

University Senate TRANSMITTAL FORM

Senate Document #:	14-15-26
Title:	Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Staff Procedures
Presenter:	Brandon Dula, Chair, Senate Staff Affairs Committee
Date of SEC Review:	April 19, 2016
Date of Senate Review:	April 28, 2016
Voting (highlight one):	1. On resolutions or recommendations one by one, or
	2. In a single vote
	3. To endorse entire report
Statement of Issue:	In fall 2014, the Office of Civil Rights & Sexual Misconduct
	(OCRSM) and the University administration developed interim
	procedures for resolving complaints of sexual misconduct
	brought against faculty and staff at the University. The
	procedures were approved on an interim basis in January 2015. In
	February 2015, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Staff Affairs Committee with review of the interim University
	of Maryland Staff Sexual Misconduct Investigation & Adjudication
	Procedures, Appendix B of the University of Maryland Sexual
	Misconduct Policy & Procedures.
Relevant Policy # & URL:	VI-1.60(A) University of Maryland Sexual Misconduct Policy &
,	Procedures – Appendix B
	http://umd.edu/policies/docs/VI-160A.pdf
Recommendation:	The Staff Affairs Committee recommends that the Staff Sexual
	Misconduct Complaint Procedures (Appendix B of VI-1.60[A]
	University of Maryland Sexual Misconduct Policy & Procedures)
	be amended as indicated in the procedures document
	immediately following the committee's report.
	The Staff Affairs Committee recommends that any <i>Notice of</i>
	Disciplinary Action sent to Respondents under the Staff Sexual
	Misconduct Complaint Procedures provide guidance on grievance
	processes at the University (e.g., by stating that the Staff Ombuds Officer is available to assist staff in understanding grievance
	policies and rights based on specific employee status), as
	appropriate. In addition, the committee recommends that
	University Human Resources and the OCRSM ensure that their
	websites provide guidance for employees on staff grievance
	Transition by a true Paragraphic to the profession and Princialise

	rights and policies, as they relate to the Staff Sexual Misconduct
Complaint Procedures, where appropriate.	

Committee Work:

The Staff Affairs Committee began reviewing the charge in spring 2015. The committee reviewed the work of the Senate Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Committee on the Sexual Misconduct Policy, and discussed how sexual misconduct cases involving staff have been handled in the past at the University, as well as at other institutions of higher education. The committee consulted with University Human Resources (UHR), the Office of General Counsel (OGC), and the OCRSM. The committee also sought to remain apprised of revisions to the Sexual Misconduct Procedures for faculty and students through the parallel Senate committee processes.

The committee developed a number of potential edits for the interim procedures. UHR and the Office of Staff Relations also submitted several comments about the interim procedures for consideration by the committee, which the committee discussed in detail with the Title IX Officer.

In fall 2015, the Senate Office received word that the OCRSM and the administration were developing revised versions of all three sets of the interim procedures. Revised procedures for faculty and staff were approved by the President on an interim basis on October 1, 2015. The committee reviewed the new interim staff procedures, and focused on a number of areas of change in the procedures, which it discussed thoroughly.

After final review, the Staff Affairs Committee approved the revised Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures and an administrative recommendation related to grievance rights via an email vote ending November 16, 2015. The committee sent its recommendations forward for review by the SEC. However, at the same time, the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) of the State of Maryland determined that it needed to conduct a holistic review of all policies and procedures related to sexual misconduct at all University System of Maryland (USM) institutions. As a result, the procedures developed by the committee were not sent to the Senate for review. In March 2016, after extensive consultation between the OAG, the OGC, and the OCRSM, the Senate Office received revised interim procedures for review.

The committee reviewed the revised interim procedures during March 2016. The committee discussed issues related to Interim Protective Measures, the Initial Assessment, the Appeals process,

	and other areas of the procedures. After consultation with the OGC and OCRSM, and after deliberation as a committee, the Staff Affairs Committee voted to approve its proposed revisions to the new interim procedures via an email vote, concluding April 15,
	2016.
Alternatives:	The Senate could reject the recommendations. However, the Senate would lose an opportunity to revise the Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures.
Risks:	There are no associated risks.
Financial Implications:	There are no financial implications.
Further Approvals Required:	Senate approval, Presidential approval.

Senate Staff Affairs Committee

Report on Senate Document # 14-15-26

Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Staff Procedures

April 2016

2015-2016 Staff Affairs Committee Members

Brandon Dula, Chair

Colleen Dove Auburger, Ex-Officio, VP Administration & Finance Rep

Andrea Goltz, Ex-Officio, Provost's Rep

Jennifer Matthews, Ex-Officio, University Human Resources Rep

Brooke Supple, Ex-Officio, VP Student Affairs Rep

Dylan Baker, Ex-Officio, CUSS Rep

Maureen Schrimpe, Ex-Officio, CUSS Rep

Dana Wimbish, Ex-Officio, CUSS Rep

Sarah Goff-Tlemsani, Ex-Officio, CUSS Alternate Rep (non-voting)

Deborah Grover, Ex-Officio, CUSS Alternate Rep (non-voting)

David Klossner, Ex-Officio, CUSS Alternate Rep (non-voting)

Carol Bonkosky, Non-Exempt Staff

Jasmine Cooper, Non-Exempt Staff

Marci Deloatch, Non-Exempt Staff

Rosanne Hoaas, Non-Exempt Staff

Michelle DeOrnellas, Exempt Staff

Ingrid Farrell, Exempt Staff

Marchon Jackson, Exempt Staff

Maribeth Kibbey, Non-Exempt Staff Contingent II

Gregory Stoker, Exempt Staff Contingent II

Jo Zimmerman, Faculty

Shayna Mazel, Graduate Student

BACKGROUND

In fall 2014, the Office of Civil Rights & Sexual Misconduct (OCRSM) and the University administration worked together to develop interim procedures for resolving cases of sexual misconduct brought against faculty and staff at the University. The procedures were approved on an interim basis in January 2015 and subsequently sent to the Senate for review.

