



The “Participation Update” and Due Process in Title IX

D. STAFFORD & ASSOCIATES & NACCOP

PRESENTED SEPTEMBER 20, 2022

ANN TODD, D. STAFFORD & ASSOCIATES

1



Today’s webinar is being conducted by the National Association of Clery Compliance Officers and Professionals (NACCOP).

© 2022 NACCOP

Sponsored by



D. STAFFORD
& ASSOCIATES

NACCOP Partners



ASCA
Association for Student Conduct Administration

2

2

A Timeline on the Issue



May 2020 New Regulations (Trump Administration)
Says must participate or statements are suppressed



3

So what are we talking about?

- Exclusionary Rule
- Suppression Clause
- Participation Rule
- Preclusion Requirement

4

2020 Title IX Regulations



- “If a party or witness does not submit to cross-examination at the live hearing, the decision-maker(s) must not rely on any statement of that party or witness in reaching a determination regarding responsibility.”

© 2022 NACCOP

5

5

Clarifications (from the preamble)



- “The Department declines to add exceptions to this provision, such as permitting reliance on statements against a party’s interest.” (*Too hard for non-attorneys*)
- “If a party or witness makes a statement in the video, then the decision-maker may not rely on the statement of that party or witness in reaching a determination regarding responsibility” (*But video without a statement of the incident is admissible*)
- “Even though a party’s statements that are not subject to cross-examination might be admissible in a civil or criminal trial under rules of evidence that apply in those contexts, the Department has determined that such untested statements, whether testimonial or nontestimonial, should not be relied on.” (*Hearsay exceptions in courts don’t apply here*)
- “Police reports, SANE reports, medical reports, and other documents and records may not be relied on to the extent that they contain the statements of a party or witness who has not submitted to cross-examination.” (*Requires attendance of professionals*)

© 2022 NACCOP

6

6

Caveats



Only applies to sexual harassment cases


Only required if for higher education (which requires hearing)

Doesn't apply to questions by the decision-maker, just the advisor

© 2022 NACCOP

7

7



ANYONE WITH HEARING UNDER 2020 REGS WITH ABSENT PARTY OR WITNESS?

© 2022 NACCOP

8

8

A Timeline on the Issue



May 2020 New Regulations (Trump Administration)
Says must participate or statements are suppressed

July 2021 Q and A on Title IX (Biden Administration)
Repeats rule and pulls problematic examples from preamble

© 2022 NACCOP

9

9

OCR 2021 Q and A

- Question 42: Are parties and witnesses required to participate in the Title IX grievance process, including submitting to cross examination during a live hearing at the postsecondary school level? *Answer 42: No. Parties and witnesses are not required to submit to cross examination or otherwise participate in the Title IX grievance process... FOR INFORMATION ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT PARTICIPATING, SEE QUESTIONS BELOW...*

10

© 2022 NACCOP

10



OCR 2021 Q & A


“The preamble explains that even if a party is unable to participate at a hearing “due to death or post investigation disability,” the school’s decision makers may not rely on any statements from that individual in their decision making about whether the respondent has committed sexual harassment in violation of school policy.”

(Question 51, p. 25)

© 2022 NACCOP

11

11



Q&A Question 53: Using Statements When the Party Does Not Submit to Cross

“. . . evidence in which a party or witness comments on the interaction between the parties without engaging in harassment (e.g., email or text exchanges leading up to the alleged harassment or an admission, an apology, or other comment about the alleged harassment), would be considered statements that could not be considered unless the party or witness is cross-examined.” (Question 53, p. 27)

© 2022 NACCOP

12

12

Q&A Question 54: Multiple Party Statements

“The preamble explains that in such cases, even if a party or witness in a text message, email, or video does not submit to cross-examination, the decision-maker may still rely on the statements by other people in that text message, email, or video who do submit to cross-examination.” (Question 54, p. 27)



13

© 2022 NACCOP

13

A Timeline on the Issue



May 2020 New Regulations (Trump Administration)
Says must participate or statements are suppressed

July 2021 Q and A on Title IX (Biden Administration)
Repeats rule and pulls problematic examples from preamble

Jul 28, 2021 Mass. court vacates rule in VRLC v. Cardona decision

14

© 2022 NACCOP

14

Victims Rights Law Center v. Cardona



- The Department had not “considered or adequately explained why it intended for section 106.45(6)(i) to compound with a respondent's procedural safeguards quickly to render the most vital and ultimate hallmark of the investigation -- the hearing -- a remarkably hollow gesture.”
- This rule created several opportunities for a respondent to “further a disruptive agenda” which could include not attending the hearing to avoid self-incrimination and encouraging other witnesses not to appear for questioning.
- “This is not some extreme outlier or fanciful scenario. No attorney worth her salt, recognizing that -- were her client simply not to show up for the hearing -- an ironclad bar would descend, suppressing any inculpatory statements her client might have made to the police or third parties, would hesitate so to advise.”


[Victims Rights Law Center v. Cardona](#), No. CV 20-11104-WGY, 2021 WL 3185743, (D. Mass. July 28, 2021)

© 2022 NACCOP

15

15

A Timeline on the Issue



© 2022 NACCOP

16

16



ANYONE WITH HEARING POST CARDONA?

