



Title IX Decision-Maker Training for K-12 Districts




Session One | October 13, 2022

Presented by:

Melissa Gallegos, Senior Associate
mgallegos@aalrr.com • (562) 653-3200


Ashlee Reece, Associate
ashlee.reece@aalrr.com • (562) 653-3200





aa/rr Title IX

Title IX Decision-Maker Training for K-12 Districts



IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT


Session One | October 13, 2022

PRESENTED BY:
Melissa Gallegos, Senior Associate
Ashlee Reece, Associate

Cerritos • Fresno • Irvine • Marin • Pasadena • Pleasanton • Riverside • Sacramento • San Diego

Agenda

- Definitions for Training
- Review Title IX Decision-Maker Role
- Review Final Investigative Report
- Facilitate Written Questions for the Parties
- Review Hypothetical “Cross-Examination” Questions
- Preparation for Session Two



aa/rr

1

Definitions for Training

- Complainant/Respondent
- Parties
- Witness
- Advisor
- Grievance Process
- Final Investigative Report
- Written Cross-Examination Questions
- Determination of Responsibility

Title IX Team: Decision-Maker

Decision-Maker Role:

- Reviews Final Investigative Report with “fresh eyes” to see if information is missing or incomplete
- Facilitates relevant written questions & “cross-examination” from parties for parties and witnesses; must be trained on issues of relevance
- Reviews all evidence, identifies the disputed issues, and weighs the evidence

Title IX Team: Decision-Maker

Decision-Maker Role:

- Makes conclusions about whether alleged conduct occurred and determines responsibility
- Prepares written determination with findings of fact, policy conclusions, and rationale for the result as to each allegation
- If applicable, recommends sanctions for Respondent and remedies for Complainant
- Provides written determination and appeal rights to the parties/advisors simultaneously

REVIEW FINAL INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

Review Final Investigative Report

- **Review your Title IX Board Policies and/or Administrative Regulations**

- Look at the policies and regulations cited in the Final Investigative Report and the Notice of Allegations
- Review your role as Decision-Maker, and determine the scope of your decision
 - Are you deciding if there is a preponderance of evidence to find quid pro quo sexual harassment, hostile environment sexual harassment, sexual assault, fondling, stalking, and/or dating violence, etc. under the Title IX administrative regulations? (Federal Law)
 - Are you deciding if there is a preponderance of evidence to find quid pro quo sexual harassment, hostile environment sexual harassment, sexual assault, and/or sexual battery, etc. under the Board Policies prohibiting sexual harassment? (State Law)

Review Final Investigative Report

- **Read Final Investigative Report and Review Attachments**

- Take notes, and create a list of questions (if any)

- **Calendar timelines to accommodate these phases:**

- Process to ask questions of Parties and exchange written “cross examination” questions between Parties or from the Parties to witnesses
- Decision-Maker analyzes the evidence, writes the decision, and Title IX Coordinator, administrator or legal advisor reviews for thoroughness and readability
- Deliver written decision to the Complainant, Respondent, Advisors (if any), and Title IX Coordinator with notice of appeal rights

- **Plan and Schedule the Process with the Parties**

- If needed, seek help from Title IX Coordinator to schedule and plan logistics

Discuss *Hypothetical* Final Investigative Report

- Review Table of Contents for Roadmap
- Read the Notice of Allegations and Formal Complaint
- Tips for what to look for in the Investigative Report
 - Note the steps taken in the Title IX complaint process **for this matter** because that information will likely be “copied” into your decision
 - Note where Complainant or others describe an **impact on the educational environment** (e.g., how did the matter affect Complainant’s access to or actual education?)
 - Note where Complainant or others describe the **desired remedy** (e.g., what result does the Complainant want from the formal complaint?)

Discuss *Hypothetical* Final Investigative Report

- Tips for what to look for in the Investigative Report, continued :
 - Note the evidence from Complainant and Respondent
 - Pay attention to **timing** of statements (e.g., What’s in the NOA vs. the Formal Complaint? When did Respondent know of allegations?)
 - Pay attention to **content** of statements (e.g., vague, offering too much or too little information, full or partial denial, conditional denial - “I would never”)
 - Pay attention to where they **disagree** about what happened
 - Pay attention to what makes one more **credible** than the other
 - Credible: The person offers reasonable grounds for being believed
 - You must articulate your credibility observations in a deliberate, systematic, and objective process (e.g., look at corroboration; consistency/inconsistency; admissions against interest; plausibility; motive to lie/falsify, etc.)

FACILITATE WRITTEN QUESTIONS BETWEEN PARTIES OR FOR WITNESSES

Written Questions Between Parties

Before making a decision about responsibility, the Decision-Maker must facilitate a question process:

The Decision-maker must afford *each party the opportunity to submit written, **relevant** questions that a party wants asked of any party or witness*, provide each party with the answers, and allow for additional, limited follow-up questions from each party. (34 CFR 106.45(b)(6)(ii).)

