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Title IX Requirements For Hearings
Procedural Requirements for Investigations

- Notice TO BOTH PARTIES
- Equal opportunity to present evidence
- An advisor of choice
- Written notification of meetings, etc., and sufficient time to prepare
- Opportunity to review ALL evidence, and 10 days to submit a written response to the evidence prior to completion of the report
- Report summarizing relevant evidence and 10-day review of report prior to hearing
Procedural Requirements for Hearings

- Must be live, but can be conducted remotely
- Cannot compel participation
- Standard of proof used may be preponderance of the evidence or clear and convincing; standard must be the same for student and employee matters
- Cross examination must be permitted and must be conducted by advisor of choice or provided by the institution
- Decision-Maker determines relevancy of questions and evidence offered
- Written decision must be issued that includes finding and sanction
Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"). Accordingly, section 106.45(b)(6)(i)’s prohibition was vacated as well as remanded on July 28, as is the usual course in successful APA challenges.

Do you still have this rule?

Exclusion of all statements of that party or witness
Cross Examination
Exceptions to the Exclusionary Rule

Statements that consist of or are made in the course of the prohibited conduct

When cross examination is waived or not conducted
Hearing Technology: Requirements and Considerations

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

All hearings must be recorded.

Participants must be able to communicate during the hearing
- The parties with the decision-maker(s)
- The parties with their advisors
Purpose of the Hearing

- Review and Assess Evidence
- Make Findings of Fact
- Determine Responsibility / Findings of Responsibility
- Determine Sanction and Remedy
## Evaluating the Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is it relevant?</strong></td>
<td>Evidence is relevant if it has a tendency to make a material fact more or less likely to be true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is it authentic?</strong></td>
<td>Is the item what it purports to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is it credible?</strong></td>
<td>Is it convincing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is it reliable?</strong></td>
<td>Can you trust it or rely on it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What weight, if any, should it be given?</strong></td>
<td>Weight is determined by the finder of fact!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trauma-informed practices provide tools/techniques for interviewing and engaging with the Complainant, Respondent, and Witnesses.
Lessons Learned

- The Process Takes A LOT of Time. Prepare Folks for This.
- There Must be a Shared Understanding of Policy and Practices
- Gaming the Process
- Handling New Evidence at the Hearing
- All procedural steps, evidence, and witness log in summary of relevant evidence report
Data Reporting Expectations

By December 1 annually, each institution must submit to the Department of Higher Education a report that includes the numbers of:

• reports of sexual misconduct reported to the Title IX coordinator by a student or employee of the institution against another student or employee;
• reports made by a student or employee against another student or employee investigated by law enforcement, if known;
• students and employees found responsible;
• students and employees found not responsible; and
• disciplinary actions imposed after a finding of responsibility

Process Participants
The Participants
The Parties
Advisors
Support Persons?
The Investigator
The Participants

The Hearing Facilitator/Coordinator

- Manages the recording, witness logistics, party logistics, curation of documents, separation of the parties, and other administrative elements of the hearing process
- Non-Voting
The Participants

The Decision-Maker(s)

- One person or a panel
- Questions the parties and witnesses at the hearing
- Determines responsibility
- Determines sanction, where appropriate

GRAND RIVER SOLUTIONS
The Participants
The Hearing Chair

- Is a decision-maker
- Answers all procedural questions
- Makes rulings regarding relevancy of evidence, questions posed during cross examination
- Maintains decorum
- Prepares the written deliberation statement
- Assists in preparing the Notice of Outcome
The Advisor’s Role

First Steps
After you are assigned a case...

- Review the policy
- Review the materials provided, if any
- Reach out to your advisee
- Schedule a meeting
Make the Party Aware that ...

- You are under no obligation to keep what the party tells you confidential
- Not an advocate
- There is no attorney client relationship nor any other recognized privilege between you and the party
- Were this matter go to a court of law, and you were asked to testify, you would have to do so, truthfully
- Do this at the outset
Pre-Hearing Preparation

Do Your Homework
Exactly, What Type of Homework?

• Review applicable policy language/provisions
• What are the rules or procedures governing your role?
• Familiarize yourself with investigative report
• What is the timeline of events
• Think about what areas you may want to highlight or expand upon
• What questions does party want to ask
• What type of questions you will ask
• Who are the key witnesses
• Anticipate questions of others
• Consult with your advisee
What does the party want you to show?