On February 9, 2015, in conjunction with the Senate's review of the interim University of Maryland Sexual Misconduct Policy (Senate Doc. 14-15-11), the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Staff Affairs Committee with review of the interim University of Maryland Staff Sexual Misconduct Investigation & Adjudication Procedures, which appeared as Appendix B of the University of Maryland Sexual Misconduct Policy. The SEC asked the Staff Affairs Committee to make recommendations on whether these interim procedures are appropriate for the University (Appendix 1).

COMMITTEE WORK

The Staff Affairs Committee began reviewing the charge during the spring 2015 semester. The committee reviewed the work of the Senate Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) Committee on the Sexual Misconduct Policy (Senate Doc. 14-15-11), and discussed how sexual misconduct cases involving staff have been handled in the past at the University, as well as at other institutions of higher education. Throughout its review process, the Staff Affairs Committee consulted with University Human Resources, the Office of General Counsel (OGC), and the OCRSM. The committee met with the University's Title IX Officer on a number of occasions, to discuss the interim procedures in detail. The committee also sought to remain apprised of concurring revisions to the Sexual Misconduct Procedures for faculty and students through the parallel processes in the Senate Faculty Affairs and Student Conduct Committees.

The committee first met with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on March 12, 2015 to discuss the interim procedures. Additionally, the committee met with the Assistant Vice President for Human Resources on April 13, 2015, and the Title IX Officer on May 7, 2015.

The 2014-2015 Staff Affairs Committee developed a number of potential edits for the interim procedures. Likewise, University Human Resources and the Office of Staff Relations submitted several comments about the interim procedures for consideration by the committee. Most of the comments focused on assurance of due process, equity, and fairness. The committee discussed these comments, and other matters, at length with the Title IX Officer at the end of the 2014-2015 academic year.

In fall 2015, the Senate Office received word that the OCRSM and the administration were developing revised versions of all three sets interim procedures, due to issues with the procedures found while conducting investigations in spring and summer 2015. The OCRSM determined that immediate changes were needed in order to streamline processes. Revised procedures for faculty and staff were approved by the President on an interim basis on October 1, 2015 (Appendix 3). The new interim procedures were renamed as the Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures. The 2015-2016 Staff Affairs Committee immediately began reviewing these new interim procedures by considering revisions to align with the procedures for faculty and students, and highlighted substantive changes in the procedures for further discussion.

As it reviewed the new interim procedures, the committee focused on a number of areas of change in the procedures, including the absence of a process for the parties to appeal the Finding by the Special Investigator, which had previously existed in the January interim procedures. The committee's coordinator frequently presented suggested changes and edits to the procedures that were concurrently being reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Student Conduct Committee, for the Staff

Affairs Committee's consideration. Some of these revisions included clarification of the difference between making a report of sexual misconduct and officially filing a complaint of sexual misconduct with the OCRSM, and the addition of a of the Finding by a Standing Review Committee (SRC). The committee was in support of adding an automatic independent review of the Finding to the new interim procedures, in order to provide an adequate level of oversight of the Finding by the Special Investigator, while staying sensitive to the overall timeline of the resolution process.

The interim procedures included a list of existing grievance policies and procedures that staff may be able to use, depending on disciplinary action given and the staff member's employee status at the University. However, through further discussion with the Title IX Officer and the Office of General Counsel, it was suggested that this information be removed. The committee considered this recommendation and was somewhat concerned about the lack of information in the procedures on how to initiate a grievance, if needed. After consideration of possible alternatives, the committee voted to approve an administrative recommendation that University Human Resources and the OCRSM should ensure that their websites provide guidance for employees on staff grievance rights and policies, as they relate to the Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures, where appropriate. The committee decided to recommend that that the *Notice of Disciplinary Action*, which may be sent to Respondents under the Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures if they are to receive disciplinary action, should provide guidance on grievance processes at the University (e.g., by stating that the Staff Ombuds Officer is available to assist staff in understanding grievance policies and rights based on specific employee status), as appropriate.

After a final discussion and thorough review of the procedures as edited by the committee, the Staff Affairs Committee approved the revised Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures, and the administrative recommendation related to grievance rights, via an email vote ending Monday, November 16, 2015. The committee sent its recommendations forward for review by the SEC. However, at the same time, the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) of the State of Maryland determined that it needed to conduct a holistic review of all policies and procedures related to sexual misconduct at all University System of Maryland (USM) institutions. As a result, the procedures developed by the Staff Affairs Committee were not sent to the Senate for review. In March 2016, after extensive consultation between the OAG, the OGC, and the OCRSM, the Senate Office received revised interim procedures for review (Appendix 2).

The revised interim procedures incorporate a few key issues discussed by the committee during its fall 2015 review. For instance, the procedures expressly state that all Complainants and Respondents will have the opportunity to have one Support Person and one Advisor with them during the process, at their own expense and initiation. The procedures also clarify many technical issues raised by the Staff Affairs and the Faculty Affairs Committees as proposed amendments in their fall 2015 drafts. The coordinators for both committees ensured that concerns shared by the committees were addressed by the OCG and the OCRSM for clarification during committee discussions.