© 2022 NACCOP

17

17

A Timeline on the Issue



May 2020 New Regulations (Trump Administration)
Says must participate or statements are suppressed

July 2021 Q and A on Title IX (Biden Administration)
Repeats rule and pulls problematic examples from preamble

Jul 28, 2021 Mass. court vacates rule in *VRIC v. Cardona* decision
Aug 10, 2021 Court applied decision nationwide (but case is on appeal)
Aug 24, 2021 Dept of Education announces will no longer enforce

Jun 28, 2022 Dept of Education updates Q and A on Title IX
Removes language in conflict; states CANNOT suppress

© 2022 NACCOP

18

18

Revised Q and A (June 28, 2022)



- **Question D:** Despite the court’s decision, may a postsecondary school choose to maintain the prohibition on considering statements made by a party or witness who does not submit to cross-examination at a live hearing as part of its Title IX grievance process?
- **Answer D:** *No. The 2020 amendments require “an objective evaluation of all relevant evidence.” To the extent that statements made by a party or witness who does not submit to cross-examination at a live hearing satisfy the regulation’s relevance rules, they must be considered in any postsecondary school’s Title IX grievance process that is initiated after July 28, 2021.*

© 2022 NACCOP

19

19

Really, you should go ahead and change...




- ~~“If a party or witness does not submit to cross-examination at the live hearing, the decision-maker(s) must not rely on any statement of that party or witness in reaching a determination regarding responsibility”~~
- **Victims Rights Law Center et al. v. Cardona**, WL 3185743 (D. Mass. July 28, 2021)

© 2022 NACCOP

20

20

A Timeline on the Issue



© 2022 NACCOP

21

21

2022 Proposed Title IX Regulations



- **106.46(f)(4) Refusal to respond to questions related to credibility.**

If a party does not respond to questions related to their credibility, the decisionmaker must not rely on any statement of that party that supports that party's position.

© 2022 NACCOP

22

22

Credibility Checklist




Truthfulness	Past behaviors	Post assaultive behaviors	Corroborating evidence	Ability to perceive
Ability to remember	Plausibility	Demeanor	Motivation	Bias

© 2022 NACCOP

23

23



Other Evidence



Confession

“When credibility is not in dispute . . . cross-examination is unwarranted”

© 2022 NACCOP

24



Waive Right to Hearing

24

From the 2022 preamble...



- “The Department is concerned, however, that placing no limitations on the decisionmaker’s ability to consider statements made by a party who does not submit to a credibility assessment could lead to manipulation by the parties.
- For example...a complainant could write an email to a friend and leave a voicemail for another friend detailing the events. If the complainant refused to submit to a credibility assessment, the decisionmaker would be permitted to consider the email and voicemail for their truth, but the respondent would not have an opportunity to question the complainant, including to assess credibility.”

© 2022 NACCOP

25

25

And more from the preamble...



- “It would apply when a party refuses to answer questions related to their own credibility either during the investigation in individual meetings with the decisionmaker or investigator or during the live hearing, if the postsecondary institution holds a live hearing. The Department would propose this change regardless of whether the district court’s vacatur is ultimately upheld on appeal.”

© 2022 NACCOP

26

26



ANN'S OPINION

NOT ALL EVIDENCE IS CREATED EQUAL. DECISION-MAKERS SHOULD WEIGH ALL EVIDENCE BASED ON CREDIBILITY ETC.

© 2022 NACCOP 27

27

Decision-Maker Assessments

© 2022 NACCOP



Easy

- Gender
- Status as Complainant/Respondent
- Inadmissible information (rape shield, privileged)




Hard

- Delayed report
- Inconsistent versions
- Incapacitated parties
- Absent

28

28


Two Grievance Procedures



© 2022 NACCOP

29

29



30

The Report



Four students from your college are arrested. They are accused of drugging your school’s librarian and stealing \$5 million dollars worth of rare books from your school’s library. Your president says, “kick them out.” What due process rights should they get before you do so? (And does the librarian have any rights?)

© 2022 NACCOP


31

31

What process is due?



Public



Private



© 2022 NACCOP

32

32



When do we feel due process is warranted?

- Any discipline
- Academic discipline
- Behavior discipline
- Short term Suspension
- Long term Suspension
- Expulsion

© 2022 NACCOP

33

33

Comparing Notice



2020	NEW 106.45 (DOES NOT NEED TO BE IN WRITING!!!)	NEW 106.46
		YES
“Sufficient details” (parties, conduct, date, location)	YES “Sufficient information”	YES “Sufficient information”
Statement that retaliation prohibited	YES	YES
Respondent is presumed not responsible		YES
Right to advisor of choice		YES
Prohibition on false statements*		YES

© 2022 NACCOP

34

34

RULES OF A HEARING (Q43 & Q44)



“ . . . may decide whether or how to place limits on evidence introduced at a hearing that was not gathered and presented prior to the hearing.”

“The preamble adds that a school may adopt a rule stating that duplicative questions are irrelevant.”

“ . . . a postsecondary school could limit the role of advisors to relaying questions drafted by their party.”

“ . . . a school may prohibit advisors from questioning parties or witnesses in an abusive, intimidating, or disrespectful manner.”

“ . . . a school may enforce a rule requiring that relevant questions must be asked in a respectful, non abusive manner.”

© 2022 NACCOP

35

35

Thanks to our
sponsor!



D. STAFFORD
& ASSOCIATES

For more information:
dstaffordandassociates.com

Upcoming D. Stafford Title IX Classes

Title IX Coordinator Training (virtual) -

October 10-14, 2022

Introduction to Title IX (virtual) -

November 16, 2022

Check out our website for more information on the above plus national and institution offerings on Threat Assessment, Clery Compliance, and Procedural Justice.

© 2022 NACCOP

36

36