

Title IX and Bias Series Mitigating Bias in Hearings

Tibisay Hernandez Manager of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Solutions **Kelly Gallagher** Senior Solutions Specialist

Grand River Solutions



Vision

We exist to help create safe and equitable work and educational environments.



Mission

Bring systemic change to how school districts and institutions of higher education address their Clery Act & Title IX obligations.



Core Values

- Responsive Partnership
- Innovation
- ✤ Accountability
- ✤ Transformation
- ✤ Integrity

Your Facilitators

Tibisay Hernandez (she/her/ella)



Manager of DEI Solutions

Kelly Gallagher (she/her/hers)



Senior Solutions Specialist

Today's Agenda

01

02

Before the Hearing

- Preparation
- Pre-Hearing Meetings

The Hearing

- Opening Instructions, Opening/Closing Statements, and Party Participation
- Relevancy Determinations

03

Decision-Making

- Evidence Weight
- Fact Finding and Credibility Determinations
- Policy Analysis





Before the Hearing

- ٠
- Preparation Pre-Hearing Meetings •

Strategic Foresight Promotes Bias Mitigation

Strategic foresight considers potential challenges; alternate possibilities to develop action plans to prepare or implement strategies that help us avoid inequitable outcomes.

Mitigating Bias Through Preparation

Through a preliminary review, identify areas that may have been influenced by bias during investigation and need further exploration.

Consider questions from every angle.

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

Relevancy Arguments and Advance Rulings

Bias Mitigation = Community Trust



The Hearing S

- Opening Instructions, Opening/Closing Statements
- Party Participation
- Relevancy Determinations

02

- Opening Instructions
 Opening/Closing Statements
 Party Participation

How Our Minds Perceive People

- Motivation Bias (Fundamental Attribution Error) can be defined as an assumption about a person's motivations based on current behaviors.
 - We don't consider possible reasons for their behavior.
 - We believe their behaviors tell us something about who they are as people all the time.

Halo/Horns Bias

Halo/Horns Bias is more specific to someone's positive/negative impressions triggering positive/negative feelings toward them.



BERMAN, FOEHL, TROWER 2018



Relevancy Determinations



Bias Can Affect Relevancy Assessment

GRAND RI

- Brain is in overdrive because you are doing this in the moment time is limited.
- Your emotions may be triggered (Affect Bias).
 - Eg., Advisor interrupts or shows aggressive behavior.
 - Eg., Previous negative encounters with anyone in the hearing.

Bias Mitigation Technique

• • • • • • • • • •

•••

Make definitions for Focus on the decision relevancy or policy a to be made. visual. Remember: you are in CHARGE! You have the opportunity to slow things down.



You have to be the person to control the room.

Have the presence and emotional intelligence to pause.



Decision-Making

- Evidence Weight
- Fact-Finding and Credibility Determination
- Policy Analysis

03



Bias in Evaluating Evidence

GRAN

- The Framing Effect is when our decisions are influenced by the way information is presented.
 - Expert evidence
 - Character evidence
- They may be related or even relevant, but it does not mean that this evidence has a greater weight.



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 preponderance of evidence standard
 - 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.
- What to do when there are different versions?

Judging Credibility Invites Bias

- Can you spot a liar?
- Can investigators or hearing panel members understand clues that are culturally different from their own?







Policy Analysis

Break down the policy into elements.

Organize the facts by the element to which they relate.



Analysis Grid		NS NS
Touching of the private body parts of another person	For the purpose of sexual gratification	Without consent due to lack of capacity
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.



Leave Us Feedback:



thernandez@grandriversoluions.com kgallagher@grandriversolutions.com info@grandriversolutions.com

@GrandRiverSols
 Grand River Solutions

©Grand River Solutions, Inc., 2021. Copyrighted material. Express permission to post training materials for those who attended a training provided by Grand River Solutions is granted to comply with 34 C.F.R. § 106.45(b)(10)(i)(D). These training materials are intended for use by licensees only. Use of this material for any other reason without permission is prohibited.