After consultation with the OGC and OCRSM, and after deliberation as a committee, the Staff Affairs Committee voted to approve its proposed revisions to the new interim procedures via an email vote, concluding April 15, 2016.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Staff Affairs Committee recommends that the Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures (Appendix B of VI-1.60[A] University of Maryland Sexual Misconduct Policy & Procedures) be amended as indicated in the procedures document immediately following this report.

The Staff Affairs Committee recommends that any *Notice of Disciplinary Action* sent to Respondents under the Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures provide guidance on grievance processes at the University (e.g., by stating that the Staff Ombuds Officer at UMD is available to assist staff in understanding grievance policies and rights based on specific employee status), as appropriate. In addition, the committee recommends that University Human Resources and the OCRSM ensure that their websites provide guidance for employees on staff grievance rights and policies, as they relate to the Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures, where appropriate.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Charge from the Senate Executive Committee on the Review of the Interim Sexual Misconduct Staff Procedures (dated February 9, 2015)

Appendix 2 – Revised Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures (approved on an interim basis on March 21, 2016)

Appendix 3 – Interim Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures (approved on interim basis on October 1, 2015)

Recommended Changes to the Interim Staff Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures
New Text in Blue/Bold (example), Removed Text in Red/Strikeout (example), Moved Text in Green (example)

I. Overview

II. Rights to Support Person and Advisor

- A. Support Person
- B. Advisor
- C. Party Obligations
- D. Non-Party Participant Requirements

III. Reporting

IV. Complaint Intake Process

- A. Notification to Complainant
- B. Requests for Confidentiality
- C. Initial Assessment
- D. Interim Protective Measures

V. Resolution Processes

- A. Time Frame for Resolution
- B. Alternative Resolution Process
- C. Investigation Process

VI. Appeals of Finding

- A. Overview
- B. Grounds for Appeal
- C. **SRC** Appellate Body
- D. Appeal Outcome

VII. Remedies & and Disciplinary Action

- A. Impact Statement & and Mitigation Statements
- B. Remedies
- C. Disciplinary Action

VIII. Grievance Rights

- IX. Final Outcome
- X. Records Retention
- XI. Post-Resolution Follow-Up

I. OVERVIEW

These procedures ("Staff Procedures") set forth in Appendix B accompany the University of Maryland (UMD) Sexual Misconduct Policy (the "Policy") and are the exclusive procedures that govern the handling of all reports or complaints of sSexual mMisconduct against UMD staff. Key terms used herein are defined in the Policy. For example, sSexual mMisconduct is an umbrella term defined in the Policy that encompasses dDating vViolence, dDomestic vViolence, sSexual vViolence, sSexual hHarassment, sSexual aAssault, sSexual eExploitation, sSexual iIntimidation, rRelationship vViolence, and sStalking.

For purposes of the Policy and these Staff Procedures, staff include University coaches and all University employees other than those with faculty rank as described in II-1.00(A) University of Maryland Policy on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty at http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/2014-ii-100a.html¹.

Employees with faculty rank are governed by the Faculty Sexual Misconduct Complaint Procedures (*see Appendix C*). These **Staff pP**rocedures replace all procedures previously in effect pertaining to the investigation and resolution of **sS**exual **mM**isconduct complaints against staff at the University of Maryland-UMD.

II. RIGHTS TO SUPPORT PERSON AND ADVISOR

Throughout the process, any party may be accompanied to any meeting related to an investigation and resolution of a complaint by up to two (2) other people: (1) a Support Person, and/or (2) an Advisor. Meetings include, but are not limited to, meetings with the Office of Civil Rights & Sexual Misconduct (OCRSM), investigative interviews, and document reviews, and alternative resolutions.

A. Support Person

A party may choose to be accompanied by a Support Person of their choice, at their own initiation and expense. A Support Person is someone who can provide emotional, logistical, or other kinds of assistance. The Support Person cannot be a witness or provide evidence in the case. The Support Person is a non-participant who is present to assist a Complainant or Respondent by taking notes, providing emotional support and reassurance, organizing documentation, or consulting directly with the party in a way that does not disrupt or cause any delay. A Support Person shall not be an active participant and the parties must speak for themselves.

B. Advisor

A party may choose to be assisted by an Advisor of their choice, including an attorney, at their own initiation and expense. The Advisor is a non-participant who is present to provide advice and consultation to a party. An Advisor cannot be a witness or provide evidence in a case. If necessary, a party may request a recess in order to speak privately with an Advisor. An Advisor shall not be an active participant. The parties must speak for themselves. An Advisor may not delay, or otherwise interfere with, the University's process.

C. Party Obligations

¹ Complaints against law enforcement officers will be investigated and adjudicated consistent with the requirements of the Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights (LEOBR), Md. Code Ann., Public Safety Article, Title 3, Subtitle 1.

Throughout the process, the Title IX Officer or designee, Investigators, and other University representatives will communicate and correspond directly with the parties, not through a Support Person or Advisor. Parties are responsible for having ensuring that Support Persons and Advisors follow the non-party participation requirements below. When a party wishes to have a Support Person and/or Advisor accompany them to a meeting, the individual party must notify the OCRSM in advance. Parties are also responsible for making sure appropriate authorization exists for the University to communicate the non-party participation requirements below to any Support Person or Advisor.

D. Non-Party Participant Requirements

All Support Persons and Advisors must review the materials about the scope of their respective roles, prior to accompanying a party to any meeting or other activity. These materials may be obtained online at the OCRSM website, www.umd.edu/ocrsm/ or from the OCRSM directly. This is to ensure the Support Persons and Advisors are informed about the process and their respective roles. All parties, Support Persons, and Advisors are expected to understand their roles and adhere to the University's expectations regarding decorum and privacy considerations.

