



DELTA TAU DELTA

Honor Board

Standards Board Membership

The Due Process for the Standards Board of the Iota Sigma chapter as described in the chapter bylaws is described on the following pages. The Standards Board consists of the following members:

Spring 2018:

Ben Nerson (SR), Mason Rademacher (JR), Sam Safgren (SP), Jon Wyffels (SR), Connor Bale (SR), Christian Oien (JR)

Fall 2018:

Mason Rademacher (SR), Sam Safgren (JR), Christian Oien (SR), Devin Schatz (JR), Evan Bernhardson (JR), Cody Beaulieu (SP).

The Standards Board has also utilized various other resources as a means of training, including the Central Office Standards Board Document found on DeltsConnect, the Interfraternity Council Standards Board documents for North Dakota State University, and met multiple times with advisers Connor Johnson and Jon Rott to discuss ways to improve effectiveness.

To supplement our in-chapter resources, we had our Director of Fraternity and Sorority Life, Jordan Dadez speak to the Standards Board about general Standards Board operations and effective punishment. The presentation discussed the multiple ways to discipline a member without using fines or additional service hours. We at Iota-Sigma believe that there is a corrective approach to punishment and punitive does not always solve the problem.

Standards Board Due Process

(a) Jurisdiction:

(i) The Standards Committee shall handle all proposed hearings presented by a member or new member including, but not limited to: violations of NDSU's policies, rules, and/or regulations; violations of Delta Tau Delta (national and Chapter) policies, rules and/or regulations; and conflicts between brothers.

(ii) All proposed hearings shall be presented to the Director of Standards. The Standards Committee shall report any violation of city laws, state laws, or national laws brought before it to the appropriate higher authority.

(b) Definition of Inadmissible Conduct:

(i) If the actions, words or demeanor of a member of this Chapter are characterized as being unbecoming of a member of Delta Tau Delta International Fraternity based upon and in light of the Delta Tau Delta Fraternity's Mission and Values Statement, its Constitution and Bylaws, the MRG, the bylaws of NDSU Iota Sigma Chapter, NDSU's standing rules and regulations, city laws, state laws, or national laws, then that member's conduct shall be deemed

inadmissible.

(ii) If the member in question is an officer, committee chairman, or committee member and that member's actions, words, or demeanor are detrimental to the best interests of the office or committee, then the conduct of that member shall be deemed inadmissible to their position.

(iii) If the member in question has any assigned duties within the Chapter, then inappropriate conduct extends to that member's failure to perform those duties in a satisfactory manner as deemed by the appropriate body tasked and empowered to assign those duties.

(c) Definition of Parties:

(i) The member or new member who has been accused of a violation of an issue shall be referred to as the "Accused" and the party who has presented the proposed hearing shall be referred to as the "Petitioner."

(d) Hearings:

(i) All hearings of the Standards Committee shall be closed to all members except the Chapter Advisor, members of the Standards Committee, Director of Standards, accused, petitioner, and any applicable witnesses.

(ii) The Chairman of the Standards Committee shall determine the time and place of hearings and all concerned parties shall be given notice of such at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing.

(iii) Quorum shall consist of a majority of the Standards Committee, with at least three out of four (3/4) justices present.

(iv) A Standards Committee member must recuse himself from a hearing if he is the accused or the petitioner in that hearing. If the Chairman of the Standards Committee is the accused or the petitioner in a hearing, he shall recuse himself and shall be replaced by the Vice President for that hearing alone. A Standards Committee member and/or the Chairman of the Standards Committee does not have to recuse himself from a hearing if he is to be a witness in that hearing, unless said member or chairman does not believe he can both perform his Standards Committee duties and serve as an impartial witness.

(e) Procedures for Hearings:

(i) The Chairman of the Standards Committee shall read all complaints against the accused that were presented to him by the petitioner.

(ii) The petitioner shall have the opportunity to present his case first and shall have the right to make a final statement after questions have been asked by the Standards Committee.

