



GRAND RIVER | SOLUTIONS

Hearings in a Post Regulatory World

SWACC

Martha Compton | May 2022



Martha Compton

She/her

Director of Strategic Partnerships and
Client Relations

Meet Your Facilitator

Martha consults and trains nationally on Title IX and student conduct and has previously served as a technical trainer for Department of Justice VAWA campus grantees. Martha is a former President of the Association for Student Conduct Administration, has been a faculty member for ASCA's Gehring Academy, and was part of the core team that developed ASCA's Sexual Misconduct Institute. A student conduct professional for over 20 years, Martha is also a former dean of students and has extensive experience in residence life, behavior intervention, emergency services, orientation, leadership, and working with student organizations.

About Us

Vision

We exist to help create safe and equitable work and educational environments.

Mission

Bring systemic change to how school districts and institutions of higher education address their Clery Act & Title IX obligations.

Core Values


- Responsive Partnership
- Innovation
- Accountability
- Transformation
- Integrity

Agenda

- 1 Title IX Requirements for Hearings
- 2 Process Participants
- 3 Pre-Hearing Tasks
- 4 The Hearing
- 5 After The Hearing
- 6 Practical Application




Title IX Requirements For Hearings



01

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS



Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972

"No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Section 106.30: Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment means conduct on the basis of sex that satisfies one or more of the following:

- (1) An **employee** of the recipient conditioning the provision of an aid, benefit, or service of the recipient on an individual's participation in unwelcome sexual conduct;
- (2) Unwelcome conduct determined by a reasonable person to be so **severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive** that it **effectively denies** a person equal access to the recipient's education program or activity; or
- (3) "**Sexual assault**" as defined in 20 U.S.C. 1092(f)(6)(A)(v), "**dating violence**" as defined in 34 U.S.C. 12291(a)(10), "**domestic violence**" as defined in 34 U.S.C. 12291(a)(8), or "**stalking**" as defined in 34 U.S.C. 12291(a)(30).

AND... Only Covered, IF:

Place of Conduct

- On campus
- Campus Program, Activity, Building, and
- In the United States

Required Identity

- Complainant participating/attempting to participate in Program or Activity, AND
- Control over Respondent

Procedural Requirements for Investigations

Notice to both parties

Equal opportunity to
present evidence

An advisor of choice

Written notification of
meetings, etc., and
sufficient time to prepare

Opportunity to review all
evidence, and 10 days to
submit a written response
to the evidence prior to
completion of the report

Report summarizing
relevant evidence and 10
day review of report prior
to hearing

Procedural Requirements for Hearings

Must be live, but can be conducted remotely

Cannot compel participation of parties or witnesses

Standard of proof used may be preponderance of the evidence or clear and convincing; standard must be the same for student and employee matters

Cross examination must be permitted and must be conducted by advisor of choice or provided by the institution

Decision maker determines relevancy of questions and evidence offered

Written decision must be issued that includes finding and sanction

The Requirement of Impartiality

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS

The Requirement of Impartiality

“

The Department's interest in ensuring impartial Title IX proceedings that avoid prejudgment of the facts at issue necessitates a broad prohibition on sex stereotypes so that decisions are made on the basis of individualized facts and not on stereotypical notions of what “men” or “women” do or do not do.

”

85 Fed. Reg. 30254 (May 19, 2020).

Section 106.45(b)(1)(iii)

The Title IX Coordinator, investigator, **decision maker**, or facilitator of informal resolution must receive training on how to serve impartially, including avoiding prejudgment of the facts at issue, conflict of interest, and bias

This training material may not rely on sex stereotypes and must promote impartial investigations and adjudications of formal complaints of sexual harassment.



Section 106.45(b)(1)(iii)

The Grievance Process requires that any individual designated as a Title IX Coordinator, Investigator, Decision-Maker, Appeal Officer, or Informal Resolution Facilitator not have a conflict of interest or bias:

For or against Complainants or Respondents generally, or

An individual Complainant or Respondent.

In Summary...