III. REPORTING

Complaints and other reports of sSexual mMisconduct against staff may be made to the OCRSM.

Complaints Reports may also be made to any Responsible University Employee (RUE). An RUE, as defined by this the Policy, includes all University administrators, supervisors in non-confidential roles, faculty members, campus police, coaches, athletic trainers, resident assistants, and non-confidential first responders. Responsible University Employees RUEs are required to share all reports of sSexual mMisconduct they receive; promptly with the Title IX Officer or designee.

Students Complainants may also report sexual mMisconduct against staff to the Office of Student Conduct (OSC), or to the Office of Rights & Responsibilities (R&R) in the Department of Resident Life.

Prompt reporting of Prohibited Conduct is encouraged so that the University can take immediate and corrective action to eliminate the misconduct, prevent its recurrence, and address its effects. The University will provide support and assistance to the Complainant and respond according to the steps outlined in these Staff Procedures. As described in section IV. C, Uupon receipt of any report, the Title IX Officer or designee will make an immediate assessment of the risk of harm to the parties or to the eampus University community and will take steps necessary to address any risks. These steps may include working with the Office of Staff Relations in University Human Resources and other campus offices to facilitate Interim Protective Measures (as described in section IV. D) that provide for the safety of the parties and the eampus University community, when appropriate.

A Complainant may choose to make a report to the University and pursue resolution under these Staff Procedures, and may also choose to make a report to law enforcement. A Complainant may pursue either of these options or both options at the same time. The criminal process and the University's internal process under these Staff Procedures are separate and independent. A Complainant who wishes to pursue criminal action should contact campus police or external law enforcement directly. See Policy Section VII for more information on criminal reporting.

The University recognizes that deciding whether to report sSexual mMisconduct and proceed with a formal complaint under these Staff Procedures is a personal decision that may evolve over time. While prompt reporting is strongly encouraged, there is no time limit for reporting a complaint of sSexual mMisconduct. The OCRSM will coordinate with the appropriate University office to provide support and assistance to each Complainant in making important decisions related to reports of sSexual mMisconduct.

Consistent with the goal of safety for all **University** community members, the University will make every effort to respect a Complainant's autonomy in making their own personal decisions after reporting sSexual mMisconduct. However, when appropriate, the University, through the OCRSM, retains the right to initiate a formal complaint on its own, independent of any individual's decision as to how they wish to proceed.

IV. COMPLAINT INTAKE PROCESS

A. Notification to the Complainant

Upon receipt of a complaint, the OCRSM will ensure that the Complainant is provided with a copy of the Policy and Staff Procedures and is informed of their rights and responsibilities. The OCRSM will provide information to the Complainant about the University's internal, administrative complaint process and review with them their respective rights and responsibilities. The Complainant will be informed of available community and campus resources and services; their right to a Support Person and the Support Person's role; their right to an Advisor and the Advisor's role; their right to file a report with law enforcement, or not; and the University's prohibition against retaliation. The Complainant will have an opportunity to ask questions and seek additional information.

B. Requests for Confidentiality

Whenever possible, the OCRSM will take action consistent with the Complainant's expressed wishes regarding confidentiality. The University's ability to fully investigate and respond to a complaint may be limited if the Complainant requests that their name not be disclosed to the Respondent or declines to participate in an Investigation. When a Complainant requests their name or other identifiable information not be disclosed and/or that no further action be taken, the Title IX Officer or designee will seek to honor such requests, balancing the Complainant's wishes for confidentiality with the University's obligation to provide a safe and non-discriminatory environment for all members of the University community. The University retains the right to proceed with a complaint as necessary to meet its obligations, and in some cases, may not be able to honor a request for confidentiality.

C. Initial Assessment of Complaint

When the University receives a complaint, the OCRSM will conduct an Initial Assessment. The Initial Assessment will determine whether the reported conduct constitutes a potential violation of the Policy, and if whether further action is warranted based on the reported conduct, and whether the University has jurisdiction over the parties.

The first step in the Initial Assessment is a preliminary meeting between the Complainant and the OCRSM to gather information that will enable the OCRSM, in consultation with other offices, as appropriate, to:

- Assess the nature and circumstances reported in the complaint;
- Assess the safety of the Complainant and of the campus University community;
- Implement any appropriate Interim Protective Measures;
- Assess for pattern evidence or other similar conduct by the Respondent when relevant to the safety assessment;
- Assess the Complainant's expressed preference regarding resolution, including any request that no further action be taken;
- Assess any request by the Complainant for confidentiality or anonymity; and

• Assess the reported conduct for possible referral to the University of Maryland Police Department (UMPD) for a timely warning under the Clery Act.

During the Initial Assessment, information will be shared with other units/administrators only as necessary and confidentiality will be maintained by the OCRSM and other administrators, to the extent possible.

At the conclusion of the Initial Assessment, the OCRSM will determine the appropriate next step(s), including but not limited to: no further action, the imposition of Interim **Protective** Measures, Alternative Resolution, and/or proceeding with an investigation.

When the Initial Assessment determines the reported conduct does not rise to the level of constitute a potential violation under this the Policy, but may violate another University policy, the complaint may be referred to another appropriate University official for review and resolution.

Where When the Initial Assessment determines the alleged reported conduct does constitute a potential violation under the Policy, but reveals that the University lacks jurisdiction over the Respondent, the University will take available and reasonable steps to address the Sexual Misconduct, prevent its recurrence, and address its effects at the University.