(iii) The accused shall have the opportunity to present his case second and shall have the right to make a final statement after questions have been asked by the Standards Committee.

(iv) Both the petitioner and the accused shall have the right to present witnesses. The opposing party and all members of the Standards Committee shall have the right to cross-examine witnesses. The Standards Committee may call additional witnesses if necessary.

(v) In the event where the petitioner, the accused, or a witness fails to appear at the time of the hearing, he may then be subject to a penalty determined by the Standards Committee for contempt.

(f) Agenda for All Standards Committee Hearing:

(i) The agenda for all Standards Committee hearing shall be:

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Introduction by the Chairman
- 3) The petitioner states his case
- 4) The accused and then the Standards Committee may question the petitioner
- 5) Witnesses for the petitioner make their statement
- 6) Cross-examination of the petitioner's witnesses by the accused and the Standards Committee
- 7) The accused states his case
- 8) The petitioner and the Standards Committee may question the accused
- 9) Witnesses for the accused make their statement
- 10) Cross-examination of the accused's witnesses by the petitioner and the Standards Committee
- 11) Witnesses for the Standards Committee answer the questions of the Standards Committee
- 12) The petitioner and the accused may cross-examine the Standards Committee's witnesses
- 13) Final statement by the Petitioner
- 14) Final statement by the Accused
- 15) Deliberation by the Standards Committee in private
- 16) Announcement of the Standards Committee's decision

(g) Order at Hearings:

(i) The Chairman of the Standards Committee bears the responsibility of controlling the proceedings. As such, the Chairman may intervene if he feels that the petitioner or the accused is misusing their allotted time to present irrelevant information, make inflammatory statements, or use time exhaustive measures.

(h) Deliberation of the Standards Committee:

(i) The Standards Committee shall spend a reasonable amount of time deliberating a decision. Barring extraordinary circumstances, the Standards Committee will reach its decision within twenty-four (24) hours from the day of the proceedings. The Director of Standards, while having no voting rights, shall be present and active in the deliberation process.

(i) Verdict of the Standards Committee:

(i) The verdict for the accused shall be determined by a majority vote of the Standards Committee, with quorum being present.

(j) Voting of Standards Committee Members:

(i) No voting member of the Standards Committee present during voting procedures may abstain from casting a vote. If the accused in question holds a seat on the Standards Committee, The Standards Committee Chairman shall relinquish his vote, and a majority of the three remaining votes shall be sufficient for a verdict.

(k) Resolution of a Tie Vote:

(i) The Director of Standards shall cast the deciding vote in the event of a tie vote.

(l) Public Announcement of Standards Committee Decision:

(i) Standards Committee decisions shall be announced during the next regular general body meeting by the Director of Standards.

(m) Sanctions:

(i) Sanctions imposed by the Standards Committee may include but are not limited to: warning; recommendation of suspension; recommendation of expulsion from the Chapter; recommendation of removal of officer, committee chairman, committee member, or any other special position status; work discipline; fines; and recommendation for professional counseling.

Complaints:

The Standards Board of Iota-Sigma offers members multiple opportunities to submit complaints. The Director of Standards may fill out a complaint form (Spring 2019 Summons Form) in person, the alternative is that a member may access the form online. This online version

offers a more comfortable atmosphere to submit a complaint.

Appeal of Honor Board Decision:

Article I. The Accused shall notify the Honor Board Chairman within 24 Hours of his wish to appeal the Honor Board decision to the General Body.

Article II. The Appeal process shall follow the agenda for an Honor Board Hearing as previously stated.

Article III. Voting of the chapter shall be consist of “upholding” or “overturning” the Honor Board’s decision from the trial. This vote shall be done by secret ballot and counted by the Honor Board Chairman in front of the President, and the Alumni Advisor or his designee.

Article IV. A majority rule of quorum of the General Body of the chapter shall rule as the final decision in the case.

2019 Online Complaint Form:

Honor Board Complaint

This is to serve as the appropriate means of logging a complaint to the Honor Board for a hearing. Please note that standard procedure for Honor Board Hearings is to allow for at least one week of lead time between notification of the Accused and the date of the Hearing.

