A. POLICY: Equal Opportunity, Harassment, and Nondiscrimination

1. Glossary

- **Advisor** means a person chosen by a party or appointed by the University to accompany the party to meetings related to the resolution process, to advise the party on that process, and to conduct indirect questioning for the party at the hearing, if any.

- **Complainant** means an individual who is alleged to be the victim of conduct that could constitute harassment or discrimination based on a protected class; or retaliation for engaging in a protected activity. May also be referred to at the University as “Reporting Party”.

- **Complaint (formal)** means a document submitted or signed by a Complainant or signed by the Title IX Coordinator alleging harassment or discrimination based on a protected class or retaliation for engaging in a protected activity against a Respondent and requesting that the University investigate the allegation.

- **Confidential Resource** means an employee who is not a Mandated Reporter of notice of harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation (irrespective of Clery Act Campus Security Authority status).

- **Day** means a business day when the University is in normal operation.

- **Directly-related evidence (DRE)** is evidence related to the complaint, but is neither inculpatory (tending to prove a violation) nor exculpatory (tending to disprove a violation). DRE will not be relied upon by the investigative report.

- **Education program or activity** means locations, events, or circumstances where the University exercises substantial control over both the Respondent and the context in which the sexual harassment or discrimination occurs and also includes any building owned or controlled by a student organization that is officially recognized by the University.

- **Employee** means any person in the categories of either staff or faculty (see definitions in this section for each).

- **Faculty** are defined for the purposes of this Handbook as any person at RMU employed as Faculty Staff or Adjunct Faculty hired primarily to teach courses.

- **Final Determination**: A conclusion, using the preponderance of the evidence standard, that the alleged conduct occurred and whether it did or did not violate policy.
• **Finding:** A conclusion using the preponderance of the evidence standard that the conduct did or did not occur as alleged (as an example, a “finding of fact”).

• **Formal Grievance Process** means “Process A,” a method of formal resolution designated by the University to address conduct that falls within the policies included below beginning on p.57, and which complies with the requirements of the Title IX regulations (34 CFR Part 106.45).

• **Grievance Process Pool** includes any investigators, hearing officers, appeal officers, and Advisors who may perform any or all of these roles (though not at the same time or with respect to the same case).

• **Hearing Decision-maker** refers to those who have decision-making and sanctioning authority within the University’s Formal Grievance process.

• **Investigator** means the person or persons charged by the University with gathering facts about an alleged violation of this Policy, assessing relevance and credibility, synthesizing the evidence, and compiling this information into an investigation report and file of directly related evidence.

• **Mandated Reporter** means an employee of the University who is obligated by policy to share knowledge, notice, and/or reports of harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation with the Title IX Coordinator. At Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions, this includes all employees.

• **Notice** means that an employee, student, or third-party informs the Title IX Coordinator or other Official with Authority of the alleged occurrence of harassing, discriminatory, and/or retaliatory conduct.

• **Official with Authority (OWA)** means an employee of the University explicitly vested with the responsibility to implement corrective measures for harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliatory conduct on behalf of the University.

• **Parties** include the Complainant(s) and Respondent(s), collectively.

• **Process A** means the Formal Grievance Process detailed below for federally-defined offenses under Title IX. See below beginning on p. 57.

• **Process B** means the administrative resolution procedures detailed in Appendix E, and also in Section 3 of the 2019 Nondiscrimination, Nonharassment, Conduct, and Equity Resolution Handbook, that apply only when Process a does not, as determined by the Title IX Coordinator.

• **Recipient** means a postsecondary education program that is a recipient of federal funding.

• **Relevant evidence** is evidence that tends to prove or disprove an issue in a complaint.

---

1 Not to be confused with those mandated by state law to report child abuse, elder abuse, and/or abuse of individuals with disabilities to appropriate officials, though these responsibilities may overlap with those who have mandated reporting responsibility in this Policy.
**Remedies** are post-finding actions directed to the Complainant and/or the community as mechanisms to address safety, prevent a recurrence, and restore access to the University’s educational program.

**Respondent** means an individual who has been reported to be the perpetrator of conduct that could constitute harassment or discrimination based on a protected class; or retaliation for engaging in a protected activity.

**Resolution** means the result of an informal or Formal Grievance Process.

**Sanction** means a consequence imposed by the University on a Respondent who is found to have violated this policy.

**Sexual Harassment** is the umbrella category including the offenses of sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking, dating violence, and domestic violence. See Section 17.b., for greater detail.

**Staff** are any employee who do not fall under the definition of faculty, namely, administrative, non-faculty, or regular staff.

**Title IX Coordinator** is the RMUoHP Institutional Equity Officer (IEO) designated by the University to ensure compliance with Title IX and the University’s Title IX program. References to the Coordinator throughout this policy refers to the IEO and may also encompass a designee of the Coordinator for specific tasks.

**Title IX Team** refers to the Title IX Coordinator, any Deputy Title IX Coordinators, and any member of the Grievance Process Pool.

**University** means Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions, a postsecondary higher education institution that is a recipient of federal funding. May also be referred to as “Recipient”, “RMUoHP”, “ or “Rocky Mountain University”.

### 2. Rationale for Policy

Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions (hereafter, “RMU”, “RMUoHP”, or “the University”) is committed to providing a workplace and educational environment, as well as other benefits, programs, and activities, that are free from discrimination, harassment, and retaliation. To ensure compliance with federal and state civil rights laws and regulations, and to affirm its commitment to promoting the goals of fairness and equity in all aspects of the educational program or activity, the University has developed internal policies and procedures. These policies and procedures provide a prompt, fair, and impartial process for those involved in an allegation of discrimination or harassment on the basis of protected class status, and for allegations of retaliation. RMUoHP values and upholds the equal dignity of all members of its community and strives to balance the rights of the parties in the grievance process during what is often a difficult time for all those involved.

### 3. Applicable Scope
The core purposes of this policy are the prohibition of all forms of discrimination, to emphasize that all forms of discrimination are not tolerated at RMUoHP, and as a guide to identify the process to reporting and handling of complaints falling within the scope of discrimination, assault, or harassment. Sometimes, discrimination involves exclusion from or different treatment in activities, such as admissions or employment. Other times, discrimination takes the form of harassment or, in the case of sex-based discrimination, can encompass sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking, sexual exploitation, dating violence, or domestic violence. When an alleged violation of this anti-discrimination policy is reported, the allegations are subject to resolution using the University’s “Process A” or “Process B,” as determined by the Title IX Coordinator, and as detailed below.

When the Respondent is a member of the RMUoHP community, a grievance process may be available regardless of the status of the Complainant, who may or may not be a member of the RMUoHP community. This community includes, but is not limited to, students, student organizations, faculty, administrators, staff, and third parties such as guests, visitors, volunteers, invitees, and others involved with RMUoHP activities or properties. The procedures below may be applied to incidents, patterns, and/or the campus climate, all of which may be addressed and investigated in accordance with this policy.

4. Title IX Coordinator
The Institutional Equity Officer serves as the Title IX Coordinator and ADA/504 Coordinator and oversees the implementation of the University’s disability compliance and RMUoHP policy on equal opportunity, harassment, and nondiscrimination. The Title IX Coordinator has the primary responsibility for coordinating the University’s efforts related to the intake, investigation, resolution, and implementation of supportive measures to stop, remediate, and prevent discrimination, harassment, and retaliation prohibited under this Handbook.

5. Independence and Conflict-of-Interest
The Institutional Equity Officer (also referred to as the “IEO”) manages the Title IX Team and acts with independence and authority free from bias and conflicts of interest. The Institutional Equity Officer oversees all resolutions under this policy and these procedures. The members of the Title IX Team are vetted and trained to ensure they are not biased for or against any party in a specific case, or for or against Complainants and/or Respondents, generally.

To raise any concern involving bias or conflict of interest by the IEO, or to report misconduct or discrimination by the IEO, contact the President of RMUoHP at rick.nielsen@rm.edu. Concerns of bias, of potential conflict of interest, or discrimination or misconduct by any other Title IX Team member should be raised directly with the IEO.