Do not rely on cultural “rape myths”



Do not rely on cultural stereotypes about how men or women purportedly behave



Do not rely on gender-specific research data or theories to decide or make inferences of relevance or credibility in particular cases



Recognize that anyone, regardless of sex, gender, gender identity or sexual orientation, can be a victim or perpetrator of sexual assault or other violence



Avoid any perception of bias in favor of or against complainants or respondents generally



Employ interview and investigation approaches that demonstrate a commitment to impartiality

Bias

“Department also rejected commenters’ arguments that individuals should be disqualified from serving as investigators because of past personal or professional experience”

“Department encourages [schools] to apply an objective (whether a reasonable person would believe bias exists), common sense approach to evaluating whether a particular person serving in a Title IX role is biased” WHILE ALSO

“exercising caution not to apply generalizations that might unreasonably conclude that bias exists (for example, assuming that all self-professed feminists, or self-described survivors, are biased against men, or that a male is incapable of being sensitive to women, or that prior work as a victim advocate, or as a defense attorney, renders the person biased for or against complainants or respondents”

Conflicts of Interest

Commenters argued that investigators and hearing officers employed by schools have an “inherent conflict of interest” because of their affiliation with the school, so Department should require investigations and hearings to be conducted by external contractors

Department noted that some of those commenters argued that this resulted in bias against complainants, and some argued that this resulted in bias against respondents

Department's response: Department's authority is over schools, not individual investigators and other personnel, so Department will focus on holding school's responsible for impartial end result of the process, without labeling certain administrative relationships as per se involving conflicts of interest

Avoiding Conflicts of Interest and Bias

Ask these questions:

- Do I know any of these individuals?
 - If so, what is the nature of the relationship?
- Am I likely to have to work with or teach them in the future?
- Do I hold any bias against any of these individuals for any reason?
 - Could there be a reasonable perception that I do?
- Have I been adequately distanced from the investigation process?



Hearing Technology: Requirements and Considerations



If hearings cannot be in person, or if someone chooses to participate remotely, must have a remote participation platform available.



All hearings must be recorded.



Participants must be able to communicate during the hearing

The parties with the decision maker(s)
The parties with their advisors

Purpose of the Hearing

1

Review and
Assess
Evidence

2

Make Findings
of Fact

3

Determine
Responsibility/
Findings of
Responsibility

4

Determine
Sanction and
Remedy

Evaluating the Evidence

Is it relevant?

Evidence is relevant if it has a tendency to make a material fact more or less likely to be true.



Is it authentic?

Is the item what it purports to be?



Is it credible?

Is it convincing?



Is it reliable?

Can you trust it or rely on it?



What weight, if any, should it be given?

Weight is determined by the finder of fact!

Trauma-informed practices provide tools/techniques for engaging with the Complainant, Respondent, and Witnesses.



Format/Structure of the Hearing



Format of Questions




Approach to Clarification



Process Participants

02

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS



The Participants

The Parties

Complainant	Respondent
<p>An individual who is alleged to be the victim of conduct that could constitute sexual harassment.</p>	<p>An individual who has been reported to be the perpetrator of conduct that could constitute sexual harassment.</p>

The Participants

The Investigator

- Can present a summary of the final investigation report, including items that are contested and those that are not;
- Submits to questioning by the Decisionmaker(s) and the parties (through their Advisors).
- Can be present during the entire hearing process, but not during deliberations.
- Questions about their opinions on credibility, recommended findings, or determinations, are prohibited. If such information is introduced, the Chair will direct that it be disregarded.



The Participants

The Investigator


- Can present a summary of the final investigation report, including items that are contested and those that are not;
- Submits to questioning by the Decisionmaker(s) and the parties (through their Advisors).
- Can be present during the entire hearing process, but not during deliberations.
- Questions about their opinions on credibility, recommended findings, or determinations, are prohibited. If such information is introduced, the Chair will direct that it be disregarded.



- Can be anyone, including a lawyer, a parent, a friend, and a witness
- No particular training or experience required (institution appointed advisors should be trained)
- Can accompany their advisees at all meetings, interviews, and the hearing
- Advisors should help the Parties prepare for each meeting and are expected to advise ethically, with integrity, and in good faith
- May not speak on behalf of their advisee or otherwise participate, except that the advisor will conduct cross examination at the hearing.
- Advisors are expected to advise their advisees without disrupting proceedings

The Participants


Advisors



The Participants

Advisors: Prohibited Behavior

An Advisor who oversteps their role as defined by the policy should be warned once. If the Advisor continues to disrupt or otherwise fails to respect the limits of the Advisor role, the meeting may be ended, or other appropriate measures implemented. Subsequently, the Title IX Coordinator has the ability determine how to address the Advisor's non-compliance and future role.