- Credibility?
- Clarification on timeline?
- The thought process?
- Inconsistencies?
Pre-Hearing Tasks for the Decision-Maker(s) and Chair
# Prior to the Hearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bias/conflict of interest check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and evidence to parties/advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response (if any) delivered to Decision-Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-hearing meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set your script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of decorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for witnesses, evidence, and preliminary questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pre-Hearing Meetings

Review the Logistics for the Hearing

Set expectations
  • Format
  • Roles of the parties
  • Participation
  • Decorum
  • Impact of not following rules

Advance Submission of Questions

NO Advance Rulings
The Decision-Maker(s)

- Review evidence and report
- Review applicable policy and procedures
- Preliminary analysis of the evidence
- Determine areas for further exploration
- Develop questions of your own
- Anticipate the party’s questions
- Anticipate challenges or issues
- Prepare the script
Common Areas of Exploration

- Credibility?
- Clarification on timeline?
- Clarification on language
- The thought process?
- Inconsistencies?
The Hearing
Order of the Proceedings

01 Opening introductions and instructions by the Chair
02 OPTIONAL: Opening statements
03 Testimony and questioning of the parties and witnesses
04 Optional: Closing statements
05 Deliberations
Opening Instructions by the Chair

• The institution should have a script for this portion of the proceedings, and it should be used.
• Introduction of the participants.
• Overview of the procedures.
• Be prepared to answer questions.
• Parties are provided one last opportunity to challenge the composition of the Panel for bias or conflict of interest.
  • Chair or TIXC will make ruling.
Testimony
Testimony and Questioning of the Parties

01  Decision-Maker(s) will question Complainant first

02  Respondent Advisor questions Complainant and follow up

03  Follow up by the Decision-Maker(s)

04  Decision-Maker(s) will question Respondent second

05  Complainant Advisor questions Respondent and follow up

06  Follow up by Decision-Maker(s)
Questioning of the Witnesses

01
The Chair will determine the order of questioning of witnesses

02
Decision-Maker(s) will question first

03
Advisor cross-examination will occur next

04
Follow up by the Decision-Maker(s)
General Questioning Guidelines
Format of Questioning

The Decision-Maker(s) or the Advisor will remain seated during questioning.

Questions will be posed orally, in writing one by one, in email batch?

Questions must be relevant.
What constitutes a relevant question?

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

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

“Evidence is relevant if:
• (a) it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence; and
• (b) the fact is of consequence in determining the action.”
When is evidence relevant?

- Logical connection between the evidence and facts at issue
- Assists in coming to the conclusion – it is “of consequence”
- Tends to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without that evidence
Questions that seek to illicit irrelevant information
- Complainant's prior sexual history
- Information protected by an un-waived legal privilege
- Medical treatment and care

Duplicative questions

Information that is otherwise irrelevant
When Questioning....

- Be efficient.
- Explore areas where additional information or clarity is needed.
- Listen to the answers.
- Be prepared to go down a road that you hadn't considered or anticipated exploring.
- Take your time. Be thoughtful. Take breaks if you need it.
Foundational Questions to Always Consider Asking

- Were you interviewed?
- Did you see the interview notes?
- Did the notes reflect your recollection at the time?
- As you sit here today, has anything changed?
- Did you review your notes before coming to this hearing?
- Did you speak with any one about your testimony today prior to this hearing?
### Common Areas of Where Clarity or Additional Information is Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details about the alleged misconduct</th>
<th>Facts related to the elements of the alleged policy violation</th>
<th>Relevancy of certain items of evidence</th>
<th>Factual basis for opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Timelines</td>
<td>Inconsistencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questioning to Assess Reliability

- Authentication
- Inherent plausibility
- Logic
- Corroboration
- Other indicia of reliability
# Questioning to Assess Reliability

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

- opportunity to view
- ability to recall
- motive to fabricate
- plausibility
- consistency
Opinion Evidence

When might it be relevant?

