibrium (quiescence) and/or when the relationship is dissolved. A conflict which ends in equilibrium creates a social structure between the two groups that will hold until one group becomes dissatisfied and challenges the established norms, thus reopening the conflict and starting the cycle over. A conflict which ends in dissolution, as happened in the ski trip conflict when the six fraternities disaffiliated from the university, only creates separation between the two parties, which, in turn, creates a condition where politicization continues, and further conflict is necessary to create equilibrium and reinstate a period of quiescence.

The cycle of conflict demonstrated how a single socialized conflict created a period of politicization ending in equilibrium/quiescence, and then reemerged when that equilibrium was challenged. The organization then found itself once again in a period of politicization. If, however, the organization privatized conflict when it arose, it avoided politicization and maintained quiescence until conflicting values over existing norms revitalized the conflict. The cycle is demonstrated in Figure 30 using the conflicts from this study.
Figure 30. Cycle of Conflict Using Conflicts from This Study

With equilibrium established at the end of the Fraternity War, tension from the initial conflict was minimized, and the institution returned to a state of quiescence. The university maintained quiescence through the bias clause and membership selection conflict by continually privatizing conflict. When the ski trip incident began, however, actors within the institution and environment became dissatisfied with actions of fraternities and sororities and changed the established rules and regulations in order to gain more control over them. Fraternities and sororities viewed this as an attack on their right to organize and function revitalizing the original conflict from the Fraternity War and plunging the institution into a state of politicization. The conflict that began in 1845 started again in 2015.

Educational leaders would do well to be aware of the history of their institutions and the conflicts that preceded them to avoid reopening conflicts that are unwinnable. Conflicts which originally ended by creating rules and regulations are unlikely to be resolved in any other way. Reopening conflict may result in the creation of new rules and regulations, or a return to the
original rules and regulations to bring about equilibrium and quiescence once again. This change in norms may be avoided if educational leaders are able to effectively manage and privatize conflicts.

**Student affairs professionals as conflict managers.** *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration* described student affairs professionals as those who connect students with people who care about them, and the profession as the many ways that happens (Rhatigan, 2009). While that may be true, this study explored the role of student affairs professionals as conflict managers. Through this study, educational leaders are provided data which suggests that, regardless of the reason student affairs professionals are in their role, they are first and foremost conflict managers. Blimling (2001) explained that there are four “communities of practice” which explain functional areas of student affairs professionals: student learning, student development, student services, and student administration. Sandeen (1991) described the four roles of a chief student affairs officer: leader, manager, mediator, and educator. Regardless, from entry-level staff members to senior leadership, it is vital that student affairs professionals are equipped to provide appropriate conflict management practices (Allan, Payne, & Kerschner, 2018). Their function is to assist students and provide reassurance to their parents and other stakeholders in order to minimize and control conflict to protect the core function of the university.

In Thompson’s (2003) model of organizational theory, educational leaders exist within the managerial level of the institution. Their role is to mediate between the technical core and those who use it by creating bridges and buffers. To manage conflict, organizations create units or roles which are positioned to handle ever more specific conflicts and grouped with similar positions under increasingly broad areas. Student affairs developed as a result of colleges and
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universities creating specific roles to manage student conflicts, buffering the technical core of the institution, so faculty could focus on teaching and research.

The Fraternity War conflict is an example of why student affairs professionals were necessary. In 1845, the University of Michigan faculty were responsible for teaching and research as well as managing the student body. As fraternities challenged faculty governance over students, it became increasingly apparent that faculty alone could not manage the student body. Thus, at the end of the Fraternity War, the first university president was hired to manage the student body, allowing faculty to focus on research and teaching. Over time, increasingly specialized positions were created to privatize increasingly specialized conflicts. In 1921, the first dean of students was appointed (Shaw, 1920). Then, in 1933, as fraternities grew in both size and influence at the university, the first fraternity advisor was hired. Other student affairs roles have been created in similar ways.