Purposes for the questions may include:

- The opportunity for the parties to seek information that may shed light on someone's credibility
- The opportunity for the Decision-Makers to ask questions and observe the credibility of Complainant, Respondent and witnesses, since they did not conduct the investigation

Written Questions Between Parties

Requirements for Questions

- Questions must be **relevant**
- Questions and evidence about the Complainant's sexual predisposition or prior sexual behavior are **not** relevant...
 - Unless such questions and evidence about Complainant's prior sexual behavior are offered to prove that someone other than the Respondent committed the conduct alleged by the Complainant; or
 - If the questions and evidence concern specific incidents of Complainant's prior sexual behavior with respect to the Respondent and are offered to prove consent.
- You must explain any decision to **exclude** a party's question as irrelevant

Written Questions Between Parties

Definition of Relevance

- Having significant and demonstrable bearing on the matter at hand
- Affording evidence tending to prove or disprove the matter at issue or under discussion
- **Synonyms:** applicable, material, pertinent
(Merriam-Webster)
- Legalistic definition of relevance:
 - That quality of evidence which renders it properly applicable in determining the truth and falsity of the matters at issue between the parties.*(Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition)*

Written Questions Between Parties

Guidelines for Questions

- Questions should not be repetitive
 - Ask the party to ask another question intended to elicit different information
- Questions should be clear
 - Ask the party to clarify the question
- Avoid compound questions
 - Ask the party to separate the questions
- Avoid questions with difficult words
 - Ask the party to rephrase the question
- Avoid argumentative questions
 - Ask the party to rephrase the question

REVIEW HYPOTHETICAL “CROSS EXAMINATION” QUESTIONS

PREPARATION FOR SESSION TWO

Homework Between Sessions

Hypothetical Investigative Report

- Weigh the evidence and determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether Respondent was flirty or friendly with Complainant before the August 21 incidents.
- If you find that Respondent was flirty, write factual findings to demonstrate the flirting.
- If you find the Respondent was friendly in a non-sexual way, write factual findings to demonstrate the non-sexual friendliness.
- Your factual findings should include who, what, where, when, why & how of what happened that was flirty or friendly.
- Explain why you made that finding; what was your rationale.
- **GOAL:** We may disagree, but did you adequately explain your rationale?

Homework Between Sessions

Hypothetical Investigative Report

- Review the definition of sexual fondling (pg. 4 of Report)
- Review the evidence in the Investigative Report related to touching the Complainant's groin, crotch, or private parts
- Weigh the evidence and determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether Respondent touched Complainant's groin area
- If you find that Respondent touched Complainant's groin, determine what kind of physical touch **and** if Complainant permitted **and** was touch for sexual gratification
- Write a factual finding (who, what, where, when, why & how of the allegation)
- Explain why you made that finding; what was your rationale
- **GOAL:** We may disagree, but did you adequately explain your rationale?

Question & Answer
Session

Disclaimer

This AALRR presentation is intended for informational purposes only and should not be relied upon in reaching a conclusion in a particular area of law. Applicability of the legal principles discussed may differ substantially in individual situations. Receipt of this or any other AALRR presentation/publication does not create an attorney-client relationship. The firm is not responsible for inadvertent errors that may occur in the publishing process.



© 2022 Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo



Thank You

For questions or comments, please contact:

{ Mellissa E. Gallegos
(562) 653-3200
mgallegos@aalrr.com }

{ Ashlee B. Reece
(562) 653-3200
Ashlee.Reece@aalrr.com }



Melissa E. Gallegos

Senior Associate

562-653-3200

mgallegos@aalrr.com



Melissa Gallegos represents and advises California school districts, community college districts, and county offices of education in all education and employment law matters, including employee evaluation, discipline and dismissal, reasonable accommodation, interactive meetings, and restraining orders. She also assists with Uniform Complaint investigations and responses; California Public Records Act responses; collective bargaining issues; and defending employers against allegations of discrimination with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Ms. Gallegos also has significant experience in conducting prompt, thorough, and effective investigations.

While in law school, Ms. Gallegos was Networking Co-Chair and Co-President with La Raza de Loyola, Treasurer of the Immigration Law Society, and a member of the Public Interest Law Foundation. Ms. Gallegos also served as Production Editor of the *Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review*. Ms. Gallegos was awarded scholarships from Loyola Law School, the Mexican American Bar Foundation, the Latina Lawyers Bar Association, and the Loyola Marymount Jesuit Community.

Events & Speaking Engagements

Ms. Gallegos has co-presented on topics such as sexual harassment, mandated reporting, and workplace investigations. She has spoken before an audience of over 400 staff and administrators at a district-wide meeting and has presented at ACSA (Association of California School Administrators) Personnel Academy.

Publications

Ms. Gallegos contributes to the firm's publications.

OFFICE

12800 Center Court Drive
Suite 300
Cerritos, CA 90703

INDUSTRIES

Technology

EDUCATION

J.D., Loyola Law School
B.A., University of California, Los Angeles

CLERKSHIPS

California Department of Justice,
Office of the Attorney General
Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles

ADMISSIONS

2015, California
U.S. District Court, Central District of
California

PRACTICE AREAS

Education

LANGUAGES

Ms. Gallegos is proficient in Spanish.

Ashlee B. Reece

Associate

(562) 653-3200

Ashlee.Reece@aalrr.com



Ashlee Reece provides counsel and representation to California community college districts, county offices and public school districts in a wide variety of employment and education law matters. Ms. Reece also conducts investigations for school and community college districts with respect to Title VII, Title IX and other discrimination allegations.

Prior to joining Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, Ms. Reece was a labor and employment law associate for a large law firm in Los Angeles where she handled matters including ADA, FEHA, wage and hour, wrongful termination, and Unruh Civil Rights Act litigation. Prior to working in litigation Ms. Reece was an Equity Officer at a private university in St. Louis, Missouri where she conducted Title VII and Title IX investigations.

Events & Speaking Engagements

Cultural Competence & Sensitivity Institute
Virtual, February 10, 17 & 24, 2022

Alerts & Articles

Ms. Reece is a contributor to the firm's publications and blog.

OFFICE

12800 Center Court Drive
Suite 300
Cerritos, CA 90703

INDUSTRIES

Educational Agencies

EDUCATION

J.D., Saint Louis University
B.A., University of Missouri

ADMISSIONS

2019, California
2017, Missouri
United States District Court Central
District of California

PRACTICE AREAS

Investigations
Labor & Employment Law