How do you establish a foundation for opinion evidence so that the reliability of the opinion can be assessed?
Asking Questions to Assess Authenticity
Investigating the Products of the Investigation

Never assume that an item of evidence is authentic.
Ask questions, request proof.
Request further investigation of the authenticity if necessary.
What are the “Hard” Questions

- Details about the sexual contact
- Seemingly inconsistent behaviors
- Inconsistent evidence/information
- What they were wearing
- Alcohol or drug consumption
- Probing into reports of lack of memory
How to Ask the Hard Questions

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

Be deliberate and mindful in your questions:
- Can you tell me what you were thinking when....
- Help me understand what you were feeling when...
- Are you able to tell me more about...
Special Considerations for Questioning the Investigator

- The Investigator’s participation in the hearing is as a fact witness and to explain procedure;
- There should be no need for questions if the report is thorough;
- Neither the Advisors nor the Decision-Maker(s) should ask the Investigator(s) their opinions on credibility, recommended findings, or determinations;
- There is one big question to ask: Did you hear anything today that differed from what you were told during the investigation?
### Possible Questions for the Investigator, IF RELEVANT AND IF NOT IN REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions about how they conducted their investigation (process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the investigator’s decision making for excluded witnesses, evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek clarity about evidence collected</td>
<td>Where it came from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authenticity of the evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask factual questions that will assist in evaluation of the evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If bias is not in issue at the hearing, the Chair should not permit irrelevant questions of the investigator that probe for bias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Considerations for Panels

- If a panel, decide in advance who will take the lead on questioning
- Go topic by topic
- Ask other panelists if they have questions before moving on
- Do not speak over each other
- Pay attention to the questions of other panelists
- Ok to take breaks to consult with each other, to reflect, to consult with the TIXC or counsel
The Do’s of Conducting Cross

- **Be efficient**: Highlight the portions of their testimony that support your narrative.
- **Listen**: Be prepared to go down a road that you hadn’t considered or anticipated exploring.
- **Do make your points through pointed and calm questioning**: Do raise concerns about credibility and reliability.
- **Take your time. Be thoughtful. Ask for breaks if you need it.**
The Do Nots of Cross Examination

- Don’t rehash everything a witness has said.
- Don’t call folks liars or attack them.
- Don’t rant, rave, lose your temper.
The Decision-Maker’s Role in Advisor Questioning
The Role of the Decision-Maker During Questioning by the Advisors

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

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

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

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

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

- Ask the party why their question is relevant
- Take a break
- Ask their own questions of the party/witness
- Review the hearing record
Reminder

Logical connection between the evidence and facts at issue

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

Tends to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without that evidence
When the Exclusionary Rule is in Effect and a Party or Witness Declines to Answer a Relevant Questions Posed by an Advisor

The Chair should:

- Remind the party of the impact of not submitting to cross examination;
- Pause the proceedings to allow the party or witness to reconsider.
After the Hearing
Deliberations
Weighing the Evidence & Making a Determination

1. Evaluate the relevant evidence collected to determine what weight, if any, you will afford that item of evidence in your final determination;

2. Apply the standard of proof and the evidence to each element of the alleged policy violation;

3. Make a determination as to whether or not there has been a policy violation.
Preponderance of the Evidence

More likely than not

Does not mean 100% true or accurate

A finding of responsibility = There was sufficient reliable, credible evidence to support a finding, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the policy was violated

A finding of not responsible = There was not sufficient reliable, credible evidence to support a finding, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the policy was violated
Findings of Fact

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

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

Fondling is the:

- touching of the private body parts of another person
- for the purpose of sexual gratification,
- without the consent of the victim,
  - including instances where the victim is incapable of giving consent because of their age or because of their temporary or permanent mental incapacity.
### Analysis Grid

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Touching of the private body parts of another person</th>
<th>For the purpose of sexual gratification</th>
<th>Without consent due to lack of capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Undisputed: Complainant and Respondent agree that there was contact between Respondent’s hand and Complainant’s vagina. | Respondent acknowledges and admits this element in their statement with investigators.  
“We were hooking up. Complainant started kissing me and was really into it. It went from there. Complainant guided my hand down her pants…” | Complainant: drank more than 12 drinks, vomited, no recall  
Respondent: C was aware and participating  
Witness 1: observed C vomit  
Witness 2: C was playing beer pong and could barely stand  
Witness 3: C was drunk but seemed fine  
Witness 4: carried C to the basement couch and left her there to sleep it off. |
Final Report – Within 7 business days

- The allegations
- Description of all procedural steps
- Findings of fact
- Conclusion of application of facts to the policy
- **Rationale** for each allegation
- Sanctions and remedies
- Procedure for appeal
Lunch Break
Practical Application
Pre-Hearing
Rapid Fire #1

The investigation is complete!