D. Interim Protective Measures

Based on the nature and circumstances of the complaint, the Title IX Officer or designee in consultation with appropriate Unit heads and other University administrators may authorize Interim pProtective mMeasures to ensure the safety and well-being of the Complainant and others in the campus community, as appropriate. The Title IX Officer or designee will promptly inform the Respondent (if they are a member of the University community) of any Interim pProtective mMeasures that will directly impact the Respondent and provide an opportunity for the Respondent to respond.

The OCRSM retains discretion to impose and/or modify any iInterim pProtective mMeasures based on all available information. Interim pProtective mMeasures will remain in effect until the University's final resolution of the sSexual mMisconduct complaint. Interim Protective Measures may be made permanent, as needed, after adjudication. A party may challenge the imposition of iInterim pProtective mMeasures, or a decision not to impose iInterim pProtective mMeasures, by contacting the OCRSM and University Human Resources to address any concerns. Information about iInterim pProtective mMeasures can be found on pages 11-12 of the Policy.

V. RESOLUTION PROCESSES

A. Time Frame for Resolution

Consistent with the goal of maximizing educational and working opportunities, remedying the effects of Prohibited Conduct and promoting campus safety while minimizing the possible disruptive nature of the process, the OCRSM will strive to resolve all complaints within sixty (60) business days of receipt. In general, the investigation phase may last approximately four to five weeks and the adjudication phase may last an additional estimated four to five weeks. Good faith efforts will be made to complete the process in a timely manner by balancing principles of thoroughness and fundamental fairness with the importance of resolving complaints in a timely and expeditious manner. The Title IX Officer may extend the general time frames for the completion of all required actions. If such an extension occurs, the parties will be notified in writing by the OCRSM.

B. Alternative Resolution Process

The Title IX Officer or designee has the discretion to determine whether a complaint is appropriate for Alternative Resolution and may propose Alternative Resolution to the Complainant as an option. In some cases, tThe Complainant may then seek Alternative Resolution in lieu of an investigation and adjudication.

Alternative Resolution is a process whereby remedies and interventions may serve to address the alleged Prohibited Conduct without proceeding to an investigation and adjudication. Alternative Resolution is not appropriate for complaints involving Sexual Violence, including Sexual Assault. Neither party is required to accept responsibility for the alleged Prohibited Conduct in order to proceed with Alternative Resolution. The parties may decide not to proceed with Alternative Resolution and may request an investigation and adjudication at any time. The Title IX Officer or designee has the discretion to determine whether a complaint is appropriate for Alternative Resolution and The Title IX Officer retains discretion to terminate an ongoing Alternative Resolution process at any time.

The purpose of Alternative Resolution is to take appropriate action by imposing individual and community interventions and remedies designed to maximize the Complainant's access to educational, extra-curricular and/or employment activities at the University; and/or to address the effects of the conduct on the larger University community. Any combination of interventions and remedies may be utilized, including but not limited to:

- Increased monitoring, supervision and/or security at locations or activities where the Prohibited Conduct occurred or is likely to reoccur;
- Targeted or broad-based educational programming or training for relevant individuals or groups;
- Academic and/or housing modifications for Student Complainants:
- Workplace modifications and other administrative changes;
- Completion of projects, programs, or requirements designed to help the Respondent manage behavior, refrain from engaging in Prohibited Conduct and understand why the Prohibited Conduct is prohibited; and
- Compliance with orders of no Agreements to cease contact that and limit access to specific University buildings or areas or forms of contact with particular persons.

The imposition of remedies or interventions obtained through Alternative Resolution may be achieved by an agreement acceptable to the parties and the University. The Title IX Officer or designee will work with University Human Resources to facilitate the development of this agreement. In such cases where an agreement is reached, the terms of the agreement are implemented and the matter is resolved and closed. In cases where an agreement is not reached, and the Title IX Officer or designee determines that further action is necessary, or if a Respondent fails to comply with the terms of the Alternative Resolution agreement, the matter may be referred for investigation and resolution under these Staff Procedures.

Where the Complainant, and Respondent, and the University have reached an Alternative Resolution agreement, the parties will be provided with a written notice of the outcome copy of the agreement. Entering into Alternative Resolution and signing an agreement does not mean that the Respondent admits responsibility; nor does it mean that there has been a finding of a Policy violation.

C. Investigation Process

When the Initial Assessment determines the University has jurisdiction over the Respondent and the alleged conduct, and where Alternative Resolution is not appropriate or Respondent fails to comply with the terms of an Alternative Resolution agreement, an investigation will occur.

1. Notice of Investigation

In the event of an investigation, the Investigator will send a written *Notice of Investigation and Notice of Rights and Responsibilities* to both parties.

The *Notice of Investigation* will contain the circumstances of the alleged incident (which generally will include, to the extent known, the name of the Complainant and the date, time, and location), the Prohibited Conduct alleged as defined by the Policy, and the range of potential disciplinary action associated with the Prohibited Conduct. Both parties will also be informed that they will have an opportunity to be heard regarding the complaint during the investigation process, including the opportunity to be heard during an separate interviews with an Investigator regarding the alleged sexual mMisconduct.

2. Notice of Rights and Responsibilities

Both parties will be provided with a copy of the Policy and Staff Procedures and informed of their rights and responsibilities pursuant to the Policy. This includes but is not limited to: no contact directives (and provided a copy), prohibitions against retaliation and guidance about reporting any retaliatory conduct, and available community and campus resources and services.