* Required

Date of Complaint *

Date

mm/dd/yyyy

Complainant/Petitioner Name *

Accused Name *

Your answer _____

Description of Complaint *

Your answer _____

Relevant Bylaws (If Known)

Your answer _____

Witnesses

Your answer _____

Will Mondays following meeting work for you to be present at the hearing? *

Yes

No



Spring 2019 Summons:



DELTA TAU DELTA

Case #:
Date:

Notice of Standards Board Hearing

Bill of Complaint issued:(date) 01/03/19

Name of accused: Joe Delt

Name of member that filed complaint: Luke DeVries (Director of Academics)

Notice of Hearing: 01/10/19

Reason for Hearing: (Check all that apply)

- Violation of Oath or Code of Conduct
Conduct unbecoming a member
Disrespect of established authority of the chapter or the Fraternity
[X] Unsatisfactory grades
Disregard of orders officially given by established authority
Failure to pay current account to an undergraduate chapter (no vote needed)
Violation of rules pertaining to hazing, alcohol and illegal drugs
Other

Reasoning to Support Above Determination:

Grades under 2.0 GPA

Director of Standards: Cale Dunwoody

Article IX: The Standards Board

H. Hearings

Clause 2.

The Chairman of the Standards Board shall determine the time and place of hearings and all concerned parties shall be given notice of such at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing.

Spring 2019 Hearing Minutes:

Standards Board Agenda

Delta Tau Delta Fraternity-Iota Sigma Chapter
North Dakota State University

Wednesday, January 10th, 2019, 5pm (MU)

- I. Call to Order 5:00pm
- II. Introduction by the Chairman Ben Nerson, Mason Rademacher, Sam Safgren, Jon Wyffels, Connor Bale, Christian Oien
 - a. Infraction: 1st semester GPA under 2.0 (MOCK)
 - b. Petitioner: Director of Academic Luke DeVries
 - c. Accused: Joe Delt
 - d. Witness for the Petitioner: N/A
 - e. Witness for the Accused: N/A
 - f. Witness for the Honor Board: N/a
- III. The petitioner states his case:
 - a. Luke: Joe Delt was under a 2.0 GPA in the Fall semester, which was his first semester at NDSU and in DTD. I think that he should have a semester off, so that he can focus on school and find his major.
- IV. The accused and then the Honor Board may question the petitioner:
 - a. Ben: Did he reach out to you?
 - i. Luke: No, he never responded to my FaceBook messages either.
- V. Witnesses for the petitioner make their statement
 - a. N/A
- VI. Cross-examination of the petitioner's witnesses by the accused and the Honor Board
 - a. N/A
- VII. The accused states his case
 - a. Joe Delt: I just had a really bad semester this Fall. I wasn't able to keep up with my classes and was not in a major that I enjoyed. I met with my advisor half way through the semester and have decided that I am going to pursue a different major.
- VIII. The petitioner and the Honor Board may question the accused
 - a. Luke: Why did you not reach out to me if you were struggling?
 - i. Joe: I did not feel comfortable coming to someone I don't really know and showing him that I am struggling.
 - b. Luke: What could I do to help bridge that gap of being uncomfortable?
 - i. Joe: Maybe if someone with the same major helped me.
 - c. Sam: What's your major?
 - i. Joe: Electrical Engineering
 - d. Sam: What did you change you major to?
 - i. Joe: Construction Management
 - e. Jon: Did you always go to class?
 - i. Joe: I did miss a few classes, I just had a lot going on and I haven't really adjusted to college.