6. Administrative Contact Information
Complaints or notice of alleged policy violations, or inquiries about or concerns regarding this policy and procedures, may be made internally to:

Raymond J Rodriguez, MPH, MCHES
Institutional Equity Officer, Title IX and ADA Coordinator

For the purpose of this policy, the University defines “student” as any individual who has accepted an offer of admission, or who is registered or enrolled for credit or non-credit bearing coursework, and who maintains an ongoing relationship with the University.
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions
Room 195, Building 3
Discrimination Hotline: 385.375.8344 / 385.375.8798 / IEO@rm.edu

Nick Starr, MBA, CCP, CBP
Human Resources Manager, Title IX Deputy Coordinator
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions
Room 188, Building 3
Main: 385.375.8658 / nick.starr@rm.edu

Mark Horacek, PT, MS, PhD
Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs & Provost, Title IX Deputy Coordinator
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions
Room 123, Building 3
Main: 385.375.8340 / mark.horacek@rm.edu

Emily Dykstra, PhD
Associate Director of Institutional Research, Title IX Decision-Maker and Hearing Officer
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions
Main: 385.375.8349 / emily.dykstra@rm.edu

Cynthia Jeffs
Registrar, Title IX Decision-Maker and Hearing Officer
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions
Main: 385.375.8316

Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions has determined that the above administrators are
Officials with Authority (OWA) to address and correct harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation, per
federal guidance and regulation.

The University has also determined that all employees serve as Mandated Reporters of any knowledge
they have that a member of the community is experiencing harassment, discrimination, and/or
retaliation. The section below on Mandated Reporting details their duties, accordingly.

Inquiries may be made externally to:
Office for Civil Rights (OCR)
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202-1100
Customer Service Hotline #: (800) 421-3481
Facsimile: (202) 453-6012
TDD#: (877) 521-2172
Email: OCR@ed.gov
Web: http://www.ed.gov/ocr

HHS/Office for Civil Rights
1961 Stout Street
Room 08-148
Notice/Complaints of Discrimination, Harassment, and/or Retaliation

Notice or complaints of discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation may be made using any of the following options:

a. File a complaint with, or give verbal notice to, the Title IX Coordinator or a Deputy Title IX Coordinator (see section 6, directly above). Such a report may be made at any time (including during non-business hours) by using the telephone number or email address, or by mail to the office address, listed for the Title IX Coordinator, Deputy Coordinators, or Decision-Makers listed above.

b. Report online, using the reporting form posted at https://rm.edu/institutional-equity/. Anonymous reports are accepted but can give rise to a need to investigate. The University attempts to provide supportive measures to all Complainants, which is impossible with an anonymous report. Reporting carries no obligation to initiate a formal response; the University respects Complainant requests to dismiss complaints unless there is a compelling threat to health and/or safety. As a result, the Complainant is largely in control and should not fear a loss of privacy by reporting that allows the University to discuss and provide supportive measures.

c. Report using the RMUoHP Discrimination Hotline (385.375.8344).

A formal complaint means a document submitted or signed by either the Complainant or the Title IX Coordinator, alleging a policy violation by a Respondent and requesting that the University investigate the allegation(s). Verbal notification is not necessarily a formal complaint.

A formal complaint may be filed with the Title IX Coordinator in person, by mail, or by electronic mail, by using the contact information in the section immediately above, or as described in this section. As used in this section, “filing a formal complaint” means a document or electronic submission (such as by electronic mail or through an online portal provided for this purpose by RMUoHP) that contains the
Complainant’s physical or digital signature, or otherwise indicates that the Complainant is the person filing the complaint, and requests that RMUoHP investigate the allegations.

If notice is submitted in a form that does not meet this standard, the Title IX Coordinator will contact the Complainant to ensure that it is filed correctly.

8. Supportive Measures
RMUoHP will offer and implement appropriate and reasonable supportive measures to all parties upon notice of alleged harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation.

Supportive measures are non-disciplinary, non-punitive individualized services offered as appropriate, as reasonably available, and without fee or charge to the parties to restore or preserve access to the University’s education program or activity, including measures designed to protect the safety of all parties or RMUoHP’s educational environment, and/or deter harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation.

The Title IX Coordinator promptly makes supportive measures available to the parties upon receiving notice of a complaint. At the time that supportive measures are offered, the University will inform the Complainant, in writing, that they may file a formal complaint with the University either at that time or in the future, if they have not done so already. The Title IX Coordinator works with the Complainant to ensure that their wishes are considered with respect to the supportive measures that are planned and implemented.

The University will maintain the privacy of the supportive measures, provided that privacy does not impair the University’s ability to provide supportive measures. RMUoHP will act to ensure as minimal an academic or occupational impact on the parties as possible. RMUoHP will implement measures in a way that does not unreasonably burden the other party.

These actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Referral to counseling, medical, and/or other healthcare services
- Referral to the Employee Assistance Program
- Referral to community-based service providers
- Visa and immigration assistance
- Student financial aid counseling
- Education to the RMUoHP community or community subgroup(s)
- Altering work arrangements for employees or student-employees
- Safety planning for the Complainant, which may include on- or off-campus safety concerns
- Providing campus safety escorts
- Providing transportation accommodations
- Implementing contact limitations (no contact orders) between the parties
- Academic support, extensions of deadlines, or other course/program-related adjustments
- Trespass, Persona Non Grata (PNG), or Be-On-the-Lookout (BOLO) orders
- **Timely warnings**
- Class schedule modifications, withdrawals, or leaves of absence
- Increased security and monitoring of certain areas of the campus
• Any other actions deemed appropriate by the Title IX Coordinator or their designee

Violations of no contact orders will be referred to the appropriate University student or employee conduct processes for enforcement.

9. Emergency Removal
The University can act to remove a student Respondent entirely or partially from its education program or activities on an emergency basis when an individualized safety and risk analysis has determined that an immediate threat to the physical health or safety of any student or other individual justifies removal. This risk analysis is performed by the Title IX Coordinator in conjunction with the Director of Student Affairs (or designee) in the event of a student concern, or in conjunction with the Human Resources Manager (or designee) in the event of an employee concern. In any event, these bodies will use their standard objective violence risk assessment procedures.

In all cases in which an emergency removal is imposed, the student will be given notice of the action. In all such cases, they will also be presented with the option to request to meet with the Title IX Coordinator prior to such action/removal being imposed, or as soon thereafter as reasonably possible, to show cause why the action/removal should not be implemented or should be modified.

This meeting is not a hearing on the merits of the allegation(s), but rather is an administrative process intended to determine solely whether the emergency removal is appropriate. When this meeting is not requested within 24 hours of removal, objections to the emergency removal will be deemed waived. A Complainant and their Advisor may be permitted to participate in this meeting if the Title IX Coordinator determines it is equitable to do so. There is no appeal process for emergency removal decisions.

A Respondent may be accompanied by an Advisor of their choice when meeting with the Title IX Coordinator for the show cause meeting. The Respondent will be given access to a written summary of the basis for the emergency removal prior to the meeting to allow for adequate preparation.

The Title IX Coordinator has sole discretion under this policy to implement or stay an emergency removal and to determine the conditions and duration. Violation of an emergency removal under this policy will be grounds for discipline, which may include expulsion or termination.

The University will implement the least restrictive emergency actions possible in light of the circumstances and safety concerns. As determined by the Title IX Coordinator, these actions could include, but are not limited to: temporarily reassigning an employee, restricting a student’s or employee’s access to or use of facilities or equipment, allowing a student to withdraw or take grades of incomplete without financial penalty for the immediate semester, authorizing an administrative leave, and suspending a student’s participation in extracurricular activities, student employment, or student organizational leadership.

At the discretion of the Title IX Coordinator, alternative coursework options may be pursued to ensure as minimal an academic impact as possible on the parties.

Where the Respondent is an employee, existing provisions for interim action are applicable, as defined in appropriate Handbook.

10. Promptness
All allegations are acted upon promptly by RMUoHP once it has received notice or a formal complaint. Complaints can take 60-90 business days to resolve, typically. There are always exceptions and extenuating circumstances that can cause a resolution to take longer, but the University will avoid all undue delays within its control.

Any time the general timeframes for resolution outlined in these University procedures will be delayed, RMUoHP will provide written notice to the parties of the delay, the cause of the delay, and an estimate of the anticipated additional time that will be needed as a result of the delay.

**11. Privacy**

Every effort is made by the University to preserve the privacy of reports. RMUoHP will not share the identity of any Complainant, any individual who has been reported to be the perpetrator of sex discrimination, any Respondent, or any witness, except as permitted by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. 1232g; FERPA regulations, 34 CFR part 99; or as required by law; or to carry out the purposes of 34 CFR Part 106, including the conducting of any investigation, hearing, or grievance proceeding arising under these policies and procedures.