The Participants

The Hearing Facilitator/Coordinator

- Manages the recording, witness logistics, party logistics, curation of documents, separation of the parties, and other administrative elements of the hearing process
- Non-Voting
- Optional, not required



The Participants

The Decision-Maker


- Regulations permit one person or a panel
 - University uses a single decision maker
- Questions the parties and witnesses at the hearing
- Determines responsibility
- Determines sanction, where appropriate



The Participants

The Decision-Maker


- Answers all procedural questions
- Makes rulings regarding relevancy of evidence, questions posed during cross examination
- Maintains decorum
- Prepares the written deliberation statement
- May assist in other tasks such as preparing the Notice of Outcome





Decision Maker Pre-Hearing Tasks

What should be done in advance
of the hearing



03

Pre-Hearing Meetings

Review the Logistics for the Hearing

Set expectations

- Format
- Roles of the parties
- Participation
- Decorum
- Impact of not following rules

Cross Examination/Questioning Format & Expectations

Decision-Maker



Review evidence and report



Review applicable policy and procedures



Preliminary analysis of the evidence



Determine areas for further exploration



Develop questions of your own



Anticipate the party's questions



May convene a pre-hearing meeting



Anticipate challenges or issues



Prepare the script

Common Areas of Exploration



Credibility?



Clarification on timeline?



Thought process?




Inconsistencies?



04

The Hearing

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS



Order of the Proceedings

01

Introductions
and instructions
by the Decision
Maker; Opening
Statements

02

Presentation by
Investigator

03

Presentation of
information and
questioning of
the parties and
witnesses

04

Closing
Statements

05

Deliberation &
Determination

Opening Introductions and Instructions by the Chair

- The College should have a script for this portion of the proceedings, and it should be used consistently.
- Introduction of the participants.
- Overview of the procedures.
- Overall goal: manage expectations.
- Be prepared to answer questions.



Opening Statements

Optional: Not required by the regulations; institution may choose to allow.

- Prior to questioning beginning during the hearing, each party may be given the opportunity to make an opening statement.
- Intended to be a brief summary of the points the party would like to highlight.
- Directed to the Decision Maker and only the Decision Maker.
- Both parties should give opening statement before either is questioned.
- Typically, the complainant goes first.



Presentation of Information

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS

A man in a brown jacket is shouting into a megaphone. The image is overlaid with a semi-transparent teal background and a diagonal watermark that reads "GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS".

Presentation of Information & Questioning of the Parties

01

The Decision Maker will question Complainant first

02

Cross examination of Complainant will occur next

03

Follow up by the Decision Maker

04

The Decision Maker will question Respondent second

05

Cross examination of Respondent will occur next

06

Follow up by the Decision Maker

Questioning of the Witnesses

01

The Decision Maker
will determine the
order of questioning
of witnesses

02

The Decision Maker
will question first

03

Advisor cross-
examination will
occur next
(suggested:
Complainant's
advisor followed by
Respondent's
advisor)

04

Follow up by the
Decision Maker

Closing Statements

Optional: Not required by the regulations; institution may choose to allow.

- Prior to the conclusion of the hearing, each party may have the opportunity to make a closing statement.
- Intended to be a brief summary of the points the party would like to highlight.
- Directed to the Decision Maker and only the Decision Maker.
- Not a time to introduce new information or evidence.

General Questioning Guidelines

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS



Format of Questioning



The Hearing Panel or the advisor will remain seated during questioning



Questions will be posed orally



Questions must be relevant

What constitutes a relevant question?

The Department declines to define “relevant”, indicating that term “should be interpreted using [its] plain and ordinary meaning.”

See, e.g., Federal Rule of Evidence 401 Test for Relevant Evidence:

“Evidence is relevant if:

- (a) it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence; and
- (b) the fact is of consequence in determining the action.”

When is evidence relevant?

Logical connection between the evidence and facts at issue

Assists in coming to the conclusion – it is “of consequence”

Tends to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without that evidence



Information
protected by an
un-waived legal
privilege

Medical treatment
and care

Unduly repetitious
or duplicative
questions

Information that
otherwise
irrelevant

Complainant's
prior sexual
history, with
limited exceptions.

**Irrelevant and
Impermissible
Questions**

When Questioning....



Be efficient.



Explore areas where additional information or clarity is needed.



Listen to the answers.



Be prepared to go down a road that you hadn't considered or anticipated exploring.



Take your time. Be thoughtful. Take breaks if you need it.

Foundational Questions to Consider

Were you interviewed?

Did you see the interview notes?

Did the notes reflect your recollection at the time?

As you sit here today, has anything changed?

Did you review your notes before coming to this hearing?

Did you speak with any one about your testimony today prior to this hearing?

Common Areas of Where Clarity or Additional Information is Needed

Details about the
alleged
misconduct

Facts related to the
elements of the
alleged policy
violation

Relevancy of
Certain Items of
Evidence

Factual Basis for
Opinions

Credibility

Reliability

Timelines

Inconsistencies

Questioning to Assess Reliability

Inherent plausibility

Logic

Corroboration

Other indicia of reliability

Questioning to Assess Credibility

No formula exists, but consider asking questions about the following:

opportunity to view

ability to recall

motive to fabricate

plausibility

consistency

character, background, experience, and training

coaching


Credibility Versus Reliability

Reliability

- I can trust the consistency of the person's account of their truth.
- It is probably true and I can rely on it.