Standards Board Agenda

Delta Tau Delta Fraternity-Iota Sigma Chapter

North Dakota State University

Wednesday, January 10th, 2019, 5pm (MU)

- f. Cale: What year are you?
 - i. I'm a freshman
- g. Mason: So you were primarily taking introduction classes?
 - i. Joe: Pretty much, but the classes that focused on my major were confusing and difficult.
- IX. Witnesses for the accused make their statement
 - a. N/A
- IX. Cross-examination of the accused's witnesses by the petitioner and the Honor Board
 - a. N/A
- X. Witnesses for the Honor Board answer the questions of the Honor Board
 - a. N/A
- XII. The petitioner and the accused may cross-examine the Honor Board's witnesses
 - a. N/A
- XIII. Final statement by the Petitioner
 - a. I still believe that he needs to take a break from delts and find himself.
- XIV. Final statement by the Accused
 - a. I believe that I can say in DTD and fix my academic.
- XV. Deliberation by the Honor Board
- XVI. Announcement of the Honor Board's decision
 - a. As a Stand Board we recommend that Joe delt be suspended from Delta Tau Delta until May of 2019. Per our chapter bylaws, a member that falls below a 2.5 GPA shall be suspended.
- XVII. Adjourn: 5:47pm

Spring 2019 Sanction Form:

01/10/19
SBS-19-01



Delta Tau Delta Fraternity -
Iota Sigma Chapter
North Dakota State University

Official Sanctions Form

Petitioner: _____
Luke DeVreis (Director of Academic

Accused: _____
Joe Delt (Mock)

Sanctions:
As a Stand Board we recommend that Joe delt be suspended from Delta Tau Delta until
May of 2019. Per our chapter bylaws, a member that falls below a 2.5 GPA shall be
suspended.

Cale Dunwoody
Director of Standards



DELTA TAU DELTA

Case #:
Date:

Notice of Standards Board Hearing

Bill of Complaint issued:(date) 10/13/19

Name of accused: Joe Delt

Name of member that filed complaint: Jim Erickson (Director of Risk Management)

Notice of Hearing: 10/21/19

Reason for Hearing: (Check all that apply)

- Violation of Oath or Code of Conduct
- Conduct unbecoming a member
- Disrespect of established authority of the chapter or the Fraternity
- Unsatisfactory grades
- Disregard of orders officially given by established authority
- Failure to pay current account to an undergraduate chapter (no vote needed)
- Violation of rules pertaining to hazing, alcohol and illegal drugs
- Other

Reasoning to Support Above Determination:

Overly drunk and obnoxious at Homecoming events

Director of Standards: Cale Dunwoody

Article IX: The Standards Board

H. Hearings

Clause 2.

The Chairman of the Standards Board shall determine the time and place of hearings and all concerned parties shall be given notice of such at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the hearing.

Fall 2019 Hearing Minutes:



I
Delta Tau Delta Fraternity -
Iota Sigma Chapter
North Dakota State University
Monday, October 21st, 2019
5:00pm Room of Nations