It is time to schedule the hearing...

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arranging for space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors assigned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling pre-hearing meetings with parties &amp; advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling prehearing meetings of the panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing report and record to panel and parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling the hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for written submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other considerations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Decision-Maker,

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

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

You and your team did a great job scheduling the hearing and arranging all the logistics!
## Rapid Fire Recap

- Development of introductory comments
- Initial discussion of the evidence
- Areas for further exploration
- List of questions for the parties and the witnesses
- Anticipation of potential issues
- Logistics
- Review of any written submissions by the parties
- Other considerations?
Recap

Logical connection between the evidence and facts at issue

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

Tends to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without that evidence
Can You Have a General Rule About Evidence In Title IX Investigations?

NO
Evidence That Will Not Be Considered

- Rape Shield Protections
- Privileged Information
Not a Court of Law

- Not making complex legal arguments
- Are not treating parties with hostility
- Rules of evidence outside of Title IX regulations do not apply
- Not looking for the “gotcha” moment
A recipient may adopt rules of order or decorum to forbid badgering a witness, and may fairly deem repetition of the same question to be irrelevant.

A postsecondary institution recipient may adopt reasonable rules of order and decorum to govern the conduct of live hearings.

Schools “retain flexibility to adopt rules of decorum that prohibit any party advisor or decision-maker from questioning witnesses in an abusive, intimidating, or disrespectful manner.”
Foundational Questions to Always Consider Asking

- Were you interviewed?
- Did you see the interview notes?
- Did the notes reflect your recollection at the time?
- As you sit here today, has anything changed?
- Did you review your notes before coming to this hearing?
Did You Also Cover . . . ?

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

#1

Say hi!

Pick a scribe.

Discuss.

• Develop Questions for Hearing Panel to ask and discuss areas or topics that you would like to explore further in the hearing
  • Groups 1 & 2: Questions for Complainant
  • Groups 3 & 4: Questions for Respondent
  • Group 5: Questions for Bob, Dylan, and Stevie
  • Group 6: Questions for Nick, Kayla, and Caitlyn
Report Out

- **Groups 1 & 2**: Questions for Complainant
- **Groups 3 & 4**: Questions for Respondent
- **Group 5**: Questions for Bob, Dylan, and Stevie
- **Group 6**: Questions for Nick, Kayla, and Caitlyn
The Hearing
Break Out!

#2

Say hi again!

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

Discuss the list of proposed questions; make determinations on questions and cite rationale:

- Group 1: Questions submitted by Complainant for Respondent
- Group 2: Questions submitted by Respondent for Complainant
- Group 3: Questions for Bob
- Group 4: Questions for Dylan
- Group 5: Questions for Stevie, Nick
- Group 6: Questions for Kayla, Caitlyn
Report Out