Credibility

- I trust their account based on their tone and reliability.
- They are honest and believable.
- It might not be true, but it is worthy of belief.
- It is convincingly true.
- The witness is sincere and speaking their real truth.



Opinion Evidence

When might it be relevant?

How do you establish a foundation for opinion evidence so that the reliability of the opinion can be assessed?

Asking Questions to Assess Authenticity

Investigating the Products of the Investigation



Never assume that an item of evidence is authentic.



Ask questions, request proof.



Request further investigation of the authenticity if necessary.

Is it authentic?



QUESTION THE
PERSON WHO
OFFERED THE
EVIDENCE



REQUEST
ORIGINALS



OBTAIN
ORIGINALS FROM
THE SOURCE



HAVE OTHERS
REVIEW AND
COMMENT ON
AUTHENTICITY



ARE THERE
OTHER RECORDS
THAT WOULD
CORROBORATE?

What are the “Hard” Questions

Details about the sexual contact

Seemingly inconsistent behaviors

Inconsistent evidence/information

What they were wearing

Alcohol or drug consumption

Probing into reports of lack of memory

How to Ask the Hard Questions

Lay a foundation for the questions

- Explain why you are asking it
- Share the evidence that you are asking about, or that you are seeking a response to

Be deliberate and mindful in your questions:

- Can you tell me what you were thinking when....
- Help me understand what you were feeling when...
- Are you able to tell me more about...

Special Considerations for Questioning the Investigator

- The Investigator's participation in the hearing is as a fact witness;
- Questions directed towards the Investigator shall be limited to facts collected by the Investigator pertinent to the Investigation;
- Neither the Advisors nor the Decision-maker(s) should ask the Investigator(s) their opinions on credibility, recommended findings, or determinations;
- The Investigators, Advisors, and parties will refrain from discussion of or questions about these assessments. If such information is introduced, the Chair will direct that it be disregarded.

Special Considerations for Questioning the Investigator



Ask questions about how they conducted their investigation



Explore the investigator's decision making



Seek clarity about evidence collected

Where it came from
Authenticity of the evidence



Ask factual questions that will assist in evaluation of the evidence



If bias is not in issue at the hearing, the Chair should not permit irrelevant questions of the investigator that probe for bias.

Special Considerations for Panels

Must appoint a chair

If a panel, decide in advance who will take the lead on questioning


Go topic by topic


Ask other panelists if they have questions before moving on

Do not speak over each other


Pay attention to the questions of other panelists

Ok to take breaks to consult with each other, to reflect, to consult with the TIXC or counsel





The Decision Maker's Role in Advisor Questioning



05

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS

Cross Examination

Who does it?

Must be conducted
by the advisor

If party does not
appear or does not
participate, advisor
can appear and cross

If party does not
have an advisor,
institution must
provide one

The Role of the Decision Maker During Questioning by the Advisors

After the Advisor poses a question, the proceeding will pause to allow the Chair to consider it.

Chair will determine whether the question will be permitted, disallowed, or rephrased. The Chair may explore arguments regarding relevance with the Advisors.

The Chair will limit or disallow questions on the basis that they are irrelevant, unduly repetitious (and thus irrelevant), or abusive.

The Chair will state their decision on the question for the record and advise the Party/Witness to whom the question was directed, accordingly. The Chair will explain any decision to exclude a question as not relevant, or to reframe it for relevance.

The Chair has final say on all questions and determinations of relevance. The parties and their advisors are not permitted to make objections during the hearing. If they feel that ruling is incorrect, the proper forum to raise that objection is on appeal.

When Assessing Relevance, the Decision Maker Can:

Ask the Advisor or why their question is relevant

Take a break

Ask their own questions of the party/witness


Review the hearing record



After The Hearing

06

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS



GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS


Deliberations

Preponderance of the Evidence

- Standard of proof by which determinations of responsibility are made
- "More likely than not"
- It does not mean that an allegation must be found to be 100% true or accurate
- A finding of responsibility = There was sufficient reliable, credible evidence to support a finding, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the policy was violated
- A finding of not responsible = There was not sufficient reliable, credible evidence to support a finding, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the policy was violated

Weighing the Evidence & Making a Determination

1. Evaluate the relevant evidence collected to determine what weight, if any, you will afford that item of evidence in your final determination;
2. Apply the standard of proof and the evidence to each element of the alleged policy violation;
3. Make a determination as to whether or not there has been a policy violation.