Standards Board Minutes MOCK Trial

- I. Call to Order
 - a. 5:02pm
- II. Introduction by the Chairman
 - a. Infraction: Public Drunkenness
 - b. Standards Board members ~~present~~ Sam ~~Spencer~~, Christian ~~Qion~~, Devin Schatz, Evan ~~Bamber~~, Cody Beaulieu
 - c. Petitioner: Jim Erickson- Director of Risk Management
 - d. Accused: Joe Delt
 - e. Witness for the Petitioner: Hunter McMullen
 - f. Witness for the Accused: N/A
 - g. Witness for the Standards Board: N/A
- III. The petitioner states his case
 - a. Jim: During the Homecoming social on Friday, Joe Delt was acting very aggressively and was visibly intoxicated. There were multiple guests at the event that had approached me and ask if he could be sent home. They said that he was being very rude and obnoxious. He is over the age of 21, but I believe that his character was unprofessional and reflected the fraternity in a poor manner. This is not his first time being brought to Standards Board for a similar violation.
- IV. The accused and then the Standards Board may question the petitioner
 - a. ~~Spencer~~: What would you like to see done?
 - i. Jim: I would at least like to see Brother Delt have to meet with Jordan, Greek Life Advisor, and discuss his excessive drinking.
 - b. Dunwoody: Do you think that he should be suspended?
 - i. Jim: Not necessarily, I think that Joe Delt is a great member of the chapter. I think that he has a drinking problem that we as a chapter need to address and help him get through.
 - c. ~~Qion~~: Would you like him to apologize to the guests?
 - i. Jim: I think that would be beneficial, because they were from Kappa Delta and we would like to keep our ~~Greek life~~ relationships intact.
- V. Witnesses for the petitioner make their statement
 - a. McMullen: I was a sober brother that night and I can attest to his rude and obnoxious behavior. Joe Delt was being very difficult to deal with and would not listen to any directions from myself or other brothers.
- VI. Cross-examination of the petitioner's witnesses by the accused and the Standards Board
 - a. ~~Spencer~~: Do you think that brother Delt should be suspended for his actions?
 - i. McMullen: I think that a suspension may allow him time to realize his mistakes and possibly help him work through them.
 - b. (Keep doing the same...)
- VII. The accused states his case
 - a. Joe Delt: I screwed up. I need to control my alcohol better. I agree with everything that has been said by Jim and Hunter. I need to change and become a better man. Drinking is not the solution to all of my problems. I would like to apologize to everyone in both our chapter and in Kappa Delta.
- VIII. The petitioner and the Standards Board may question the accused
- IX. Witnesses for the accused make their statement
- X. Cross-examination of the accused's witnesses by the petitioner and the Standards Board
- XI. Witnesses for the Standards Board answer the questions of the Standards Board
- XII. The petitioner and the accused may cross-examine the Standards Board's witnesses
- XIII. Final statement by the Petitioner
 - a. Jim: I think that Brother Delt has recognized there is a problem. I believe that is the first step, but I would like to see the chapter have a hand in this too. I think we need to set a few guidelines for Joe Delt.
- XIV. Final statement by the Accused
 - a. Delt: I will do whatever it takes to stay in the chapter.
- XV. Deliberation by the Standards Board
- XVI. Announcement of the Standards Board's decision
 - a. As a Standards Board, we come to a unanimous decision. Brother Delt must be a sober brother at both formal and informal this semester. He must attend a meeting with Jordan D. to discuss his drinking behavior. Brother Delt must apologize in front the chapter and write the ladies of KD an apology letter. All of this must be done before December 16th, 2019.
- XVII. Adjourn
 - a. 6:15pm



Delta Tau Delta Fraternity -
Iota Sigma Chapter
North Dakota State University

Official Sanctions Form: MOCK

Jim Erickson (Director of Risk Management)

Petitioner: _____

Joe Delt

Accused: _____

Sanctions:

As a Standards Board, we come to a unanimous decision. Brother Delt must be a sober brother at both formal and informal this semester. He must attend a meeting with Jordan D. to discuss his drinking behavior. Brother Delt must apologize in front of the chapter and write the ladies of KD an apology letter. All of this must be done before December 16th, 2019.

Cale Dunwoody

Director of Standards

600 Level - Sanctioning

The Iota Sigma chapter does not find that community service and fines are a reasonable issue to combat misconduct. If a member could not complete 15 service hours during a semester, then we as a Standards board would not make a member complete 30 the following semester. A member would be on social probation the following semester from our formal event, the only remedy would allow a member to make-up the missed hours and complete 30. This is a reasonable solution, because it allows a member to take a corrective course of action. They may either miss a social event or repay their service to society by completing 30 the following semester.

800 Level - Standards Board Training

Our Greek life coordinator, Jordan Dadez, was asked to present to the Delta Tau Delta Standards board about effective practices. Mason Rademacher (SR), Sam Safgren (JR), Christian Oien (SR), Devin Schatz (JR), Evan Bernhardson (JR) were all present for this presentation on October 14th, 2019. The presentation highlights fair and effective Standards board practices. Jordan did a fantastic job discussing the purpose and goals on Standards board, while doing this she also used personal experiences to create great discussion. This presentation allowed our members to brainstorm ideas of corrective and effective sanctions for our members. Jordan concluded by opening the floor up for questions and discussion. I would suggest that all Standards board justices complete this training prior to their first hearing.