- **Group 1**: Questions submitted by Complainant for Respondent
- **Group 2**: Questions submitted by Respondent for Complainant
- **Group 3**: Questions for Bob
- **Group 4**: Questions for Dylan
- **Group 5**: Questions for Stevie and Nick
- **Group 6**: Questions for Kyle and Caitlyn
These questions are submitted by Complainant for Respondent
1. How many drinks did you have at Kayla’s before going to TKE?
2. How big were those drinks?
3. Who mixed those drinks?
4. Were you drunk when you got to TKE?
5. How often do you go to parties?
6. How often do you get drunk at parties?
7. Why didn’t you stay with your friends when you got to TKE?
8. When you got to TKE, did you intend to have sex with Angel that night?
9. What else do you remember from that night?
10. Did you play darts?
11. Isn’t it true that you were easily able to throw darts and hit the bullseye that night?
12. When Angel was "hugging" you, as you called it, he was actually just holding on to you for support because he could not stand up, isn’t that right?
13. How many times did he fall on to you when the two of you were on the couch?
14. Who got up first from the couch?
15. Isn’t it true that you got up first and pulled Angel to his feet?
16. You told the investigator the two of you were drunk sloppily kissing. It seems you are admitting that Angel was drunk, isn’t that correct?
17. Given all that you recall, it seems that you have a really good recollection of that night, no impaired memory, were easily able to play darts, and never fell down, so for you to act as if you were too drunk to give him a blow job and that you’re the real victim here is nothing less than highly offensive, isn’t that right?
18. If someone were sexually assaulted and the other person said it was the victim’s fault, that is victim blaming, isn’t it?
19. Are you alleging you were sexually assaulted?
20. Why would you make that up?
21. If you are saying that you were sexually assaulted, why didn’t you file a complaint? Is that because you know you’ll lose and be expelled for a false complaint and retaliation if you do that?
22. Are you making an allegation in order to retaliate against complainant?
23. Did you ever drink from Angel’s water bottle?
24. Did you ever smell alcohol on Angel’s breath while at the TKE party?
25. Have you seen the video of you giving Angel a blow job?
26. Did you initiate sex with Angel in order to get back at your boyfriend?
27. He wasn’t restraining you, why didn’t you just pull away?
28. Do you often give blowjobs to boys at parties?

Questions submitted by Respondent for Complainant
1. You said you do not remember anyone drinking from your water bottle. How can you remember that?
2. Did you file a report with the police?
3. Why not?
4. Did you get a medical exam?
5. Why not?
6. Is it true that you are hoping to go to medical school?
7. Isn’t it true that you are really worried about your grades this semester?
8. Isn’t it true you were struggling with inorganic chemistry class?
9. And isn’t it true that you wanted to drop the class, but you would have had a “W” on your transcript?
10. Did you end up withdrawing from that class?
11. And isn’t it true that there is no notation on the transcript because you were given the gift of being pulled from the class without any transcript notation?
12. And is that why you filed this claim, so you could get out of taking the class without anything showing up on your transcript?
13. You said to the investigator that you “could not believe anyone would film” the sex act that occurred at the TKE party, isn’t that correct?
14. Have you ever watched any porn videos?
15. Didn’t you take a video last year of some of your friends, including Bob and Dylan, playing a game that involved simulating sex acts?
16. During your interview with the investigator, isn’t it true that you had to be reminded by your own advisor that your “story” is that you were too drunk to remember anything, right?
17. How many times did you and your advisor rehearse your interview?
18. You said you had no information or memories about what happened at the party, but also claim to remember how her hands were moving, when the two of you were sitting on the couch in the basement. Which one of those statements is the lie?
Questions for Bob

By Complainant:
1. When you were describing the vodka you poured into your water bottle, what exactly do you consider to be 2 or 3 shots?
2. Did you use shot glasses, red solo cups, or did you eyeball it?
3. What do you remember about Barb’s Tinder profile?
4. Did it suggest what type of relationship she was looking for?
5. Did you match?
6. Why were you looking at Tinder?
7. How often do you troll on Tinder?
8. You said Barb took a huge gulp out of your water bottle toward the end of the evening. What did you mean by “huge gulp?”
9. How much of the vodka/orange juice in your bottle did you drink that night?
10. How much was left in the morning?

By Respondent:
1. Doesn’t your frat have a reputation on campus of getting girls drunk at parties?
2. Isn’t true when you say you take care of people at parties, that you actually just get them more drunk so they will have sex with one of your friends or brothers? That is what you were doing to the respondent, correct?
3. Didn’t you have to retake Measuring Science 101 where they teach you how to measure liquids?
4. How many times did you watch that video before deleting it?
5. Do you still have the video?
6. Will you get in trouble with your fraternity for bringing in illicit alcohol to the party?
7. Isn’t it a violation of fraternity rules for you to drink, particularly when you were supposed to stay sober and prevent people from getting too drunk or harming themselves or others?
8. Do you feel bad that, by drinking so much, you were unable to do your job well that night?
9. Do you feel bad that, by drinking so much, you basically allowed the sex assault in the basement to occur, because you weren’t keeping a watchful eye?