Findings of Fact

- **A "finding of fact"**
 - The decision whether events, actions, or conduct occurred, **or** a piece of evidence is what it purports to be
 - Based on available evidence and information
 - Determined by a preponderance of evidence standard
 - Determined by the fact finder(s)
- **For example...**
 - Complainant reports that they and Respondent ate ice cream prior to the incident
 - Respondent says that they did not eat ice cream
 - Witness 1 produces a timestamped photo of Respondent eating ice cream
- **Next steps?**

Policy Analysis

- Break down the policy into elements
- Organize the facts by the element to which they relate

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS



Allegation: Fondling


Fondling is the:

- ❑ touching of the private body parts of another person
- ❑ for the purpose of sexual gratification,
- ❑ Forcibly and/or without the consent of the Complainant,
 - ❑ including instances where the Complainant is incapable of giving consent because of their age or **because of their temporary or permanent mental or physical incapacity.**

Analysis Grid

Touching of the private body parts of another person	For the purpose of sexual gratification	Without consent due to lack of capacity
Undisputed: Complainant and Respondent agree that there was contact between Respondent's hand and Complainant's vagina.	<p>Respondent acknowledges and admits this element in their statement with investigators.</p> <p>"We were hooking up. Complainant started kissing me and was really into it. It went from there. Complainant guided my hand down her pants..."</p>	<p>Complainant: drank more than 12 drinks, vomited, no recall</p> <p>Respondent: C was aware and participating</p> <p>Witness 1: observed C vomit</p> <p>Witness 2: C was playing beer pong and could barely stand</p> <p>Witness 3: C was drunk but seemed fine</p> <p>Witness 4: carried C to the basement couch and left her there to sleep it off.</p>

Apply Preponderance Standard to Each Element

Touching of the private body parts of another person	For the purpose of sexual gratification	Without consent due to lack of capacity
<p>Undisputed: Complainant and Respondent agree that there was contact between Respondent's hand and Complainant's vagina.</p> 	<p>Respondent acknowledges and admits this element in their statement with investigators.</p>  <p>"We were hooking up. Complainant started kissing me and was really into it. It went from there. Complainant guided my hand down her pants..."</p>	<p>Complainant: drank more than 12 drinks, vomited, no recall Respondent: C was aware and participating</p>  <p>Witness 1: observed C vomit Witness 2: C was playing beer pong and could barely stand Witness 3: C drank but seemed fine Witness 4: carried C to the basement couch and left her there to sleep it off.</p>

Did You Also Analyze...?

(if required by policy)

- ☐ On campus?
- ☐ Program or Activity?
- ☐ In a building owned/controlled by a recognized student organization?
- ☐ Substantial control over respondent and context?
- ☐ Complainant was attempting to access program/activity?

Sanctioning

- Primary Goals:
 - End the harassment
 - Prevent its recurrence
 - Remedy the harm
- What steps would be reasonably calculated to end harassment and prevent recurrence?



Sanctioning Considerations



State law



System policy



Learning
environment



Measures
available

The sanctioning officer ***must*** assume the finding is correct.

No lesser sanction if you disagree with findings

REMINDER

The sanction does not “undo” the finding.

Determining Sanctions

- Precedent/Consistency
- Past conduct
- Foreseeability of repeated conduct
- Availability of measures
- Does bias creep in?
- Remorse?
- Victim impact or request?



Aggravating Circumstances

Premeditation

Predation

Physical violence

Repeated violation

Multiple policy violations in one incident

Harm to others, impact on complainant and/or community

Did the behavior continue after intervention?


Effort to conceal or hide the incident?

Refusal to attend past trainings


Past failures to comply with directives

Final Report

- The allegations
- Description of all procedural steps
- Findings of fact
- Conclusion of application of facts to the policy
- Rationale for each allegation
- Sanctions and remedies
- Procedure for appeal



The Final Determination Should **STAND** On Its Own



S

Simple and Easy to Comprehend

T

Transparent/Clear

A

Accurate

N

Neutral/Unbiased

D


Draw Attention to Significant
Evidence and Issues



Practical Application

06

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS





Scenario 1

Respondent appears at the hearing with Witness 7. Respondent would like Witness 7 to provide information testimony about text messages between them and Complainant that indicate that Complainant has made the allegations up.

- **Can the HP hear from Witness 7 at the hearing?**



Scenario 2A

Respondent provides a polygraph report to investigators wherein it is concluded that Respondent is not being deceptive when denying the allegations.

- **The Investigator determines the report is irrelevant. Must the Investigator share the report with the decision maker?**



Scenario 2B

Respondent provides a polygraph report to Investigators wherein it is concluded that Respondent is not being deceptive when denying the allegations. The polygrapher appears and answers all relevant questions on cross.