As student affairs roles developed to manage specific aspects of the student experience, student affairs professionals assigned their own purpose to those roles. Some student affairs professionals may argue that their role is not to manage conflict but, rather, to develop leaders, promote student health, provide educational housing experiences, etc. These are important aspects of each individual student affairs role; however, if one accepts that conflict is the result of divergent interests (Bolman & Deal, 2017) or “tension between contraries” (Simmel, 1904, p. 490), then it is possible to make the case that all student affairs professionals are also conflict managers. The purpose of colleges and universities is teaching and research. Students (inputs) come to the university to learn (outputs). Everything that happens to them (environment) while at the university can stand contrary to that learning.
For example, if a student falls ill or abuses alcohol, they may not be able to well enough to learn effectively. Or if a student organization (like a fraternity) does something so egregious that it damages the reputation of the institution, students may choose to go elsewhere, and the reputation of the institution might suffer. It might also be the case that a student does not feel welcomed at the university for reasons related to their identity. That student may struggle. Alternatively, student affairs professionals can establish departments and programs to preemptively avoid conflict by helping students feel welcomed and supported on the campus.

Any issue that may act in contrast to the objective of learning and research may be considered a conflict that can be privatized and managed by a student affairs professional.

Student affairs professionals utilize bridges, buffers, and symbolic gestures to manage conflict. Previous research demonstrated the power and necessity of bridges and buffers to protect the technical core of an institution (Thompson, 2003), as well as symbolic coding to bridge with the institutional environment of an organization (Scott, 2003). This study revealed the use of condensation symbols for bridging with the cultural environment (the masses) of an organization. This is significant as it enhances the importance of symbolic gestures to reassure the cultural environment. Examples of this in practice may include the creation and naming of a task force to address an issue, public statements made by a university, and holding public forums. Using these symbolic gestures, student affairs professionals are able to shift conflicts by providing reassurance to those actors in the cultural environment. This allows those in the cultural environment (i.e., students, parents, stakeholders) to focus on different threats and concerns to the institution, thus privatizing the original conflict (Edelman, 1985b).

As stated previously, in Thompson’s (2003) model of organizational theory, educational leaders exist within the managerial level of the institution to mediate between the technical core
and those who use it by creating bridges and buffers. The analysis of two eras of politicization explored in this study demonstrated that student affairs professionals are vital to the privatization and control of conflict through their managerial efforts to bridge and buffer the environment. When there are threats (cultural, institutional, or to the task environment), student affairs professionals provide reassurance to the masses (bridges) using condensation symbols (Edelman, 1985b). These symbolic gestures indicate for people that the university has heard their concerns and will act on them. Student affairs professionals can then create structures and rules (buffers) to insulate and protect the core function of the university, teaching and research. These bridges and buffers assist the university in gaining or maintaining control when faced with conflict.

This study also demonstrated that the role of educational leaders to manage conflict within an organization is more expansive when that organization is considered a political organization. Bolman and Gallos (2011) explained that educational leaders “succeed when they create an appropriate set of campus arrangements and reporting relationships that offer clarity to key constituents and facilitate the work of faculty, students, staff, and volunteers” (p. 11). However, the authors warned that educational leaders can get “stuck in their comfort zones” (p. 13) if they fail to expand their perspective of leadership and their organization. Educational leaders may fail when they become stuck within one aspect of the institution and fail to take the other aspects of the organization into account.

A failure to expand perspective is particularly devastating in a political organization. Birnbaum (1988) described a political college or university as “a shifting kaleidoscope of interest groups and coalitions. The patterns in the kaleidoscope are not static, and group membership, participation, and interests constantly change with emerging issues” (p. 132). The shifting interest groups and coalitions, emerging issues, and changing group membership and
participation creates conflict. Leaders in a political organization must manage conflict within an organization between conflicting core technologies, as well as conflict from the task, cultural, and institutional environments (Figure 31). If leaders in a political organization become insulated in the technical core of the institution or within a certain environment and fail to acknowledge conflict in another aspect of the political organization, they will be unable to manage that conflict appropriately.