The University reserves the right to determine which University officials have a legitimate educational interest in being informed about incidents that fall within this policy, pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Only a small group of officials deemed who need to know will typically be told about the complaint, which may include but is not limited to: Title IX Coordinators and Deputy Coordinators, Decision-Makers, the University President, Provost, University legal counsel, and related ranking professionals on a need to know basis, and if applicable, Provo Police and the Behavioral Intervention Team at RMUoHP. Information will be shared as necessary with Investigators, Hearing Panel members/Decision-Makers, witnesses, and the parties involved. The circle of people with this knowledge will be kept as tight as possible to preserve the parties’ rights and privacy.

---

3 For the purpose of this policy, privacy and confidentiality have distinct meanings. Privacy means that information related to a complaint will be shared with a limited number of RMU employees who “need to know” in order to assist in the assessment, investigation, and resolution of the report. All employees who are involved in the University’s response to notice under this policy receive specific training and guidance about sharing and safeguarding private information in accordance with state and federal law. The privacy of student education records will be protected in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”), as outlined in the University’s FERPA policy. The privacy of employee records will be protected in accordance with Human Resources policies. Confidentiality exists in the context of laws that protect certain relationships, including those who provide services related to medical and clinical care, mental health providers, counselors, and ordained clergy. The law creates a privilege between certain health care providers, mental health care providers, attorneys, clergy, spouses, and others, with their patients, clients, parishioners, and spouses. RMU has designated individuals who have the ability to have privileged communications as Confidential Resources. For more information about Confidential Resources, see page 26. When information is shared by a Complainant with a Confidential Resource, the Confidential Resource cannot reveal the information to any third party except when an applicable law or a court order requires or permits disclosure of such information. For example, information may be disclosed when: (i) the individual gives written consent for its disclosure; (ii) there is a concern that the individual will likely cause serious physical harm to self or others; or (iii) the information concerns conduct involving suspected abuse or neglect of a minor under the age of 18, elders, or individuals with disabilities. Non-identifiable information may be shared by Confidential Resources for statistical tracking purposes as required by the federal Clery Act. Other information may be shared as required by law.
The University may contact parents/guardians to inform them of situations in which there is a significant and articulable health and/or safety risk to a student, but will make every effort to consult with the student first before doing so.

Confidentiality and mandated reporting are addressed more specifically below.

12. Jurisdiction of Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions
This Handbook applies to the conduct of any member of the RMUoHP community, including students, employees, guests, and visitors during education programs and activities of RMUoHP, to conduct that takes place on the campus or on property owned or controlled by the University, at University-sponsored events, on social media or electronic forums, or in buildings or vehicles owned or controlled by University recognized organizations.

This policy can also be applicable to the effects of off-campus misconduct that effectively deprive someone of access to RMUoHP’s educational programs. The University may also extend jurisdiction to off-campus and/or to online conduct when the Title IX Coordinator determines that the conduct affects a substantial University interest.

Regardless of where the conduct occurred, the University will address notices and complaints to determine whether the conduct occurred in the context of its employment or educational program or activity and/or has continuing effects on campus or in an off-campus sponsored program or activity. A substantial University interest includes:

   a. Any action that constitutes a criminal offense as defined by law. This includes, but is not limited to, single or repeat violations of any local, state, or federal law;

   b. Any situation in which it is determined that the Respondent poses an immediate threat to the physical health or safety of any student or other individual;

   c. Any situation that significantly impinges upon the rights, property, or achievements of oneself or others or significantly breaches the peace and/or causes social disorder; and/or

   d. Any situation that is detrimental to the educational interests or mission of RMUoHP.

If the Respondent is unknown or is not a member of the University community, the Title IX Coordinator will assist the Complainant in identifying appropriate campus and local resources and support options and/or, when criminal conduct is alleged, in contacting local law enforcement if the individual would like to file a police report.

Further, even when the Respondent is not a member of the University’s community, supportive measures, remedies, and resources may be accessible to the Complainant by contacting the Title IX Coordinator.

In addition, the University may take other actions as appropriate to protect the Complainant against third parties, such as barring individuals from University property and/or events.
All vendors serving RMUoHP through third-party contracts are subject to the policies and procedures of their employers, or to these policies and procedures to which their employer has agreed to be bound by their contracts.

When the Respondent is enrolled in or employed by another institution, the Title IX Coordinator can assist the Complainant in liaising with the appropriate individual at that institution, as it may be possible to allege violations through that institution’s policies.

Similarly, the Title IX Coordinator may be able to assist and support a student or employee Complainant who experiences discrimination in an externship, study abroad program, or other environments external to the University where sexual harassment or nondiscrimination policies and procedures of the facilitating or host organization may give recourse to the Complainant.

### 13. Time Limits on Reporting

There is no time limitation on providing notice/complaints to the Title IX Coordinator. However, if the Respondent is no longer subject to the University’s jurisdiction and/or significant time has passed, the ability to investigate, respond, and provide remedies may be more limited or impossible.

Acting on notice/complaints significantly impacted by the passage of time (including, but not limited to, the rescission or revision of policy) is at the discretion of the Title IX Coordinator, who may document allegations for future reference, offer supportive measures and/or remedies, and/or engage in informal or formal action, as appropriate.

When notice/complaint is affected by a significant time delay, the University will typically apply the policy in place at the time of the alleged misconduct and the procedures in place at the time of notice/complaint.

### 14. Online Harassment and Misconduct

The policies of RMU are written and interpreted broadly to include online and cyber manifestations of any of the behaviors prohibited below, when those behaviors occur in or have an effect on the University’s education program and activities or use RMU networks, technology, or equipment.

Although the University may not control websites, social media, and other venues in which harassing communications are made, when such communications are reported to RMU, it will engage in a variety of means to address and mitigate the effects.

Members of the RMU community are encouraged to be good digital citizens and to refrain from online misconduct, such as supporting anonymous gossip sites, sharing inappropriate content via Snaps or other social media, unwelcome sexual or sex-based messaging, distributing or threatening to distribute revenge pornography, breaches of privacy, or otherwise using the ease of transmission and/or anonymity of the Internet or other technology to harm another member of the University community.

### 15. Policy on Nondiscrimination

Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions adheres to all federal and state civil rights laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination in private institutions of higher education.
RMUoHP does not discriminate against any employee, applicant for employment, student, or applicant for admission on the basis of:

- Race,
- Religion,
- Hearing status,
- Personal appearance,
- Color,
- Sex,
- Pregnancy,
- Political affiliation,
- Source of income,
- Place of business,
- Residence,
- Religion,
- Creed,
- Ethnicity,
- National origin (including ancestry),
- Citizenship status,
- Physical or mental disability (including perceived disability),
- Age,
- Marital status,
- Family responsibilities,
- Sexual orientation,
- Gender identity,
- Gender expression,
- Veteran or military status (including disabled veteran, recently separated veteran, active duty wartime or campaign badge veteran, and Armed Forces Service Medal veteran),
- Predisposing genetic characteristics,
- Domestic violence victim status,
- Height,
- Weight
- or any other protected category under applicable local, state, or federal law, including protections for those opposing discrimination or participating in any grievance process on campus, with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or other human rights agencies.

This Handbook and Policy 3006 cover nondiscrimination in both employment and access to educational opportunities. Therefore, any member of the RMUoHP community whose acts deny, deprive, or limit the educational or employment access, benefits, and/or opportunities of any member of the RMUoHP community, guest, or visitor on the basis of that person’s actual or perceived membership in the protected classes listed above is in violation of these University policies on nondiscrimination.

When brought to the attention of the University, any such discrimination will be promptly and fairly addressed and remedied by the University according to the appropriate grievance process described below.

16. Policy on Disability Discrimination and Accommodation
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions is committed to full compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), as amended, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which prohibit discrimination against qualified persons with disabilities, as well as other federal and state laws and regulations pertaining to individuals with disabilities. Under the ADA and its amendments, a person has a disability if they have a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits a major life activity.

The ADA also protects individuals who have a record of a substantially limiting impairment or who are regarded as disabled by the University, regardless of whether they currently have a disability. A substantial impairment is one that significantly limits or restricts a major life activity such as hearing, seeing, speaking, breathing, performing manual tasks, walking, or caring for oneself. The Institutional Equity Officer (IEO) has been designated as the University’s ADA/504 Coordinator responsible for overseeing efforts to comply with these disability laws, including responding to grievances and conducting investigations of any allegation of noncompliance or discrimination based on disability.