- **Must the Hearing Panel find Respondent not responsible because of the findings in the report?**

Case Study

“

The Formal Complaint charges Respondent with sexual assault for engaging in sexual contact with Complainant when she was incapacitated by alcohol. Specifically, Complainant alleges that she was at a party with friends when they met Respondent. Complainant reported that prior to the party she pre-gamed with Witness 1 and they split a bottle of prosecco. Complainant stated that while at the party, Respondent and Witness 2 approached her and her friend, Witness 3, and asked if they would be their partners in a round of beer pong. Complainant reported that she paired up with Respondent and they played several rounds. She further alleged that that Respondent was the one who filled their cups. Complainant stated that she “got drunk fast” and her last memory was of Respondent handing her a celebratory shot because they had won the tournament. Her next memory was waking up on a couch in a bedroom that was unfamiliar to her, naked from the waist down. Respondent was on the floor next to her, asleep. He was under a blanket but was also naked.

”

Witness 1

Witness 1 was interviewed by the investigator and reported that she and Complainant are roommates, but they are not close. Witness 1 is an athlete and tends to hang out with her teammates. She stated that for this reason, they rarely hang-out, but that the night of the alleged incident they did because they were planning on going to the same party. Witness 1 stated that they split a bottle of prosecco, but that Complainant drank most of it because Witness 1 had an early practice the next morning and didn't want to get "too messed up." Witness 1 said that they went to the party together, but then went their separate ways. Witness 1 stated that towards the end of the night, she saw Complainant and described her as "a disaster." She also reported that Respondent was "practically carrying her" and she approached them and offered to take Complainant home. According to Witness 1, Complainant said she was fine, but her words were slurred, and she could barely stand. Witness 1 told Respondent to take care of her and he said, "I'm just going to put her to bed." She didn't see either party again that night.

At the hearing, Witness 1 gave testimony that was substantially the same as what she told the investigator.

Witness 2

Witness 2 told the investigators that he is Respondent's best friend and teammate. Witness 2 stated that when looking for partners for the beer pong tournament, Respondent saw Complainant and Witness 3 and suggested that they approach them because Complainant "was hot" and Witness 3 "looked drunk enough to be a good time." Witness 2 said that Complainant was fine and didn't appear to be that drunk. He also stated that she made most of the winning shots after several rounds of the game so she couldn't have been too messed up. When asked who was filling the cups, he said that he wasn't sure who did it each round, but he definitely saw Complainant fill them on two occasions. After the tournament was over, he helped Witness 3 get home and so didn't see Complainant and Respondent again that night. He also mentioned that he and Witness 3 are now dating.

At the hearing, Witness 2 testified that Complainant was fine. He also stated that Respondent never filled Complainant's cup and that Complainant was all over Respondent the entire night.


Witness 3

Witness 3 was Complainant's best friend at the time of the incident. They are no longer close and Witness 3 is now dating Witness 2.

Immediately following the alleged incident, Witness 3 told the investigators that Complainant was already drunk when she got to the party. She stated that Respondent and Witness 2 asked them to play beer pong and they agreed. She stated that the parties seemed to hit it off immediately. She stated that they won the tournament and so played at least five rounds and that by the end of the game Complainant was the "drunkest she had ever seen her." Witness 3 stated that Complainant was slurring her words, couldn't stand on her own, and was really loud, which is not like her. Witness 3 stated that that she was pretty drunk too, but not as bad as Complainant. Witness 3 stated that she left the party with Witness 2.

At the hearing, Witness 3 stated that she may have exaggerated her description of Complainant when she spoke to the investigators. She told the decision makers that although Complainant drank a lot, she wasn't that out of it, because she had a high tolerance and drank a lot all the time.

Save the Date!



Sexual Citizens SPACE Toolkit: A Discussion with the Authors

Hosted by Grand River

May 31, 2022, 2 PM Eastern

Register here!



Upcoming Trainings

Clery Act Training: Higher Education Act Campus Safety Obligations

May 10, 12, 17 & 19, 2022, noon eastern

June 8 & 9, 2022, noon eastern

From One Title IX Coordinator to Another

September 6 & 7, 2022, noon Eastern

Decision Makers: Conducting Fair, Equitable, and Compliant Title IX Hearings

October 25 & 26, 2022, noon Eastern

Title IX Investigative Report Writing Workshop

Classes in April, August, and November

Conducting Fair, Thorough, and Trauma-Informed Sexual Violence Investigations

Classes in August and October

Driving Down the 493: A Deep Dive into a California Law and Its Overlap with Title IX

June 24, 2022 noon Pacific

Questions?