Figure 31. Political Leadership in the Managerial Level

Thus, educational leaders in a political organization are tasked with seeking to prevent conflict by understanding the history of their organizations, managing new or reemerging conflict within their organization and in the environment, and being nimble enough to manage constantly shifting conflicting values both within the organization and the environment. These tasks protect the technical core of the institution. Effective educational leaders understand the history of their organization and seek to prevent or privatize conflict before it grows or are able
to manage and privatize existing conflicts that are constantly shifting. This task is accomplished by creating bridges and buffers to prevent or mitigate future conflict in the institutional and task environments or employing condensation symbols to reassure the cultural environment. Poor educational leaders become insulated in the technical core or in one of the environments and fail to acknowledge the history of conflict in the organization, or do not adjust to existing conflicts that are likely to shift, allowing conflicts to socialize and the organization to enter a period of politicization. Iannaccone (1982) demonstrated how leaders in times of politicization are often replaced in favor of new leaders who are willing to make rapid, and often substantial, change to the organization. As happened in the Fraternity War, when educational leaders failed to manage and privatize conflict, allowing it to become socialized, blame or job loss is at stake.

**Expanding the role of student affairs through conflict.** How then do educational leaders create change to existing norms and systems without reopening an old conflict and risking a period of politicization? Coser (1957) suggested flexibility in the system is the answer. If the system, in this case the college or university, is flexible, it can adapt and change to maximize gratification for groups that become dissatisfied without falling into full conflict. This idea of adaptation suggests creating partnerships, or bridges, and bottom-up solutions (buffers) to problems rather than systemic changes made from the top-down (institutional rules).

If change is necessary, educational leaders may consider privatizing conflict by bringing contrary parties together to seek a solution to the presenting issue, if at all possible. As an organization, structures must be in place to make privatization of conflict an effective solution. The University of Michigan during the Fraternity War was inflexible as an organization because the faculty only sought to maintain control over every aspect of the university and were unwilling to relinquish any control or to compromise with the fraternities. Conversely, during the
bias clause and membership selection era, the university was flexible and able to create incremental change to control and privatize conflicts as they arose.

Unlike during the Fraternity War, colleges and universities now have student affairs professionals in the managerial level of their organizations to protect the technical core of their institutions. To successfully privatize conflict, student affairs professionals must be organized and resourced in such a way as to promote success in privatizing conflict. The privatization of conflict can only happen through effective leadership based on the creation of effective bridges and buffers. Educational leaders may consider establishing structures in which student affairs units have the ability to prevent or successfully privatize and manage conflict.

Developing these structures to successfully privatize and manage conflict can be accomplished through the use of buffers and bridges. This process may include hiring additional staff to assist with existing work, creating new positions to address new issues, or reorganizing existing staff to better fit the presenting needs. Restructuring can act as a buffer to conflict in the various environments by positioning student affairs staff within the managerial level to manage conflict when it occurs. Bridges may also be useful to those staff members in the managerial level. Bridges seek partners in the various environments prior to conflict occurring so those relationships are in place when conflict does happen.

Student affairs professionals and educational leaders may agree that increased staff and structures are necessary but might (justifiably) remind us that student affairs divisions are often underfunded and resourced (Sandeen, 1991). While this may generally hold true, creating change is possible if educational leaders and student affairs professionals are ready to take advantage of periods of conflict. While an organization is in a state of quiescence, change happens incrementally, and it is unlikely that major changes will happen if they are not essential. When
an organization experiences conflict and politicization, however, change can happen rapidly in an effort to privatize conflict and return to a state of quiescence (Iannaccone, 1982). During these times of conflict, educational leaders can make the case for increased resources, changes to structures, and professional development opportunities for student affairs professionals to better privatize existing and future conflicts.

An example of this comes from the ski trip conflict explored in this study. After the ski trip incident, the university entered a period of politicization where there was significant pressure to address the perceived issues with the fraternity and sorority community. The Vice President for Student Life, Dean of Students, and Director of Greek Life were able to utilize this pressure to advocate for increased staffing and funding for the Office of Greek Life. Previous to the ski trip incident, the staff had not grown and staff salaries and programming was funded from student dues. After the ski trip incident, the staff increased from five professional staff members to seven, the university agreed to fund those positions as well as some of the existing positions, and funding was provided to the Office of Greek Life for programming. The Office of Greek Life was able to expand as a result of the conflict and the university was able to provide a condensation symbol to the cultural environment showing that it was addressing concerns about the fraternity and sorority community.