Grievances related to disability status and/or accommodations will be addressed using the procedures below. For details relating to disability accommodations in the University’s resolution process, see section 41. Disabilities Accommodations in the Resolution Process, in the Process A section of this Handbook.

**a. Students with Disabilities**
The University is committed to providing qualified students with disabilities with reasonable accommodations and support needed to ensure equal access to the academic programs, facilities, and activities of the University.

All accommodations are made on an individualized basis. A student requesting any accommodation should first contact the Institutional Equity Officer, who coordinates services for students with disabilities.

The Institutional Equity Officer reviews documentation provided by the student and, in consultation with the student, determines which accommodations are appropriate for the student’s particular needs and academic program, in accordance with Policy 1230 and other applicable RMUoHP policies.

**b. Employees with Disabilities**
Pursuant to the ADA, RMUoHP will provide reasonable accommodation(s) to all qualified employees with known disabilities when their disability affects the performance of their essential job functions, except when doing so would be unduly disruptive or would result in undue financial or administrative hardship to the University.

An employee with a disability is responsible for submitting a request for an accommodation to the Human Resources Manager and providing necessary documentation. The HR Manager, with support from the Institutional Equity Officer as needed, will work with the employee’s supervisor to identify which essential functions of the position are affected by the employee’s disability and what reasonable accommodations could enable the employee to perform those duties in accordance with applicable RMUoHP policies.

**17. Policy on Discriminatory Harassment**
Students, staff, administrators, and faculty are entitled to an employment and educational environment that is free of discriminatory harassment. RMU’s harassment policy is not meant to inhibit or prohibit educational content or discussions inside or outside of the classroom that include germane but controversial or sensitive subject matters protected by academic freedom or professional codes of ethics.

The sections below describe the specific forms of legally prohibited harassment that are also prohibited under RMU policy. When speech or conduct is protected by academic freedom or professional codes of conduct, it will not be considered a violation of RMU policy, though supportive measures may be offered to those impacted. All policies encompass actual and/or attempted offenses.

**a. Discriminatory Harassment**

Discriminatory harassment is defined as unwelcome conduct by any member or group of the community on the basis of actual or perceived membership in a class protected by policy or law.

RMUoHP does not tolerate discriminatory harassment of any employee, student, visitor, or guest. The University will act to remedy all forms of harassment when reported, whether or not the harassment rises to the level of creating a “hostile environment.”

A hostile environment is one that unreasonably interferes with, limits, or effectively denies an individual’s educational or employment access, benefits, or opportunities. This discriminatory effect results from harassing verbal, written, graphic, or physical conduct that is severe or pervasive and objectively offensive.

When discriminatory harassment rises to the level of creating a hostile environment, RMUoHP may also impose sanctions on the Respondent through the application of the appropriate grievance process below. The University reserves the right to address offensive conduct and/or harassment that 1) does not rise to the level of creating a hostile environment, or 2) that is of a generic nature and not based on a protected status. Addressing such conduct will not result in the imposition of discipline under University policy, but may be addressed through respectful conversation, remedial actions, education, effective Alternate Resolution, and/or other informal resolution mechanisms.

For assistance with Alternate Resolution and other informal resolution techniques and approaches, employees should contact the Human Resources Manager, and students should contact the Institutional Equity Officer or the Director of Student Affairs.

**b. Sexual Harassment**

The Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR), the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and the State of Utah regard Sexual Harassment, a specific form of discriminatory harassment, as an unlawful discriminatory practice.

RMU has adopted the following definition of Sexual Harassment in order to address the unique environment of an academic community, which consists not only of employer and employees, but of students as well.

---

4 This definition of hostile environment is based on Federal Register / Vol. 59, No. 47 / Thursday, March 10, 1994: Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, Racial Incidents and Harassment Against Students At Educational Recipients Investigative Guidance.
Acts of sexual harassment may be committed by any person upon any other person, regardless of the sex, sexual orientation, and/or gender identity of those involved.

Sexual Harassment, as an umbrella category, includes the offenses of sexual harassment, sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and is defined as conduct on the basis of sex, the basis of gender, or that is sexual that satisfies one or more of the following:

1) Quid Pro Quo:
   a. an employee of the University,
   b. conditions the provision of an aid, benefit, or service of the University,
   c. on an individual’s participation in unwelcome sexual conduct; and/or

2) Sexual Harassment:
   a. unwelcome conduct,
   b. determined by a reasonable person,
   c. to be so severe, and
   d. pervasive, and,
   e. objectively offensive,
   f. that it effectively denies a person equal access to the University’s education program or activity.⁵

3) Sexual assault, defined as:
   a. Sex Offenses, Forcible:
      i) Any sexual act directed against another person,
      ii) without the consent of the Complainant,
      iii) including instances in which the Complainant is incapable of giving consent.⁶
   b. Sex Offenses, Non-forcible:
      i) Incest:
         1) Non-forcible sexual intercourse,
         2) between persons who are related to each other,
         3) within the degrees wherein marriage is prohibited by Utah law.
      ii) Statutory Rape:
         1) Non-forcible sexual intercourse,
         2) with a person who is under the statutory age of consent (18 in Utah).

4) Dating Violence, defined as:

---

⁵ Unwelcomeness is subjective and determined by the Complainant (except when the Complainant is below the age of consent). Severity, pervasiveness, and objective offensiveness are evaluated based on the totality of the circumstances from the perspective of a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances (“in the shoes of the Complainant”), including the context in which the alleged incident occurred and any similar, previous patterns that may be evidenced.

⁶ This definition set is not taken from SRS/NIBRS verbatim. ATIXA has substituted Complainant for “victim,” has removed references to his/her throughout, has defined “private body parts,” has removed the confusing and unnecessary term “unlawfully,” and has inserted language clarifying that the University interprets “against the person’s will” to mean “non-consensually.” These are liberties ATIXA and RMUoHP believe are important to take with respect to the federal definitions, but users should consult legal counsel before adopting them.
a. violence,
b. on the basis of sex,
c. committed by a person,
d. who is in or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the Complainant.
   i. The existence of such a relationship shall be determined based on the Complainant’s statement and with consideration of the length of the relationship, the type of relationship, and the frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relationship. For the purposes of this definition—
   ii. Dating violence includes, but is not limited to, sexual or physical abuse or the threat of such abuse.
   iii. Dating violence does not include acts covered under the definition of domestic violence.

5) Domestic Violence, defined as:
   a. violence,
   b. on the basis of sex,
   c. committed by a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the Complainant,
   d. by a person with whom the Complainant shares a child in common, or
   e. by a person who is cohabitating with, or has cohabitated with, the Complainant as a spouse or intimate partner, or
   f. by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the Complainant under the domestic or family violence laws of the State of Utah or
   g. by any other person against an adult or youth Complainant who is protected from that person’s acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the State of Utah.

*To categorize an incident as Domestic Violence, the relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant must be more than just two people living together as roommates. The people cohabitating must be current or former spouses or have or have had an intimate relationship.

6) Stalking, defined as:
   a. engaging in a course of conduct,
   b. on the basis of sex,
   c. directed at a specific person, that
      i. would cause a reasonable person to fear for the person’s safety, or
      ii. the safety of others; or
      iii. Suffer substantial emotional distress.
   For the purposes of this definition—
   (i) Course of conduct means two or more acts, including, but not limited to, acts in which the Respondent directly, indirectly, or through third parties, by any action, method, device, or means, follows, monitors, observes, surveils, threatens, or communicates to or about a person, or interferes with a person’s property.
   (ii) Reasonable person means a reasonable person under similar circumstances and with similar identities to the Complainant.
   (iii) Substantial emotional distress means significant mental suffering or anguish that may but does not necessarily require medical or other professional treatment or counseling.
On consensual relationships:
There are inherent risks in any romantic or sexual relationship between individuals in unequal positions (such as faculty and student, supervisor and employee). These relationships may be less consensual than perceived by the individual whose position confers power. The relationship also may be viewed in different ways by each of the parties, particularly in retrospect. Furthermore, circumstances may change, and conduct that was previously welcome may become unwelcome. Even when both parties have consented at the outset to a romantic or sexual involvement, this past consent may not remove grounds for a later charge of a violation of applicable sections of this policy. The University does not wish to interfere with private choices regarding personal relationships when these relationships do not interfere with the goals and policies of the University. For the personal protection of members of this community, relationships in which power differentials are inherent (faculty-student, staff-student, administrator-student) are generally discouraged.