Email Us

info@grandriversolutions.com

Follow Us



@GrandRiverSols




Grand River Solutions

Send Feedback



©Grand River Solutions, Inc., 2022.
Copyrighted material. Express permission
to post training materials for those who
attended a training provided by Grand River
Solutions is granted to comply with 34
C.F.R. § 106.45(b)(10)(i)(D). These training
materials are intended for use by licensees
only. Use of this material for any other
reason without permission is prohibited.





GRAND RIVER | SOLUTIONS

Title IX Hearings

SWACC: Day 2

Jessica Brown & Martha Compton | May 2022

Meet Your Facilitators



Martha Compton

She/Her/Hers

Director of Strategic Partnerships
and Client Relations



Jessica Brown

She/Her/Hers

Senior Solutions Specialist



Outstanding Questions from Day One

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS

Overview of Day Two

- ☐ Community College Context

Let's Practice!

- ☐ Pre-Hearing Preparation
- ☐ Testimony and Cross Examination

Community College Context

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS



Pre-Hearing

The investigation is complete!

It is time to schedule the hearing...

Rapid Fire #1

Using the chat box, share your “To Do” List for coordinating the hearing.





Rapid Fire Recap

Arranging for space

Arranging technology

Scheduling pre-hearing meetings with parties & advisors

Scheduling prehearing meetings of the panel

Providing report and record to panel and parties

Scheduling the hearing

Accommodations

Call for written submissions

Conflict checks

Other considerations?

You and your team did a great job scheduling the hearing and arranging all the logistics!

Rapid Fire #2

It is now one week prior to the hearing. You have already received and reviewed the report and record and you will be meeting with the rest of the panel (or spending some quiet time by yourself) to prepare for the hearing.

Use the chat box to share what you plan to discuss/think about during the prehearing meeting.



Rapid Fire Recap

Development of introductory comments

Initial discussion of the evidence

Areas for further exploration

List of questions for the parties and the witnesses

Anticipation of potential issues

Logistics

Review of any written submissions by the parties

Other considerations?

Rapid Fire #3

Let's Analyze the Case Packet


- On campus?
- Program or Activity?
- In a building owned/controlled by a recognized student organization?
- Substantial control over respondent and context?
- Complainant was attempting to access program/activity?

Rapic Fire #4

Policy Analysis

- Break down the policy into elements
- Policy is on page 5 of the packet

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS



Allegation: Stalking

Stalking is:

- ☐ a course of conduct;
- ☐ directed at a specific person;
- ☐ that would cause a reasonable person to:
 - ☐ fear for his or her safety;
 - ☐ the safety of others; or
 - ☐ suffer substantial emotional distress;
- ☐ Conduct can occur
 - ☐ in person; or
 - ☐ online
- ☐ Must involve an education program or activity of the College

Break Out!

#1

Say hi!

Pick a scribe

Discuss

- All groups: Areas or topics that you would like to explore further in the hearing
- Group 1, 2, 3: Questions for Complainant and Witnesses Emma and Charlie
- Group 4, 5, 6: Questions for Respondent and Witnesses Professor McPhee and Tom

Report Out

- Group 1, 2, 3: Questions for Complainant and Witnesses
Emma and Charlie
Group 4, 5, 6: Questions for Respondent and Witnesses
Professor McPhee and Tom

Logical connection between the evidence and facts at issue

Assists in coming to the conclusion – it is “of consequence”

Tends to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without that evidence



The Hearing

Break Out!

#2



Say hi again



Select a member of your group to take notes and to report out to the whole group



Discuss the list of proposed questions for:

Groups 1 and 2:
Questions for
Respondent and
Witnesses
Tom/Emma (F





Report Out

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS

Questions submitted by Complainant's Advisor

Questions for Respondent (Groups 1 and 2)

1. How often do you stalk girls?
2. Isn't it true that you do this all the time
3. Do you keep stalking me because you're OCD?
4. Have you ever been removed from another group project because you could not get along with others?
5. Do you enjoy scaring women?
6. How often do you imagine that women like you?
7. When you first talked to me about your girlfriend breaking up with you, who was your girlfriend or did you make that up just so you could talk to me?
8. Why did you keep offering to work with Emma in person instead of by Zoom?
9. Did you have a thing for Emma?
10. Did you and Emma ever end up hooking up?

Questions for Tom (Groups 1 and 2)

1. Can you think of any reason for Oliver to be hanging out in the garage with flowers, other than to frighten Samantha?
2. Oliver was pretty creepy, wasn't he?
3. Did you see him throw an object at Samantha?
4. Do you believe he was acting in self defense when he threw the object?
5. Do you think there was any good reason for him to throw anything at her?
6. You said Samantha is really pretty and guys hit on her a lot. Don't you think someone who has had a lot of male attention would be in the best position to know which kind of male attention is acceptable, and when it is stalking?