Questions for Dylan

By Complainant:
1. You told the investigator you saw Angel spill beer on Barb, isn’t that correct?
2. And didn’t you tell the investigator that you also saw Angel stumbling and falling?
3. So basically, he was acting like he was so drunk that he could barely function, right?

By Respondent:
1. You made a water bottle of vodka and orange juice correct?
2. How much did you drink?
3. Do you remember how much of it you had left at the end of the night?
4. How strong was your orange juice and vodka?
5. You bought beer. How old are you?
6. Why do you have a fake ID?
7. You said you saw Angel at the party, and that he was so drunk he could barely stand up; did you take any action to protect your drunk friend from drinking more?
8. Is that because your friend was not really that drunk, or because you don’t really care about someone being so drunk they can barely stand?
9. Your friend passed out at the end of the night; which emergency number did you call for help?
10. You said you put a trash can by him when you saw him passed out, but you didn’t roll him on to his side? Is that because he was sleeping, and not really because he was drunk?
11. Have you ever tried to hit on Barb?
12. Didn’t she reject your advances?
13. Is that why you’re exaggerating your supposed observations that Angel was so drunk?
14. Respondent does better than you in all your classes, correct?
15. And you said you once caught her cheating off of you, but isn’t it actually true that you were the one referred to student conduct for a plagiarism charge?
16. If you have a fake ID, what else is fake? Your testimony, for example?
Questions for Stevie
By Complainant
1. How much did you have to drink?
2. How drunk did you feel that night?
3. Do you think you were close to blacking out?
4. Given how drunk you were, isn’t it likely that you don’t really have a good memory of that night?
5. You said Angel stumbles even when he is not drinking, yet you know he is an athlete, so how is it that an athlete stumbles and is as uncoordinated even when sober, as you described to the investigator?
6. Do you have a crush on Barb?
7. How long have you wanted to have sex with her?
8. Are you minimizing how very drunk Angel was in order for her to like you more?

By Respondent
1. Did you see Barb and Angel playing darts?
2. Was Angel able to play darts?
3. Was he hanging on to Barb for dear life or standing up and throwing darts?

Questions for Kayla
By Complainant
1. Did you notice the complainant stumbling or falling over, once he was in the basement?
2. Did you feel drunk that night?
3. Was the amount you had to drink that night a lot for you?
4. Given how much you had to drink, do you think you can even trust your memories from that night?
5. Barb is a good friend of yours, isn’t she?
6. You would say anything to support her, wouldn’t you?
7. Did you tell the investigator that Barb was mad at herself?
8. Is it possible she was mad at herself for violating Angel?
9. You said Barb and Angel were “drunk sloppy kissing.” Did you get that phrase from Barb, or did she get it from you?
10. Did she tell you what to say here today?
11. Do you know that, if you are caught lying for her, you will be disciplined and might be suspended or expelled?

By Respondent
1. Would you categorize Angel as the initiator of all the contact between him and Barb?
2. So you would call him the aggressor, is that right?
3. How many times did you see Angel fill Barb’s beer that night?
4. And you saw him keep topping it off, is that right?
5. Did that feel predatory to you?
6. Have you seen Angel or any of his friends like Bob, Dylan, Stevie, or Nick try to get a girl really drunk at a party, on any other occasion?
Questions for Caitlyn

By Complainant
1. You would consider complainant a good guy, right?
2. Barb wanted to “have a good time” right?
3. Did she tell you she planned to have sex with Angel that night?
4. You saw her intentionally move down to give a blow job?
5. How often has she done this at other parties? Is giving blow jobs something she casually does at parties?
6. And she is a good friend, right?
7. So this is particularly painful for you, your telling the truth about her sexually assaulting him, right?
8. And would you agree that it does not matter if the victim is a man or a woman, but rape is rape, right?
9. You said Barb had her arm around Angel’s waist when people were in the basement that night. Is that so that she could control him?

By Respondent
1. You told the investigator you had 4-5 bears and 2-3 swigs of from Bob’s vodka, correct?
2. Is that a lot for you?
3. Were you feeling drunk that night?
4. How drunk?
5. Was the drink in Bob’s water bottle strong?
6. Given how drunk you were, why should we trust your recollections of that night?
7. You said you were cheering on the sex act in the video; were you surprised to see yourself doing that?
8. Do you remember cheering?
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