3. Standard of Review

In making a determination about whether a Policy violation has occurred, the standard of review is preponderance of the evidence. A preponderance of the evidence means "it is more likely than not.". Thus, at the conclusion of the investigation phase, based on the information gathered, a recommended finding will be made to as to whether it is more likely than not that the reported conduct occurred and that it constituted Prohibited Conduct in violation of the Policy.

4. Role of the Investigator

The Title IX Officer or designee will designate one or more Investigator(s) from the OCRSM and/or an external Investigator to conduct a prompt, **thorough**, fair, and impartial investigation. All Investigators will receive annual training on issues related to sexual and gender-based harassment, sexual aAssault, dDating vViolence, dDomestic vViolence, and sStalking. The training will also include and how to conduct a fair and impartial investigation that provides parties with notice and a meaningful opportunity to be heard, as well as how to and protects the safety of eComplainants and the University community while promoting accountability.

5. Overview of the Investigation

The investigation is an impartial fact-gathering process. It is an important stage of the process in which both parties have an opportunity to be heard regarding the complaint. During the investigation the parties will each have an opportunity to meet and speak with the Investigator, provide any relevant information about the reported conduct, and identify persons they believe the Investigator should speak with because they believe they have relevant information. The Investigator will speak separately with both parties and any other individuals who may have relevant information. The Investigator will also gather any available physical evidence or documents, including prior statements by the parties or witnesses, communications

between the parties, email messages, **text messages**, social media materials, and other records, as appropriate and available.

a. Special Considerations

Information related to the prior sexual history of either party is generally not relevant to the determination of a Policy violation. However, prior sexual history between the parties may be relevant in very limited circumstances. For example, where there was a prior or ongoing consensual relationship between the parties, and where Consent is at issue in the case at hand, evidence as to the parties' prior sexual history as it relates to Consent may be relevant to assess the manner and nature of communications between the parties. As noted in the Policy, however, the mere fact of a current or previous dating or sexual relationship, by itself, is not sufficient to constitute Consent. Sexual history will never be used for purposes of illustrating either party's individual character or reputation. The Investigator will determine the relevance of prior sexual history and inform the parties if information about the parties' sexual history with each other is deemed relevant.

At the discretion of the OCRSM, multiple reports may be consolidated in one investigation if the information related to each incident is relevant in reaching a determination. Matters may be consolidated where they involve multiple Complainants, multiple Respondents, or related conduct involving the same parties, provided that it does not delay the prompt investigation and resolution of complaints.

b. Draft Report

At the conclusion of the investigation, the Investigator will draft a written investigation report that summarizes the information gathered (including, but not limited to, the names of witnesses and summaries of their statements), and synthesizes the areas of agreement and disagreement between the parties.

c. Notice of Opportunity to Review the Draft Investigation Report

Before the investigation report is finalized, the parties will be given an opportunity to review and respond to the draft report. Upon receipt of notice to review the draft report, the parties will each have five (5) business days to review the report and all underlying documents and submit **written** comments, information, and/or ask questions to the Investigator. If there is any new or additional information to be provided by either party, it must be presented to the Investigator at this time. If further investigation is warranted based on the comments, information, and/or questions provided during the review period, the Investigator will continue the investigation, as needed.

6. Recommended Investigation Outcome/Finding

Upon timely receipt of any additional information or comments from the parties or after the five (5) business day comment period has lapsed with no comments provided, and the investigation is complete, the Investigator will finalize the investigation report.

The final investigation report will include a summary of all relevant information obtained in the course of the investigation, an analysis and proposed findings of the material facts, and a recommended finding of whether or not a Policy violation occurred by a preponderance of the evidence. The notice will also include a range of potential disciplinary action associated with such findings. The Title IX Officer or designee will review the final investigation report.

7. Independent Review of the Finding

The final investigation report and the recommended finding will be automatically reviewed by a Standing Review Committee (SRC). Each SRC is composed of three (3) individuals (faculty, staff, and/or students). SRC members shall be members of the University community who have had no previous involvement with the case, and have been trained to review such cases. SRC members are obligated to disclose to the OCRSM any known conflicts prior to participating in any specific SRC review. Conflicts or familiarity with the individuals involved in the matter that are disclosed to the OCRSM will automatically disqualify an individual SRC member from participation in any particular review.

The SRC will review the final investigation report and consider whether the recommended finding is supported by the information obtained in the course of the investigation. The SRC will confine its consideration to a review of the written record. The SRC may speak with the Investigator when clarification about the final investigation report is needed and/or to issue specific instructions to the Investigator for further investigation. The results of any additional requested investigation will be reported to the SRC.

Once any additional investigation is complete, the SRC will issue its determination on the recommended finding. The SRC will make one of two possible decisions:

- Approve the recommended finding; or
- Reject the recommended finding.

The SRC must issue a written decision to the OCRSM within five (5) business days of receipt of the final investigation report and/or receipt of any additional information resulting from additional requests to the Investigator by the SRC.

After the SRC issues its written determination, the OCRSM will issue a Notice of Investigation Finding, which will be issued by the OCRSM and include a range of potential disciplinary actions associated with the finding. The Notice of Finding will be sent to the Complainant and Respondent parties and their respective Unit Head(s) University Human Resources, along with the SRC determination and a copy of the final investigation report, including any additional information resulting from additional investigation.

Both parties will be contacted by, and required to meet with, their respective Unit Head(s), or the Director of Student Conduct if a student, separately, to discuss the investigation finding/outcome and next steps.