Consensual romantic or sexual relationships in which one party maintains a direct supervisory or evaluative role over the other party are unethical. Therefore, persons with direct supervisory or evaluative responsibilities who are involved in such relationships must bring those relationships to the timely attention of their supervisor, and will likely result in the necessity to remove the employee from the supervisory or evaluative responsibilities, or shift a party out of being supervised or evaluated by someone with whom they have established a consensual relationship. This includes student group participants, teaching assistants, and any student in a relationship with another student or employee over whom they have direct responsibility. While no relationships are prohibited by this policy, failure to timely self-report such relationships to a supervisor as required can result in disciplinary action for an employee.

RMUoHP reserves the right to impose any level of sanction, ranging from a reprimand up to and including suspension or expulsion/termination, for any offense under this policy.

c. Force, Coercion, Consent, and Incapacitation

As used in the offenses above, the following definitions and understandings apply:

**Force:** Force is the use of physical violence and/or physical imposition to gain sexual access. Force also includes threats, intimidation (implied threats), and coercion that is intended to overcome resistance or produce consent (e.g., “Have sex with me or I’ll hit you,” “Okay, don’t hit me, I’ll do what you want.”).

Sexual activity that is forced is, by definition, non-consensual, but non-consensual sexual activity is not necessarily forced. *Silence or the absence of resistance alone is not consent.* Consent is not demonstrated by the absence of resistance. While resistance is not required or necessary, it is a clear demonstration of non-consent.

**Coercion:** Coercion is defined as unreasonable pressure for sexual activity. Coercive conduct differs from seductive conduct based on factors such as the type and/or extent of the pressure used to obtain consent. When someone makes clear that they do not want to engage in certain sexual activity, that

---

7 The state definition of consent is found [here](Utah Criminal Code Title 76, Chapter 5, Part 4, Section 406), which is applicable to criminal prosecutions for sex offenses in Utah but may differ from the definition used on campus to address policy violations. [Included for Clery/VAWA Sec. 304 compliance purposes]
they want to stop, or that they do not want to go past a certain point of sexual interaction, continued pressure beyond that point can be coercive.

Consent is:

- knowing, and
- voluntary, and
- clear permission
- by word or action
- to engage in sexual activity.

Individuals may experience the same interaction in different ways. Therefore, it is the responsibility of each party to determine that the other has consented before engaging in the activity.

If consent is not clearly provided prior to engaging in the activity, consent may be ratified by word or action at some point during the interaction or thereafter, but clear communication from the outset is strongly encouraged.

For consent to be valid, there must be a clear expression in words or actions that the other individual consented to that specific sexual conduct. Reasonable reciprocation can be implied. For example, if someone kisses you, you can kiss them back (if you want to) without the need to explicitly obtain their consent to being kissed back.

Consent can also be withdrawn once given, as long as the withdrawal is reasonably and clearly communicated. If consent is withdrawn, that sexual activity should cease within a reasonable time.

Consent to some sexual contact (such as kissing or fondling) cannot be presumed to be consent for other sexual activity (such as intercourse). A current or previous intimate relationship is not sufficient to constitute consent.

Proof of consent or non-consent is not a burden placed on either party involved in an incident. Instead, the burden remains on the University to determine whether its policy has been violated. The existence of consent is based on the totality of the circumstances evaluated from the perspective of a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances, including the context in which the alleged incident occurred and any similar, previous patterns that may be evidenced.

Consent in relationships must also be considered in context. When parties consent to BDSM\(^8\) or other forms of kink, non-consent may be shown by the use of a safe word. Resistance, force, violence, or even saying “no” may be part of the kink and thus consensual, so RMU’s evaluation of communication in kink situations should be guided by reasonableness, rather than strict adherence to policy that assumes non-kink relationships as a default.

**Incapacitation:** A person cannot consent if they are unable to understand what is happening or is disoriented, helpless, asleep, or unconscious, for any reason, including by alcohol or other drugs. As stated above, a Respondent violates this policy if they engage in sexual activity with someone who is incapable of giving consent.

---

\(^8\) Bondage, discipline/dominance, submission/sadism, and masochism.
It is a defense to a sexual assault policy violation that the Respondent neither knew nor should have known the Complainant to be physically or mentally incapacitated. “Should have known” is an objective, reasonable person standard that assumes that a reasonable person is both sober and exercising sound judgment.

Incapacitation occurs when someone cannot make rational, reasonable decisions because they lack the capacity to give knowing/informed consent (e.g., to understand the “who, what, when, where, why, or how” of their sexual interaction).

Incapacitation is determined through consideration of all relevant indicators of an individual’s state and is not synonymous with intoxication, impairment, blackout, and/or being drunk.

This policy also covers a person whose incapacity results from a temporary or permanent physical or mental health condition, involuntary physical restraint, and/or the consumption of incapacitating drugs.

d. Other Civil Rights Offenses

In addition to the forms of sexual harassment described above, which are covered by Title IX, RMUoHP additionally prohibits the following offenses as forms of discrimination that may be within or outside of Title IX when the act is based upon the Complainant’s actual or perceived membership in a protected class. If these occur, they will be investigated under Process B; see page 67.

- Sexual Exploitation, defined as: taking non-consensual or abusive sexual advantage of another for their own benefit or for the benefit of anyone other than the person being exploited, and that conduct does not otherwise constitute sexual harassment under this policy. Examples of Sexual Exploitation include, but are not limited to:
  - Sexual voyeurism (such as observing or allowing others to observe a person undressing or using the bathroom or engaging in sexual acts, without the consent of the person being observed)
  - Invasion of sexual privacy.
  - Taking pictures, video, or audio recording of another in a sexual act, or in any other sexually-related activity when there is a reasonable expectation of privacy during the activity, without the consent of all involved in the activity, or exceeding the boundaries of consent (such as allowing another person to hide in a closet and observe sexual activity, or disseminating sexual pictures without the photographed person’s consent), including the making or posting of revenge pornography
  - Prostituting another person
  - Engaging in sexual activity with another person while knowingly infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or a sexually transmitted disease (STD) or infection (STI), without informing the other person of the infection
  - Causing or attempting to cause the incapacitation of another person (through alcohol, drugs, or any other means) for the purpose of compromising that person’s ability to give consent to sexual activity, or for the purpose of making that person vulnerable to non-consensual sexual activity
  - Misappropriation of another person’s identity on apps, websites, or other venues designed for dating or sexual connections
  - Forcing a person to take an action against that person’s will by threatening to show, post, or share information, video, audio, or an image that depicts the person’s nudity or sexual activity
- Knowingly soliciting a minor for sexual activity
- Engaging in sex trafficking
- Creation, possession, or dissemination of child pornography
- Threatening or causing physical harm, extreme verbal, emotional, or psychological abuse, or other conduct which threatens or endangers the health or safety of any person;
- Discrimination, defined as actions that deprive, limit, or deny other members of the community of educational or employment access, benefits, or opportunities;
- Intimidation, defined as implied threats or acts that cause an unreasonable fear of harm in another;
- Hazing, defined as acts likely to cause physical or psychological harm or social ostracism to any person within the RMU community, when related to the admission, initiation, pledging, joining, or any other group-affiliation activity;
- Bullying, defined as:
  - Repeated and/or severe
  - Aggressive behavior
  - Likely to intimidate or intentionally hurt, control, or diminish another person, physically and/or mentally.

While RMUoHP recognizes First Amendment free speech, at a private institution such as RMUoHP this is not a guarantee that such speech, when in violation of the above, will be tolerated.

Violation of any other RMUoHP policies may constitute a Civil Rights Offense when a violation is motivated by actual or perceived membership in a protected class, and the result is a discriminatory limitation or denial of employment or educational access, benefits, or opportunities.

Sanctions for the above-listed Civil Rights Offenses range from reprimand through expulsion/termination.

**18. Retaliation**

Protected activity under this policy includes reporting an incident that may implicate this policy, participating in the grievance process, supporting a Complainant or Respondent, assisting in providing information relevant to an investigation, and/or acting in good faith to oppose conduct that constitutes a violation of this Policy.

Acts of alleged retaliation should be reported immediately to the Title IX Coordinator and will be promptly investigated. Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions will take all appropriate and available steps to protect individuals who fear that they may be subjected to retaliation.

