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Live Hearing: Logistics Flowchart

Assign Hearing Officer, Advisor(s), Uni. Rep, & Appellate Officer

Copies of Investigation Report & Access to All Evidence

Schedule Hearing Date & Send Notice of Hearing

Request from Both Parties:
• List of Exhibits & Witnesses?
• Special Accommodations?
• Need an Advisor?

Hold the Live Hearing
• Opening Statements
• Witness Testimony
• Cross-Examination
• Exhibits
• Closing Statements

Hearing Officer: Considers ALL relevant evidence impartially

Hearing Officer: Renders Written Determination
• Include Appellate Officer name & contact information
• Issue copy to CP and RP; cc: TIXC, cc: RP's file (Adjudication Office)

Both Parties have option to Appeal
• Procedural Irregularity
• New Evidence
• Bias/Conflict of Interest

Specific deadlines may be published in the institution’s policy and/or procedures.
Definition of “Sexual Harassment”

Conduct on the basis of sex that satisfies one or more of the following:

1. An employee of the institution conditioning the provision of an aid, benefit, or service of the institution on an individual’s participation in unwelcome sexual conduct (Quid Pro Quo);
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 institution's education program or activity; or
3. “Sexual assault,” “dating violence,” “domestic violence,” or “stalking” as defined under Clery/VAWA.

Source: Title IX Regulations (2020); UT System Model Policy for Sexual Misconduct (2021)
What is not “Sexual Harassment” but may be an issue at a hearing?

Example: Other Inappropriate Sexual Conduct

Definition of “Other Inappropriate Sexual Conduct”

Conduct on the basis of sex that does not meet the definition of “sexual harassment” (under the Model Policy), but is

1. Verbal conduct (including through electronic means), unwanted statements of a sexual nature intentionally stated to a person or group of people, that are objectively offensive to a reasonable person and also so severe or pervasive that they created a Hostile Environment, as defined in the Model Policy.

2. Physical conduct.

Source:
UT System Model Policy for Sexual Misconduct (2021)
Definition of “Other Inappropriate Sexual Conduct” (Cont.)

Potential Examples (depending on facts):
- Unwelcome sexual advances (including explicit or implicit proposition(s) of sexual contact or activity);
- Requests for sexual favors (including overt or subtle pressure);
- Gratuitous comments about an individual’s sexual activities or speculation about an individual’s sexual experiences;
- Gratuitous comments, jokes, questions, anecdotes or remarks of a sexual nature about clothing or bodies;
- Persistent, unwanted sexual or romantic attention;
- Exposure to sexually suggestive visual displays such as photographs, graffiti, posters, calendars or other materials;
- Deliberate, repeated humiliation or intimidation;
- Sexual exploitation;
- Unwelcome intentional touching of a sexual nature; or
- Deliberate physical interference with or restriction of movement.

Source:
UT System Model Policy for Sexual Misconduct (2021)

Important Distinction for Sexual Harassment Cases

If the conduct alleged is “sexual harassment,” then the advisors will ask questions at the hearing.
Title IX/Sexual Harassment

Notice

Investigation (No determination)

Both parties have access to all evidence related to the allegation(s) & ability to comment

No Administrative Disposition
Hearing Required

Appeal

Non-Sexual Harassment

Notice

Investigation (Preliminary determination)

Both parties have access to all evidence related to the allegation(s) & ability to comment

Administrative Disposition or Hearing Options

Appeal

Outline Comparisons...

Bottomline for Advisors at the Hearing

Sexual Harassment Cases

• Advisors will ask questions.
• Parties must have advisor.

Non-Sexual Harassment Cases

• Advisors will not ask questions.
• Parties may have advisor.
• Cross-examination questions go through the Hearing Officer.

All cases: Advisors are not to do opening statements, closing statements, lodge objections, or talk at the hearing.
Applies to Sexual Harassment Cases & advisors asking questions during the hearing.

Remainder of this training...

Pre-Hearing
Before the Hearing:

- Review materials.
- Review your institution's policy.

Engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety or the safety of others or suffer substantial emotional distress.

For the purposes of this definition:

- **Course of conduct** means two or more acts, including, but not limited to, acts in which the stalker directly, indirectly, or through third parties, by any action, method, device, or means, follows, monitors, observes, surveils, threatens, or communicates to or about a person, or interferes with a person's property.
- **Reasonable person** means a reasonable person under similar circumstances and with similar identities to the victim.
- **Substantial emotional distress** means significant mental suffering or anguish that may, but does not necessarily, require medical or other professional treatment or counseling.
Engaging in a (1) course of conduct (2) directed at a specific person that would (3) cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety or the safety of others or suffer substantial emotional distress.

For the purposes of this definition:

- **Course of conduct** means two or more acts, including, but not limited to, acts in which the stalker directly, indirectly, or through third parties, by any action, method, device, or means, follows, monitors, observes, surveils, threatens, or communicates to or about a person, or interferes with a person's property.

- **Reasonable person** means a reasonable person under similar circumstances and with similar identities to the victim.

- **Substantial emotional distress** means significant mental suffering or anguish that may, but does not necessarily, require medical or other professional treatment or counseling.

---

**Before the Hearing:**

 Attempt to Meet With Your Advisee

- Explain your **Advisor role**. You are not "representing" the advisee.

- Discuss a **strategy**:
  - Accept responsibility? No administrative disposition. RP may agree to conduct. Do you want to focus on mitigating factors?
  - What is the story? What evidence exists to support that story?
  - Review the investigation report & evidence. Outline what is important. What do you need from each witness to tell the story?