The ability to use conflict to expand the unit is particularly important for the fraternity and sorority profession. A 2018 NASPA working document, the association for student affairs administrators in higher education, suggested a ratio of one full-time staff member for every 1000 fraternity/sorority members (NASPA, 2018). This represents a significant increase for many campuses (Miami University, 2018; Fraternity and Sorority Life Committee on Staffing, Support and Budget, 2016). For educational leaders advising fraternity and sorority communities,
this study suggests an avenue for expanding staffing structures and support for those student affairs professionals working with fraternities and sororities.

For an oft under-resourced unit at most colleges and universities, the opportunity to take advantage of conflict is extremely important for student affairs. This starts with student affairs professionals and educational leaders understanding both the historical context and nature of conflict. Following that, student affairs professionals and educational leaders should understand the role of student affairs in managing conflict. Finally, student affairs professionals and educational leaders should be ready to make a case for additional resources to expand their units when faced with conflict.

Limitations and Delimitations

Delimitations. The focus of this study was how three conflicts in specific eras related to social fraternities and sororities at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, changed the relationship between students and the institution. This study did not explore issues related to fraternities and sororities at the other University of Michigan campuses, Dearborn and Flint. These campuses have distinct histories, cultures, and administrative practices that are separate from the Ann Arbor campus (University of Michigan, Flint, 2017; University of Michigan, Dearborn, 2017), so exploring these institutions would likely find different experiences and responses to incidents. Additionally, this study did not discuss pre-professional, professional, academic, or service fraternities and sororities. The structure, organization, mission, and values of social fraternities and sororities differ from other types of fraternities and sororities and are often handled separately.

Limitations. Due to the qualitative, case study nature of this study, focusing specifically on the University of Michigan, the findings are limited to this study and will not be directly
applicable to other campuses. For example, the institutional type and culture at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, may result in different responses to incidents and conflict than at a small, private institution. That does not mean that the general idea of this study cannot be used at other institutions. Yet the conceptual framework and design of this study may be transferable to other institutions.

A second limitation of this study was the use of unobtrusive measures and document analysis. Both of these techniques are limited in that they do not offer the researcher the opportunity to interact with the participant. Any conclusions drawn are made solely by the researcher. It is also possible that there were additional sources of information or documents available that the researcher did not find or have access to. In this way, the use of these methods may have produced less than the full story.

A third limitation of this study was the use of self as a research instrument. The researcher is a member of a fraternity, professionally advised fraternities, and was involved in the final conflict analyzed in this study. The researcher attempted to account for all biases and either disclosed them for the reader to scrutinize or attempted to mitigate them through the use of practices such as triangulation, peer debriefing, and rival thinking. It is worth noting, however, that the researcher is the primary research instrument in this study and his influence is present.

Future Research

Leadership as part of organizational theory. Organizational theory acknowledges the role of educational leaders in creating bridges and buffers (Thompson, 2003). By describing institutions of higher education as political organizations, however, conflict also becomes part of the process. This study revealed that educational leaders in the managerial level of the institution are responsible for managing and privatizing conflict. Future research might explore or expand
upon the nature of educational leadership within political organizations, utilizing organizational theory as a framework, by reviewing the role of present-day educational leaders at other institutions of higher education that are both similar and different from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

**Different events to study the nature of conflict.** Finally, this study utilized historical document analysis pertaining to fraternity and sorority critical incidents at the University of Michigan to explore the nature of political conflict on a college campus. Future research might use a similar historical document analysis method pertaining to a different institutional entity to further explore the nature of political conflict on a college campus. A study like this may explore the similarities and/or differences in how conflicts related to different institutional entities, like athletics, are managed. For example, intercollegiate athletics at a large, public institution could be examined in the same way fraternities and sororities were for this study. Or conflict pertaining to or within the technical core might be studied. A study like this may assist educational leaders in understanding how to manage conflict at various levels of the institution and between different institutional entities.
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