Questions for Emma (Groups 1 and 2)

1. Did Oliver seem fixated on Samantha when you were all part of the class project?
2. Did Oliver insist that the two of you work together in person instead of online?
3. How often did he force you to work in person with him after classes?
4. Were you afraid of him?
5. Why did you lie to Emma and tell her that Samantha was "really troubled" and "having personal issues"?
6. What did you mean by that?
7. Do you often tell lies?

Questions submitted by Complainant's Advisor

Questions for Charlie (Groups 3 and 4)

1. So are you the one you suggested he stalk her social media to find a food or drink she liked?
2. Is that your M.O. with girls?
3. Why do you think Samantha and Oliver had a plan to get together one night and talk?
4. Do you know for sure there was a confirmed plan?
5. What proof did Oliver give you to prove there was a *real* plan, and not an imaginary one?
6. You said Samantha was "rude" because you could not do a lot of work on the group project. What did you mean by that?
7. How long have you known Oliver?
8. Isn't it true you just don't like Samantha?
9. Have you ever been accused of sexual harassment or stalking?
10. Isn't it true that you would say anything to support a guy who has been accused?

Questions for Professor McPhee (Groups 3 and 4)

1. Why didn't you tell him to stop stalking me?
2. Weren't you supposed to forward my Title IX Complaint to the Coordinator and don't you think that if you had done so, I would have been spared his stalking?

Questions submitted by Respondent's Advisor

Questions for Complainant (Groups 3 and 4)

1. Isn't it true you found me attractive after we first met?
2. You wanted to hook up with me, didn't you?
3. You made this complaint only because you wanted your boyfriend's attention, isn't that true?
4. You couldn't complete your end of the project without me, right?
5. You kept calling me and asking me for help, isn't that true?
6. You told the investigator you imagined seeing me everywhere. Where do you think you saw me?
7. Why were you always thinking of me?
8. And how often do you hallucinate?
9. Do you have any imaginary friends?
10. How often do you imagine seeing people who are not there?
11. How often has this happened in the past?
12. Why did you ask your boyfriend to walk you to your car when you knew you were supposed to meet me there?
13. You said you were frightened by seeing Oliver in the parking garage. Did he have a weapon? Did he try to touch you? Did he try to hit you? Describe each and every way he tried to attack you that night.

Questions submitted by Respondent's Advisor

Questions for Tom (Groups 5 and 6)

1. When you saw Oliver in the parking garage, were you frightened?
2. What, specifically, did Oliver do that was frightening?
3. Does Samantha always over-react?
4. Does Samantha over-react when she is trying to get attention from you?
5. What, specifically, did Oliver throw at her?

Questions for Emma (Groups 5 and 6)

1. Were you frustrated when working on the group project?
2. Why?
3. Why did you think Oliver was more frustrated than others?
4. Why did you think he was "taking it out" on Samantha if he was frustrated with the whole group?
5. Are you and Samantha friends?
6. Did Samantha tell you what to say in the investigation?
7. Are you one of those "Believe all victims" people?

Questions submitted by Respondent's Advisor

Questions for Charlie

No questions

Questions for Professor McPhee (Groups 5 and 6)

1. Isn't it true that Samantha was doing poorly in class?
2. What grade did she have up to the project and what grade did she get on the project?
3. After she made this complaint, did she get some special treatment or accommodation in your class?
4. Isn't it true that, once you told her she would have to do the work, she suddenly made up a story about Oliver to paint him in a bad light?
5. Isn't it true that, before she told you this lie, you had no reason to think poorly of Oliver?



Scenario 1

Respondent appears at the hearing with Witness 7. Respondent would like Witness 7 to provide information testimony about text messages between them and Complainant that indicate that Complainant has made the allegations up.

- **Can the HP hear from Witness 7 at the hearing?**



Scenario 2

Respondent provides a polygraph report to Investigators wherein it is concluded that Respondent is not being deceptive when denying the allegations. The polygrapher appears and answers all relevant questions on cross.

- **Must the Hearing Panel find Respondent not responsible because of the findings in the report?**



Scenario 3

During the hearing, the Complainant becomes upset, shuts down, and stops answering question.

• **If you are the Hearing Chair,
how do you respond?**

Thank you!

Email Us

info@grandriversolutions.com

Follow Us



@GrandRiverSols



Grand River Solutions

Send Feedback



©Grand River Solutions, Inc., 2022.
Copyrighted material. Express permission
to post training materials for those who
attended a training provided by Grand River
Solutions is granted to comply with 34
C.F.R. § 106.45(b)(10)(i)(D). These training
materials are intended for use by licensees
only. Use of this material for any other
reason without permission is prohibited.