Either party may submit Impact and Mitigation Statements within three (3) business days of receipt of the *Notice of Finding* in accordance with section VII. A.

After the issuance of the *Notice of Finding*, University Human Resources in conjunction with the Respondent's unit head may initiate disciplinary action against the Respondent as set forth in section VII. C.

Regardless of whether a disciplinary action is initiated, Eeither or both parties party may appeal the investigation finding in accordance with Section VII below.

The Respondent has a separate right to grieve any discipline imposed in accordance with the grievance rights afforded to them based on their specific employment status. Filing an appeal of the finding with the OCRSM does not initiate a grievance of discipline imposed as a result of a finding.

VI. APPEALS OF FINDING

Either or both parties may appeal the investigation finding. An appeal must be submitted to the OCRSM or designee in writing within five (5) business days of the date of receipt of the *Notice of Investigation*Finding. Appeals submitted received after five (5) business days shall be denied. If an appeal is received by the OCRSM on time, the other party will be notified and given five (5) business days from the date of receipt of the notice to respond. Responses shall be submitted directly to the OCRSM or designee.

Appeals and responses filed by each party will be shared with the other party and considered together in one appeal review process. If neither party submits an appeal, the investigation finding is final after five (5) business days. Appeals will be decided by an SRC Appellate Body (as defined in section VI. C below).

A. Overview

The scope of the appeal is limited to the grounds set forth below. Delissatisfaction with the investigation outcome is not a valid basis for appeal. Appeals are not intended to allow for a second review of the same facts of the case or to redetermine reconsider whether there was a Policy violation based on the same facts of the case. In most cases, appeals are confined to a review of the written record and the grounds for appeal submitted by the parties.

B. Grounds for Appeal

Grounds for appeal shall be limited to:

1. Substantial Procedural Error

Specified procedural errors or errors in interpretation of University policy **that** were so substantial as to effectively deny a Complainant or a Respondent notice or a fair opportunity to be heard. Mere deviations from procedures that were not so substantial as to deny a Complainant or Respondent notice or a fair opportunity to be heard will not be a basis for sustaining an appeal.

2. New Evidence

New and significant relevant information has become available which a reasonably diligent person could not have discovered during the Investigation.

When the basis of the Appeal is new evidence, the Title IX Officer or designee SRC Appellate Body will determine whether the information is new and was unavailable at the time of the investigation. If the SRC Appellate Body determines that the information is determined not to be new and was available at the time of the investigation, the Appeal will be denied. If the information is determined to be new and unavailable at the time of the investigation, it will be sent to the SRC Appellate Body for review and will make a determination as to whether the new information could change the outcome of the investigation. If the SRC Appellate Body determines that the new evidence could change the outcome, the case will be sent back to the OCRSM Investigator for further investigation. The OSCRM Investigator will report the outcome of any further investigation to the Appellate Body. After new evidence is considered, the OCRSM will then provide the SRC Appellate Body with a modified report and findings, as appropriate. Copies of the modified report and findings, if any, will also be provided to the parties. The modified report will be considered by the SRC Appellate Body. The SRC Appellate Body will then decide to affirm the recommendations of the modified report, reject them, or ask for additional investigation.

C. SRC Appellate Body

The Standing Review Committee (SRC) Appellate Body is the designated Aappellate Body for all cases involving allegations of sexual misconduct by staff appeals of findings under these Staff Procedures. The SRC Appellate Body is composed of three (3) members (faculty, staff, and/or students). SRC Appellate Body members shall be members from the University community who have had no previous involvement with the case, and have been trained to review such cases.

D. Appeal Outcome

The SRC **Appellate Body** may:

- Affirm the **Investigation Ff**inding;
- Reject the Investigation Ffinding; or
- Remand the case back to the Investigator for further investigation.

The SRC Appellate Body Chair will render a written decision on the appeal to the Title IX Officer or designee within five (5) business days from the date of the submission of all appeal documents. The SRC Appellate Body decision is the final determination of a Policy violation and may not be further appealed under these Staff Procedures. If an appeal outcome changes the finding against an employee covered by the Exempt MOU or Nonexempt MOU, University Human Resources will review the appeal outcome and revise discipline imposed or in process, as appropriate. No further appeal is available from the SRC Decision.

VII. REMEDIES & AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION

A. Impact Statement and Mitigation Statements

Whenever there is a finding of responsibility, the parties may choose to submit statements to University Human Resources, within three (3) business days from the date of the Notice of Finding or SRC Appellate Body decision, if an appeal was filed. before the University issues any remedies or imposes disciplinary action, if any, both parties have the opportunity to submit statements for consideration by the relevant supervisor, unit head or designee in consultation with the Title IX Officer or designee, within three (3) business days from the date of receipt of the decision.

The Complainant may submit a written **Impact s**Statement **to University Human Resources** describing the impact of the Prohibited Conduct on the Complainant, and/or request to meet with the relevant supervisor, unit head or designee and Title IX Officer or designee to provide their statement verbally.

The Respondent may submit a written **Mitigation s**Statement **to University Human Resources** explaining any factors the Respondent believes should mitigate or otherwise be considered in determining appropriate remedies and/or recommended discipline **either issued or being considered**, if any₅, and/or request to meet with the relevant unit head or designee and Title IX Officer or designee to provide their statement verbally.

The parties' respective statements will be considered by University Human Resources and not be shared with the other party.