RMUoHP and any member of the University community are prohibited from taking or attempting to take materially adverse action by intimidating, threatening, coercing, harassing, or discriminating against any individual for the purpose of interfering with any right or privilege secured by law or policy, or because the individual has made a report or complaint, testified, assisted, or participated or refused to participate in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this policy and procedure.

Filing a complaint within Process B could be considered retaliatory if those charges could be applicable under Process A, when the Process B charges are made for the purpose of interfering with or circumventing any right or privilege afforded within Process A that is not provided in Process B. Therefore, RMUoHP vets all complaints carefully to ensure that this does not happen, and to assure
that complaints are tracked to the appropriate process.

The exercise of rights protected under the First Amendment does not constitute retaliation.

Charging an individual with a code of conduct violation for making a materially false statement in bad faith in the course of a grievance proceeding under this policy and procedure does not constitute retaliation, provided that a determination regarding responsibility, alone, is not sufficient to conclude that any party has made a materially false statement in bad faith.

19. Mandated Reporting
All RMUoHP employees (faculty of all positions, staff, administrators) are expected to report actual or suspected discrimination or harassment to appropriate officials immediately, though there are some limited exceptions.

In order to make informed choices, it is important to be aware of confidentiality and mandatory reporting requirements when consulting campus resources. On-campus, some resources may maintain confidentiality and are not required to report actual or suspected discrimination or harassment. They may offer options and resources without any obligation to inform an outside agency or campus official unless a Complainant has requested the information be shared. These few exceptions include staff working in the CRC and CCD clinics under the auspices of their licensure in that role. All faculty, regardless of degree, who are functioning as faculty in a teaching role are expected to report and are mandatory reporters.

If a Complainant expects formal action in response to their allegations, reporting to any Mandated Reporter can connect them with resources to report crimes and/or policy violations, and these employees will immediately pass reports to the Title IX Coordinator (and/or police, if desired by the Complainant), who will take action when an incident is reported to them.

The following sections describe the reporting options at RMUoHP for a Complainant or third-party (including parents/guardians when appropriate):

a. Confidential Resources

If a Complainant would like the details of an incident to be kept confidential, the Complainant may speak with:

- Licensed professional counselors and staff, contracted through Human Resources or Student Affairs, or personally contacted by any party
- Non-employees
- Licensed professional counselors and other medical providers in their roles of counselors and medical providers (in other words, faculty in teaching roles are not covered under this heading)
- Local rape crisis counselors
- Domestic violence resources
- Local or state assistance agencies
- Clergy/Chaplains
- Attorneys
All of the above-listed individuals will maintain confidentiality when acting under the scope of their licensure, professional ethics, and/or professional credentials, except in extreme cases of immediacy of threat or danger or abuse of a minor/elder/individual with a disability, or when required to disclose by law or court order.

Counselors contracted with Student Affairs and Human Resources are available to help free of charge and may be consulted on an emergency basis during normal business hours.

RMUoHP employees who are confidential and who receive reports within the scope of their confidential roles (namely employees at the CRC and CDC) will timely submit anonymous statistical information for Clery Act purposes unless they believe it would be harmful to the person reporting the behavior.

**b. Anonymous Notice to Mandated Reporters**

At the request of a Complainant, notice may be given by a Mandated Reporter to the Title IX Coordinator anonymously, without identification of the Complainant. The Mandated Reporter cannot remain anonymous themselves.

If a Complainant has requested that a Mandated Reporter maintain the Complainant’s anonymity, the Mandated Reporter may do so unless it is reasonable to believe that a compelling threat to health or safety could exist. The Mandated Reporter can consult with the Title IX Coordinator on that assessment without revealing personally identifiable information.

Anonymous notice will be investigated by the University to the extent possible, both to assess the underlying allegation(s) and to determine if supportive measures or remedies can be provided. However, anonymous notice typically limits the University’s ability to investigate, respond, and provide remedies, depending on what information is shared.

When a Complainant has made a request for anonymity, the Complainant’s personally identifiable information may be withheld by a Mandated Reporter, but all other details must be shared with the Title IX Coordinator. Mandated reporters are not able to maintain requests for anonymity for Complainants who are minors, elderly, and/or mentally disabled.

**c. Mandated Reporters and Formal Notice/Complaints**

All employees of the University (including student employees), with the exception of those who are designated as Confidential Resources, are Mandated Reporters and must promptly share with the Title IX Coordinator all known details of a report made to them in the course of their employment. Employees must also promptly share all details of behaviors under this policy that they observe or have knowledge of, even if not reported to them by a Complainant or third-party.

Complainants may want to carefully consider whether they share personally identifiable details with non-confidential Mandated Reporters, as those details must be shared with the Title IX Coordinator.

Generally, disclosures in climate surveys, classroom writing assignments or discussions, human subjects research, or at events such as “Take Back the Night” marches or speak-outs do not provide notice that must be reported to the Title IX Coordinator by employees, unless the Complainant clearly indicates that they desire a report to be made or a seek a specific response from the University.

Supportive measures may be offered as the result of such disclosures without formal University action.
Failure of a Mandated Reporter, as described above in this section, to report an incident of harassment or discrimination of which they become aware is a violation of RMU policy and can be subject to disciplinary action for failure to comply.

Though this may seem obvious, when a Mandated Reporter is engaged in harassment or other violations of this policy, they still have a duty to report their own misconduct, though the University is technically not on notice when a harasser is also a Mandated Reporter unless the harasser does, in fact, report themselves.

Finally, it is important to clarify that a Mandated Reporter who is themselves a target of harassment or other misconduct under this policy is not required to report their own experience, though they are, of course, encouraged to do so.

20. When a Complainant Does Not Wish to Proceed
If a Complainant does not wish for their name to be shared, does not wish for an investigation to take place, or does not want a formal complaint to be pursued, they may make such a request to the Title IX Coordinator, who will evaluate that request in light of the duty to ensure the safety of the campus and to comply with state or federal law.

The Title IX Coordinator has ultimate discretion over whether the University proceeds when the Complainant does not wish to do so, and the Title IX Coordinator may sign a formal complaint to initiate a grievance process upon completion of an appropriate violence risk assessment.

The Title IX Coordinator’s decision should be based on results of the violence risk assessment that show a compelling risk to health and/or safety that requires the University to pursue formal action to protect the community.

A compelling risk to health and/or safety may result from evidence of patterns of misconduct, predatory conduct, threats, abuse of minors, use of weapons, and/or violence. RMUoHP may be compelled to act on alleged employee misconduct irrespective of a Complainant’s wishes.

The Title IX Coordinator must also consider the effect that non-participation by the Complainant may have on the availability of evidence and the University’s ability to pursue a Formal Grievance Process fairly and effectively.

When the Title IX Coordinator executes the written complaint, they do not become the Complainant. The Complainant is the individual who is alleged to be the victim of conduct that could constitute a violation of this policy.

When the University proceeds, the Complainant (or their Advisor) may have as much or as little involvement in the process as they wish. The Complainant retains all rights of a Complainant under this Policy irrespective of their level of participation. Typically, when the Complainant chooses not to participate, the Advisor may be appointed as proxy for the Complainant throughout the process, acting to ensure and protect the rights of the Complainant, though this does not extend to the provision of evidence or testimony.
Note that the University’s ability to remedy and respond to notice may be limited if the Complainant does not want RMU to proceed with an investigation and/or grievance process. The goal is to provide the Complainant with as much control over the process as possible, while balancing RMU’s obligation to protect its community.

In cases in which the Complainant requests confidentiality/no formal action and the circumstances allow the University to honor that request, RMU will offer informal resolution options, supportive measures, and remedies to the Complainant and the community, but will not otherwise pursue formal action.

If the Complainant elects to take no action, they can change that decision if they decide to pursue a formal complaint at a later date. Upon making a formal complaint, a Complainant has the right, and can expect, to have allegations taken seriously by RMU, and to have the incidents investigated and properly resolved through these procedures. Please consider that delays may cause limitations on access to evidence, or present issues with respect to the status of parties.

21. Federal Timely Warning Obligations

Parties reporting sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and/or stalking should be aware that under the Clery Act, RMUoHP must issue timely warnings for incidents reported to them that pose a serious or continuing threat of bodily harm or danger to members of the campus community.