In addition to the training given by the Greek Life Advisor, the Iota-Sigma Standards Board completes a mock trial during each academic semester. This allows Standards Board justices to better understand how a trial within our chapter takes place. It also gives them exposure to the mindset they must approach in various hearing.

The last source of training is the use of the Standards Board Training manual. This manual outlines the scope and purpose of the Standards Board, then allows Justices to read a section of the chapter's bylaws. Once they have read the bylaws, there is a case study that infringes on the bylaws. Each Justice is to read both the bylaws and the case study, then fill out a sheet about the case study. The training manual is then reviewed by the Director of Standards, who gives justices feedback, and returns the manual to the justice for further review. The purpose of this exercise is to further the thought that Justices may have and give them experiences that might not be given in a single mock trial. EXAMPLE BELOW:

Training Manual

BYLAWS AND CASE STUDIES (1)

Bylaw:

Section 4.10 Illegal Drug and Alcohol Policy

- (f) The use or possession of any unlawful drug in any form as dictated by the State of North Dakota will be grounds for immediate expulsion from the Chapter, as this is a Level 3 violation of the Member Responsibility Guidelines (MRG).
- (i) Any illicit drug of a DUI offense shall be grounds for recommendation of expulsion by the Standards Committee.
- (g) The consumption of alcohol by a minor, as dictated by the State of North Dakota, is a punishable offense and the NDSU Iota Sigma Chapter recognizes this law and adhere to the regulations regarding alcohol as outlined in the Member Responsibility Guidelines of Delta Tau Delta International Fraternity.
- (h) No member of NDSU's Delta Tau Delta Iota Sigma Chapter shall wear their letters while drinking, or in places where alcohol is the primary source of revenue. These include, but are not limited to: clubs, bars, casinos, liquor stores, house parties, etc.
- (i) This is defined in the state of North Dakota, if an establishment requires a person to be 21 years of age or older, then no letters shall be worn in such establishment. In any state where the age limit for drinking alcohol is not 21, then if that establishment were in the state of North Dakota and the age restriction were in place, then no letters shall be worn in said establishment.
- (ii) The penalty associated with Clause 3 shall be the revocation of letters and the Chapter pin for a length of time designated by the Standards Committee with the minimum recommendation of 8 weeks. At the general body meeting following the trial, if the member is found guilty, he shall relinquish his lettered affiliations including shirts, pins, etc., to the Director of Standards following the reading of the verdict. The Director of Standards shall then be required to safeguard the possessions until the suspension period has passed.
- (i) At every Fraternity sponsored event where alcohol is present, there will be at minimum 2 sober "bosses". These individuals will not consume any alcohol and must be available to watch for potentially harmful situations. The individuals will be volunteers unless volunteers are not available, to which it will be a random drawing on who will be the sober boss(es) for the event. If a sober boss neglects his duties, there will be a mandatory meeting with the President and Advisor, as well as a Standards Committee hearing and an eight (8) week social suspension period to which the member may not attend any Fraternity social events until the suspension period is completed.

Iota-Sigma

v

Training Manual

- (j) This social policy shall be adhered to as follows:
 - (i) The first (1st) offense for public drunkenness shall consist of the following: A meeting with the Director of Risk Management and Chapter Advisor to discuss the situation that occurred as well as issue a formal apology to the Chapter during a general body meeting. The second (2nd) offense shall consist of the consequences in the 1st offense, with the inclusion of a meeting with the faculty advisor and a \$20 fine. The third (3rd) offense shall be the consequences of the 1st offense, with inclusion of a meeting with the faculty advisor, an additional \$50 fine, and a suspension from the next social up to the Standards Committee's discretion.
 - (ii) If a member receives a minor in possession or consumption, the first (1st) offense shall be a \$50 fine and a meeting with a Live Real Mentor, the faculty advisor, the Chapter advisor, and the Director of Risk Management. The second offense (2nd) shall consist of a \$100 fine and the penalties associated with the 1st offense with the exclusion of the monetary fine. The member shall be required to issue a formal apology to the Chapter for each offense. The third (3rd) offense shall consist of a presentation of their case to the Standards Committee and shall be recommended for expulsion.