**Note:** The use of the word “story” does **not** mean false. Different people often have different perceptions of same events.
Before the Hearing:

**Tips for Examining Witnesses:**
- If it’s a witness you & your Advisee are calling, before the hearing (if possible):
  - Ask your Advisee for questions they’d like asked of each witness.
  - With the Advisee & each witness: Meet or talk through what you will ask.
  - In drafting questions, focus on what is **relevant** to a potential **policy violation**.

**Note:** A prior meeting with the advisee or witnesses may not be possible or practicable before the hearing.

---

**At the Hearing**
Overview of Hearing

- Opening remarks by Hearing Officer
- Opening Statements
- Questioning of Witnesses
- Closing Statements

Presentation of Witnesses & Exhibits

- University Witness
- University Rep
- Party’s Advisor
Procedure for Asking Questions

The advisors may ask questions under the following procedure:

1. The advisor will ask a question of the applicable participant.
2. Before the participant answers a question, the hearing officer will rule as to whether the advisor’s question is relevant to the alleged conduct charges.
   - If the hearing officer rules the advisor’s question as not relevant, then the hearing officer must explain any decision to exclude a question as not relevant.
   - If the hearing officer allows the question as relevant, the participant will answer the question.

Source:
UT System Model Policy for Sexual Misconduct (2021)

Relevant Evidence

Evidence is relevant if:
- The evidence has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence; and
- The fact is of consequence in determining the action.
Relevance: Prior Sexual History

A Complainant’s sexual predisposition or prior sexual behavior are not relevant except where questions and evidence about a Complainant’s prior sexual behavior are offered to prove that someone other than the Respondent committed the alleged conduct charged by the Complainant or if the questions or evidence concern specific incidents of the Complainant’s prior sexual behavior with the Respondent and are offered to prove the Complainant’s consent of the alleged conduct.

Tips at the Hearing:

• Ensure that your Advisee is heard and felt heard by giving your Advisee an opportunity to tell their story.
• Feel free to take breaks & talk to your Advisee.
• Before finishing with a witness, ask your Advisee if he/she/they have any other questions for that witness.

Remember: This is likely a major life event for both the Complainant & Respondent.
Tips at the Hearing: Examining Witnesses

If it is a witness you call, tell the story. What happened? Use open ended questions.

- What…
- Who…
- When…
- What did you do next?
- What happened after that?
- Describe…
- Tell us…
- Explain to the hearing officer why…

Tips at the Hearing: Examining Witnesses

Focus on what is important.

- Policy violation
- Example: Stalking
  (1) Course of conduct
  (2) directed at a person
  (3) that would cause a reasonable person to fear for their safety or cause substantial emotional distress
Tips at the Hearing: Examining Witnesses

For witnesses called by the opposing party:

- Get in. Get out. Could be very short.
- Brief questions.
- Leading questions.
  - Isn’t it true that…
  - XYZ, right?
  - XYZ, correct?
  - It’s also true that…

Tips at the Hearing: Examining Witnesses

For witnesses called by the opposing party:

- Calm demeanor. Normal volume. Not TV.
- Listen.
- Don’t quarrel or fight.
- If the answer is contrary to the evidence, it shows the witness is not credible.
- If the witness’s explanation doesn’t make sense, you just made your point. Don’t ask them to explain. Move on.
- Questions may focus on credibility.
Tips at the Hearing: Examining Witnesses

**Credibility:**
- Are there inconsistencies? Is an explanation plausible?
- What did the witness do? What did they *not* do?
- Are there motives for the witness to be less than truthful?
- Are there motives for the witness to frame the event in a way more favorable to themselves? Are they lying to themselves?
- Is there an opportunity for a good faith mistake?

**Test for implicit bias:**
- What is the essence?
- Create hypo that includes elements. Switch genders.
Should an institution assign advisors for both parties as soon as the formal grievance process begins? Upon request from a party? At the closing steps of the Investigation Stage?
If a party has an advisor of choice, should the institution appoint a university advisor as a back-up in case that party’s advisor does not attend the hearing?

Question 2

You have been assigned to advise a student at an upcoming hearing. Two weeks before the hearing, you attempt to contact the student but the student doesn’t respond. You email again two more times and call the student. The student does not respond.

Hypothetical 1

What do you do?
You have been assigned an Advisee. Your Advisee states he/she/they did not commit the policy violation. Among the evidence is a video showing the person committing the policy violation. The Advisee wants you to ask cross-examination questions of the witnesses and to ask questions that you think are ridiculous.
If a party wants to ask a question that the advisor thinks is not a good idea (and is potentially even detrimental to the party’s position), does the advisor have to ask that question?

In other words, if the party and advisor disagree on a course of action, must the advisor go along?

*What do you do?*

You are advising a student (RP) in a case where the student is accused of sending three inappropriate text messages expressing a romantic interest in the CP. You ask the RP for any questions RP has for the other party. Together with any questions you can think of, you estimate the cross-examination will only last 5 minutes. You wonder if this is adequate.

*What do you do?*
Hypothetical 3

Updates

At the hearing, right before you question a witness adverse to the student you are advising, the witness makes statements that are inconsistent with statements made previously (summarized in the investigation report).

What do you do?

Hypothetical 4

Your advisee slowly grows more and more frustrated at the hearing during questioning and states that he/she/they refuses to answer certain questions because the questions are “harassing” and “unfair.”

What do you do?
You advise a party. After the hearing, the Advisee thanks you for your help.
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