RMUoHP will ensure that a Complainant’s name and other identifying information is not disclosed, while still providing enough information for community members to make safety decisions in light of the potential danger.

22. False Allegations and Evidence

Deliberately false and/or malicious accusations under this policy are a serious offense and will be subject to any appropriate disciplinary action. This does not include allegations that are made in good faith but are ultimately show to be erroneous or do not result in a policy violation determination.

Additionally, witnesses and parties knowingly providing false evidence, tampering with or destroying evidence after being directed to preserve such evidence, or deliberately misleading an official conducting an investigation can be subject to discipline under University policy.

23. Amnesty for Complainants and Witnesses

The RMUoHP community encourages the reporting of misconduct and crimes by Complainants and witnesses. Sometimes, Complainants or witnesses are hesitant to report to University officials or participate in grievance processes because they fear that they themselves may be in violation of certain policies, such as underage drinking or use of illicit drugs at the time of the incident. Respondents may hesitate to be forthcoming during the process for the same reasons.

It is in the best interests of the RMUoHP community that Complainants choose to report misconduct to University officials, that witnesses come forward to share what they know, and that all parties be forthcoming during the process.

To encourage reporting and participation in the process, RMUoHP maintains a policy of offering parties and witnesses amnesty from minor policy violations – such as underage consumption of alcohol or the use of illicit drugs – related to the incident.
Amnesty does not apply to more serious allegations such as physical abuse of another or illicit drug distribution. The decision not to offer amnesty to a Respondent is based on neither sex nor gender, but on the fact that collateral misconduct is typically addressed for all students within a progressive discipline system, and the rationale for amnesty—the incentive to report serious misconduct—is rarely applicable to Respondent with respect to a Complainant.

**Students:** Sometimes, students are hesitant to assist others for fear that they may get in trouble themselves (for example, an underage student who has been using an illegal substance might hesitate to help take an individual who has experienced sexual assault to the Department of Student Affairs).

The University maintains a policy of University amnesty for students who offer help to others in need. Although policy violations cannot be overlooked, the University may provide purely educational options with no official disciplinary finding, rather than punitive sanctions, to those who offer their assistance to others in need. This does not extend to any police or legal action outside of the University.

**Employees:** Sometimes, employees are hesitant to report harassment or discrimination they have experienced for fear that they may get in trouble themselves. For example, an employee who has violated the consensual relationship policy and is then assaulted in the course of that relationship might hesitate to report the incident to RMUoHP officials.

The University may, at its discretion, offer employee Complainants amnesty from such policy violations (typically more minor policy violations) related to the incident. Amnesty may also be granted to Respondents and witnesses on a case-by-case basis.

The University maintains a policy of amnesty for employees who offer help to others in need. Although policy violations cannot be overlooked, the University may provide purely educational options with no official disciplinary finding, rather than punitive sanctions, to those who offer their assistance to others in need. This does not extend to any police or legal action outside of the University.

**24. Federal Statistical Reporting Obligations**

Certain campus officials—those deemed Campus Security Authorities—have a duty to report the following for federal statistical reporting purposes (Clery Act):

a) All “primary crimes,” which include homicide, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson;

b) Hate crimes, which include any bias-motivated primary crime as well as any bias-motivated larceny or theft, simple assault, intimidation, or destruction/damage/vandalism of property;

c) VAWA⁹-based crimes, which include sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking; and

d) Arrests and referrals for disciplinary action for weapons-related law violations, liquor-related law violations, and drug abuse-related law violations.

All personally identifiable information is kept private, but statistical information must be shared with applicable law enforcement regarding the type of incident and its general location (on or off-campus or

---

⁹ VAWA is the Violence Against Women Act, enacted in 1994 codified in part at 42 U.S.C. sections 13701 through 14040.
in the surrounding area, but no addresses are given) for publication in the Annual Campus Security Report (also known as the Clery Report) and the campus crime log.

Campus Security Authorities include but are not limited to the Institutional Equity Officer; the Director of Operations; the Human Resources Manager; the Provost and President, and any other official with significant responsibility for student and campus activities.

25. Preservation of Evidence

The preservation of evidence in incidents of sexual assault is critical to potential criminal prosecution and to obtaining restraining orders, and particularly time-sensitive. The Recipient will inform the Complainant of the importance of preserving evidence by taking the following actions:

- Seek forensic medical assistance at the [specify] hospital, ideally within 120 hours of the incident (sooner is better)
- Avoid showering, bathing, washing hands or face, or douching, if possible, but evidence may still be collected even if you do.
- Try not to urinate.
- If oral sexual contact took place, refrain from smoking, eating, drinking, or brushing teeth.
- If clothes are changed, place soiled clothes in a paper bag (plastic destroys evidence) or secure evidence container [available from …].
- Seeking medical treatment can be essential even if it is not for the purposes of collecting forensic evidence.

If the initial meeting between the Complainant and the Title IX Coordinator falls within the time guidelines for seeking forensic medical assistance, the importance of taking these actions will be reiterated with the Complainant.
RESOLUTION PROCESS FOR ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF THE POLICY ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY, HARASSMENT, AND NONDISCRIMINATION (KNOWN AS PROCESS “A”)

1. Overview
Rocky Mountain University will act on any formal or informal notice/complaint of violation of the policy on Equal Opportunity, Harassment, and Nondiscrimination (“the Policy”) that is received by the Institutional Equity Officer, or any RMU Title IX Coordinator\(^{10}\), or any other Official with Authority (OWA) by applying these procedures, known as “Process A.”

The procedures below apply only to qualifying allegations of sexual harassment (including sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, as defined above) involving students, staff, administrator, or faculty members, as defined under the Department of Education Office of Civil Rights and federal regulation 34 CFR Parts 106.30 and 106.45.

If other policies are invoked, such as harassment or discrimination based upon other protected class other than sex harassment or discrimination (see above), please see Appendix E for a description of the procedures applicable to the resolution of such offenses, known as “Process B.”

Process B can also apply to sexual harassment (including sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, as defined above) when jurisdiction does not fall within Process A, as determined by the Title IX Coordinator.

Unionized/other categorized employees are subject to the terms of their agreements/employees’ rights to the extent those agreements do not conflict with federal or state compliance obligations.

The procedures below may be used to address collateral misconduct arising from the investigation of or occurring in conjunction with reported misconduct (e.g., vandalism, physical abuse of another). All other allegations of misconduct unrelated to incidents covered by the Policy will be addressed through procedures describe in this and other University and programmatic student, faculty, and staff handbooks.

2. Notice/Complaint
Upon receipt of a complaint or notice to the Title IX Coordinator of an alleged violation of this Handbook, the Title IX Coordinator initiates a prompt initial assessment to determine the next steps to be taken.

The Title IX Coordinator will initiate at least one of three responses:
- Offering supportive measures because the Complainant does not choose to file a formal complaint; and/or
- An informal resolution upon submission of a formal complaint; and/or
- A Formal Grievance Process including an investigation and a hearing upon submission of a formal complaint.

\(^{10}\) Anywhere this procedure indicates “Title IX Coordinator,” RMUoHP may substitute a trained Deputy.
RMUoHP uses the Formal Grievance Process to determine whether or not the Policy has been violated. If so, RMU will promptly implement effective remedies designed to ensure that it is not deliberately indifferent to harassment or discrimination, their potential recurrence, or their effects.

3. Initial Assessment
Following receipt of notice or a complaint of an alleged violation of this Policy, the Title IX Coordinator\textsuperscript{11} engages in an initial assessment, typically within one to five business days. The steps in an initial assessment can include:

- If notice is given, the Title IX Coordinator seeks to determine if the person impacted wishes to make a formal complaint, and will assist them to do so, if desired.
  - If they do not wish to do so, the Title IX Coordinator determines whether to initiate a complaint because a violence risk assessment indicates a compelling threat to health and/or safety.
- If a formal complaint is received, the Title IX Coordinator assesses its sufficiency and works with the Complainant to make sure it is correctly completed.
- The Title IX Coordinator reaches out to the Complainant to offer supportive measures.
- The Title IX Coordinator works with the Complainant to ensure they are aware of the right to have an Advisor.
- The Title IX Coordinator works with the Complainant to determine whether the Complainant prefers a supportive and remedial response, an informal resolution option, or a formal investigation and grievance process.
  - If a supportive and remedial response is preferred, the Title IX Coordinator works with the Complainant to identify their wishes, assess the request, and implements accordingly. No Formal Grievance Process is initiated, though the Complainant can elect to initiate one later, if desired.
  - If an informal resolution option is preferred, the Title IX Coordinator assesses whether the complaint is suitable for informal resolution, if so which informal mechanism may serve the situation best or is available, and may seek to determine if the Respondent is also willing to engage in informal resolution.
  - If a Formal Grievance Process is preferred, the Title IX Coordinator determines if the misconduct alleged falls within the scope of Title IX:
    - If it does, the Title IX Coordinator will initiate the formal investigation and grievance process, directing the investigation to address:
      - an incident, and/or
      - a pattern of alleged misconduct, and/or
      - a culture/climate issue, based on the nature of the complaint.
    - If it does not, the Title IX Coordinator determines that Title IX does not apply (and will “dismiss” that aspect of the complaint, if any), assesses which policies may still apply, which resolution process is applicable, and refers the matter for resolution under Process B. Please note that dismissing a complaint under Title IX is solely a procedural requirement under Federal Title IX regulations, and does not limit the RMU’s authority to address a complaint with an appropriate process and remedies.