B. Remedies

The Title IX Officer or designee, in consultation with and University Human Resources, as or other appropriate administrators, in consultation with the relevant supervisor, unit head or designee, as

appropriate, will identify reasonable short-term and/or long-term remedies to address the effects of the conduct on the Complainant and prevent its reoccurrence. Such remedies seek to restore to the Complainant, to the extent possible and within reason, the benefits and opportunities lost as a result of the Prohibited Conduct. The Title IX Officer or designee may also identify remedies, such as training for specific audiences, to address the effects of the conduct on the larger University community. Remedies are separate from disciplinary action and may occur independently of or concurrently with any discipline that is imposed.

Remedies for student Complainants under these Staff Procedures may include, but are not limited to:

- **Support measures** such as extended classwork deadline, or flexible deadlines, change of venue for taking an exam, change in exam date, and/or retaking of an exam.
- Academic accommodations such as retroactive drop from a particular class, retroactive withdrawal from a semester, policy exemption requests, and/or tuition reimbursement-; and
- Housing accommodations.

Other Rremedies for staff Complainants and Respondents may include, but are not limited to:

• Workplace modifications and other administrative changes, no contact orders, denial of access, schedule changes, counseling and/or referral to outside agencies.

C. Disciplinary Action

University Human Resources in conjunction with the Respondent's unit head may initiate disciplinary action, if any, based on a violation of this Policy, after a finding of responsibility and the issuance of the *Notice of Finding* set forth in section V. C. 7 above, or in the event of an appeal, after all appeals under these Staff Procedures, if any, have been exhausted.

Discipline imposed on Respondents covered by the Exempt MOU and Nonexempt MOU will comply with the applicable provisions of the MOU. Discipline imposed on Respondents not covered by an MOU shall be in accordance with applicable University and University System of Maryland (USM) policies.

University Human Resources in conjunction with the Respondent's unit head will When there is a finding of responsibility, and all appeals under these Procedures, if any, have been exhausted, the respective unit head or designee will consult with the Title IX Officer or designee in determining determine the appropriate disciplinary action, if any. To determine what type of disciplinary action is most appropriate, the supervisor, unit head or designee in consultation with University Human Resources and other appropriate administrator(s) shall consider the following factors shall be considered:

- The nature of the misconduct at issue:
- The impact of the misconduct on the Complainant:
- The impact or implications of the misconduct on the community or the University;
- Any prior Sexual mMisconduct by the Respondent at the University or elsewhere that is known to the University;
- Respondent's prior disciplinary history at the University; and
- Any other mitigating, aggravating, or compelling circumstances.

Discipline shall be imposed in accordance with all procedural due process rights afforded staff based on their employment status in accordance with University policy and Maryland State law. All staff

disciplinary action **under these Staff Procedures** shall be approved by the Assistant Vice President of **for University** Human Resources or designee.

1. Notice of Disciplinary Action

When disciplinary action is to be imposed, upon the approval by the Assistant Vice President of for University Human Resources or designee, University Human Resources the appropriate unit head or designee will ensure that issue a Notice of Disciplinary Action is issued to the Respondent.

Disciplinary action will depend on the specific circumstances in each case and may include discipline ranging from a written reprimand up to and including termination of employment. Other administrative and/or non-disciplinary remedies may also be imposed, including but not limited to, no contact directives, and/or a change in work duties, work locations, or work schedules.

Discipline shall be imposed in accordance with all procedural due process rights afforded staff based on their employment status in accordance with University policy and Maryland law.

VIII. GRIEVANCE RIGHTS

Staff may grieve disciplinary action in accordance with the rights afforded to them based on their specific employment status. Filing an appeal of the finding is not the same as grieving disciplinary action. The review and appeal processes under these Staff Procedures are separate from any grievance rights. An employee's grievance rights and associated time limits are separate and unrelated to the Appeal process and Impact and Mitigation Statements outlined in these Staff Procedures. During the grievance process, the Notice of Investigation Finding may also be reviewed, as it relates to the resulting disciplinary action.

IX. FINAL OUTCOME

When all the procedures and/or grievance processes afforded to both parties under these Staff Procedures, and the rights afforded to them based on their specific employment status have been exhausted, the Assistant Vice President of for University-Human Resources or designee will promptly notify the Title IX Officer or designee of any modification of the final outcome. The Title IX Officer or designee will notify the parties of any modification to the final outcome, except as prohibited by Maryland and federal law.

X. RECORDS RETENTION

The OCRSM shall maintain **Initial Assessment**, investigation, and outcome records in accordance with the University's record retention schedule.

University Human Resources and the department/unit head will maintain records of all disciplinary action, **remedies**, **and grievances** workplace modifications and other administrative changes and remedies related to a complaint and any Alternative Resolution agreements.

XI. POST-RESOLUTION FOLLOW-UP

After any disciplinary action, workplace modifications, administrative changes and/or other remedies are issued, if the Complainant agrees, the Title IX Officer or designee may periodically contact the Complainant to ensure the Prohibited Conduct has ended and to determine whether additional remedies are necessary. The Complainant may decline future contact at any time. The Title IX Officer or designee may periodically contact the Respondent to assure compliance with the intent and purpose of any

disciplinary action, workplace modifications, administrative changes and/or remedies that have been imposed. Any violation by a Respondent of the intent and purpose of any disciplinary action, workplace modification, administrative change and/or remedies imposed under the Policy, or a failure by a the University employee to provide a specified disciplinary action, workplace modification, administrative change and/or remedy should be reported to the OCRSM.

The Complainant and Respondent are encouraged to provide the Title IX Officer or designee with feedback about their experience with the process and recommendations regarding ways to improve the effectiveness of the University's implementation of the Sexual Misconduct Policy and Staff Procedures.