Case Study:

A member of your chapter attended an informal social event, organized by the fraternity. The event had an alcohol available for purchase for member that were over the age of 21. The member in question was under 19 years old but had facial hair that made him “look older”. In addition to the facial hair that might deceive bartender, but he also had a fake ID that said he was 22. The member had been buying alcohol drink from the bar using his fake ID. Many members of the chapter that were 21 and older saw this member at the bar repeatedly and were very annoyed and found this to be a risk management issue. The 21+ members brought this occurrence to the attention of the risk manager. In the following weeks, the risk manager submitted a complaint to the Standards Board.

You are a Standards Board Justice hearing this present case, you are responsible for listening to both the member as well as the risk manager. You are charged with the responsibility of listening to the information provided by both parties and deliberating with fellow justices. You have to make a determination of guilty/ or not guilty, if guilty then you have to formulate a reasonable sanction to give this member. Fill out the responses below on how you would or wouldn't sanction these actions.

Iota-Sigma

VI

Training Manual

What exact bylaw (Section and sub-section) is this member breaking?

What are three questions you would ask the charged member?

-

-

-

What is the sanction you would apply in the case study above?

Why?

1000 Level Standards Board Proactive Reinforcement

With the changes of the chapter structure that is taking place on the national level, Iota Sigma has adopted the structure. As a chapter, we believe that the implementation of this power structure will allow members to take part in the decision-making process on a micro-level. It allows for a better generation of ideas and gives members a greater responsibility as a member.

During the Fall semester our chapter introduced a Committeeman of the Month Award. This award is given to a member that meets or exceeds these requirements; member on a standing committee, receives a nomination with testimony from committee chair, and receives a simple majority vote from the Standards Board. This member must be above the 2.75-chapter GPA requirement, must abide by the 2 excused absences policy, and has excelled as a committee member.

The Sergeant will ask every committee chair to submit a name in writing, along with written testimony for the nomination. Once the Sergeant has received nomination, the Standards Board will review all testimony and nominations. Following the review of nominations, the Standards Board will vote upon each nomination, if a nomination does not reach a simple majority vote then they are removed from the list. Each Justice on the Standards Board may give 1-minute opinions or remarks before each vote. The Standards Board will complete this process until two members are left for nomination, the Director will then review the nominations and make the final nomination for the Committeeman of the Month Award.

Any member can be a part of a committee and go through the motions. This award will give members something to strive for and be proud of. The committeeman will have to compete with his fellow committee members to receive a nomination, but as well as members from other standing committees. I like to keep the nature of this award serious and also competitive; I think that we need to stress the importance of this structure change as well as not only completing but excelling in your role as a committee member.

This award is given to show members that their great work and time is being appreciated by not only their committee but the chapter as well. As a Standards Board, we have found that awards such as Delt of the week and Delt of the month have been received in a “unimportant” manner. Our chapter partakes in the trading of passable, which recognizes member that has performed a task or have excelled as a member/ new member. For example, if you “did a solid” for a brother that week prior to meeting, you would receive a tabletop. Our passable show culture, appreciation, and offer a fun gift for a week.

The Standards Board decided to formulate this Committeeman of the Month Award in Fall of 2018, to keep members dedicated to their work on the committee, and also to show

appreciation for the outstanding work. The award is just a piece of paper thus far, but I hope to advance the appearance of the award. The award will be given to the member permanently. Members that have received this award: Jacob Honl (October 2018), Jake Johnson (November 2018), Jack Kuppich (December 2018), Jack Payette (January 2019), Seth Wolf (February 2019), Dom Fettig (March 2019), Nathan Horner (April 2019), Cody Beaulieu (August 2019), Mason Brekke (September 2019), Sam Safgren (October 2019).

Picture:

