Sub Group 1:
- Legal Framework: discussed the legal framework for the fraternity houses, including: the ownership of the houses/properties, the high-level relationship between the University and the Greek groups which occupy the houses, & the underlying legal issues and principles related to infrastructure improvements to the facilities for which the fraternities assume debt.
- Fraternity Financial Positions: discussed the current and future financial positions of the fraternities including: a third-party firm completing a facilities assessment of the fraternity houses (with the sorority lodges to follow), the preliminary results show a significant capital need for the fraternity houses; this capital investment would only resolve infrastructure issues and would not augment program or aesthetics, & the current financial model does not support the required capital investment.

Short Term Next Steps
- Review relevant case law/legal perspectives related to infrastructure improvements done to the fraternity houses with fraternity funds
- Research the extent of significant infrastructure improvements with fraternity funds at Emory
- Reach out to Plaid to see if there are any models similar to Emory & provide occupancy statistics

Longer Term Next Steps
- Develop narrative that describes the thinking and goals behind the current financial arrangement between the fraternities and the University & answer the question: how should our financial relationship be arranged to best position both the groups and the University for the future.

Sub Group 2:
Reviewing:
1. The Housing Agreement
2. The Housing Policies

As the documents are reviewed, committee members will think about the PURPOSE: to establish certain relationships, financial and otherwise, between the student and the university as it relates to housing occupancy in residential buildings, and to create safe, healthy, and supportive communities that foster academic success, personal growth, responsible citizenship, and civility in the residential buildings.

& Sub Group 3:
1. Contact Plaid for top 10 recommendations of institutions and Greek programs across the U.S. with successful and innovative in-house staffing and institutional interface (assignments, maintenance) models and systems.
2. Distribute list among sub group members.
3. Each subgroup member will choose 1 or 2 from that list and conduct informal research (online, colleague discussions, etc.) on chosen program(s). We agreed not to contact these institutions via phone at this point to avoid making multiple calls to any one institution.
4. Subgroup 3 will reconvene the week of September 11 (tentatively) to review findings and narrow field down to 5 programs for more in-depth research. We’ll also agree on the best methodologies for the research moving forward.

Sub Group 1:
- NA

Sub Group 2:
- NA

Sub Group 3:
- Collected baseline information through benchmarking and discussions with colleagues. We also reviewed the Office of Sorority and Fraternity Life websites and other campus life websites to identify any existing information about our assigned topics. We also used data provided in the binders shared online to guide our focus. All information we have collected has been stored in a shared Box folder and we had a conference call to discuss goals for our share-out at the next combined working group meeting.

For our next steps: Recognizing the interconnectedness between all of our priorities, our goals are to engage student leaders and other key community stakeholders to develop recommended working definitions for academic engagement, legitimate recognition, and good standing. Then use the working definitions to develop more comprehensive expectations and guidelines for holding sorority and fraternity members accountable for upholding those working definitions.

Sub Group 4:
- Met initially with Lina Vargas to be an honorary member of the group. She came to our first meeting and gave an extensive financial overview.