\textsuperscript{11} If circumstances require, the President or Title IX Coordinator will designate another person to oversee the process below should an allegation be made about the Coordinator or the Coordinator be otherwise unavailable or unable to fulfill their duties.
a. Violence Risk Assessment

In many cases, the Title IX Coordinator may determine that a Violence Risk Assessment (VRA) should be conducted by the Title IX, Department of Student Affairs, or Human Resources teams as part of the initial assessment. A VRA can aid in ten critical and/or required determinations, including:

- Emergency removal of a Respondent on the basis of immediate threat to physical health/safety;
- Whether the Title IX Coordinator should pursue/sign a formal complaint absent a willing/able Complainant;
- Whether to put the investigation on the footing of incident and/or pattern and/or climate;
- To help identify potential predatory conduct;
- To help assess/identify grooming behaviors (the predatory act of maneuvering another individual into a position that makes them more isolated, dependent, likely to trust, and more vulnerable to abusive behavior);
- Whether it is reasonable to try to resolve a complaint through informal resolution, and what modality may be most successful;
- Whether to permit a voluntary withdrawal by the Respondent;
- Whether to impose transcript notation or communicate with a transfer University about a Respondent;
- Assessment of appropriate sanctions/remedies (to be applied post-hearing); and/or
- Whether a Clery Act Timely Warning/Trespass order/Persona-non-grata is needed.

Threat assessment is the process of evaluating the actionability of violence by an individual against another person or group following the issuance of a direct or conditional threat. A VRA is a broader term used to assess any potential violence or danger, regardless of the presence of a vague, conditional, or direct threat.

VRAs require specific training and are typically conducted by psychologists, clinical counselors, social workers, case managers, law enforcement officers, student conduct officers, or trained staff members. A VRA authorized by the Title IX Coordinator should occur in collaboration with the above-named teams. Where a VRA is required by the Title IX Coordinator, a Respondent refusing to cooperate may result in a sanction or related action for failure to comply within the appropriate student or employee conduct process.

A VRA is not an evaluation for an involuntary behavioral health hospitalization (e.g., 5150 in California, Section XII in Massachusetts, Baker Act in Florida), nor is it a psychological or mental health assessment. A VRA assesses the risk of actionable violence, often with a focus on targeted/predatory escalations, and is supported by research from the fields of law enforcement, criminology, human resources, and psychology.

More about the University’s process for VRA can be found below in Appendix D.

b. Dismissal (Mandatory and Discretionary) of the Complaint

The University must dismiss a formal complaint or any allegations therein if, at any time during the 

---

12 These dismissal requirements are mandated by the 2020 Title IX Regulations, 34 CFR Part 106.45.
investigation or hearing, it is determined that:

- The conduct alleged in the formal complaint would not constitute sexual harassment as defined above (and under 34 CFR Part 106.45), even if proved; and/or
- The conduct did not occur in an educational program or activity controlled by the University (including buildings or property controlled by recognized student organizations), and/or the University does not have control of the Respondent; and/or
- The conduct did not occur against a person in the United States; and/or
- At the time of filing a formal complaint, a complainant is not participating in or attempting to participate in the education program or activity of the University.

The University may dismiss a formal complaint or any allegations therein if, at any time during the investigation or hearing:

1) A Complainant notifies the Title IX Coordinator in writing that the Complainant would like to withdraw the formal complaint or any allegations therein; or
2) The Respondent is no longer enrolled in or employed by the University; or
3) Specific circumstances prevent the University from gathering evidence sufficient to reach a determination as to the formal complaint or allegations therein.

Upon any dismissal, the University, through the Institutional Equity Officer, will promptly send written notice of the dismissal and the rationale for doing so simultaneously to the parties.

This dismissal decision is appealable by any party under the procedures for appeal below. The decision not to dismiss is also appealable by any party claiming that a dismissal is required or appropriate. A Complainant who decides to withdraw a complaint may later request to reinstate it or refile it.

Dismissal under Process A does not preclude a decision on the part of the Title IX Coordinator to proceed with an investigation under Process B, pursuant to federal regulations.

4. Counterclaims

RMUoHP is obligated to ensure that the grievance process is not abused for retaliatory purposes. The University permits the filing of counterclaims but uses an initial assessment, described above, to assess whether the allegations in the counterclaim are made in good faith. Counterclaims by a Respondent may be made in good faith, but are, on occasion, made for purposes of retaliation instead. Counterclaims made with retaliatory intent will not be permitted.

Counterclaims determined to have been reported in good faith will be processed using the grievance procedures below. Investigation of such claims may take place after resolution of the underlying initial allegation, in which case a delay may occur.

Counterclaims may also be resolved through the same investigation as the underlying allegation, at the discretion of the Institutional Equity Officer. When counterclaims are not made in good faith, they will be considered retaliatory and will constitute a violation of University policy, with appropriate sanctions.

5. Right to an Advisor

The parties may each have one Advisor of their choice present with them for all meetings, interviews,

13 This could include an attorney, advocate, or support person.
and hearings within the resolution process, if they so choose. The parties may select whoever they wish to serve as their Advisor as long as the Advisor is eligible and available.\footnote{Available means the party cannot insist on an Advisor who simply doesn’t have inclination, time, or availability. Also, the Advisor cannot have institutionally conflicting roles, such as being a Title IX administrator who has an active role in the matter, or a supervisor who must monitor and implement sanctions.}

Choosing an Advisor who is also a witness in the process creates potential for bias and conflict-of-interest. A party who chooses an Advisor who is also a witness can anticipate that issues of potential bias will be explored by the hearing Decision-maker(s).

Upon request, RMUoHP may permit parties to have more than one Advisor. All such requests should be directed to the Institutional Equity Officer, and the decision to grant this request is at the sole discretion of the IEO. Any decision will be granted equitably to all parties.

\textbf{a. Who Can Serve as an Advisor}

The Advisor may be a friend, mentor, family member, attorney, or any other individual a party chooses to advise, support, and/or consult with them throughout the resolution process. The parties may choose Advisors from inside or outside of the RMUoHP community.

The Title IX Coordinator will also offer to assign a trained Advisor for any party if the party so chooses. If the parties choose an Advisor from the pool available from the University, the Advisor will be trained by RMUoHP and be familiar with the University’s resolution process.

If the parties choose an Advisor from outside the pool of those identified by the University, the Advisor may not have been trained by RMUoHP and may not be familiar with RMUoHP policies and procedures.

Parties also have the right to choose not to have an Advisor in the initial stages of the resolution process, prior to a hearing.

\textbf{b. Advisor’s Role in Meetings and interviews}

The parties may be accompanied by their Advisor in all meetings and interviews at which the party is entitled to be present, including intake and interviews. Advisors should help their respective parties prepare for each meeting and are expected to advise ethically, with integrity, and in good faith.

The Recipient cannot guarantee equal Advisory rights, meaning that if one party selects an Advisor who is an attorney, but the other party does not or cannot afford an attorney, the Recipient is not obligated to provide an attorney.

\textbf{c. Advisors in Hearings/University-Appointed Advisor}

Under U.S. Department of Education regulations under Title IX, a form of indirect questioning is required during the hearing, but must be conducted by the parties’ Advisors. The parties are not permitted to directly question each other or any witnesses. If a party does not have an Advisor for a hearing, the University will appoint a trained Advisor for the limited purpose of conducting any questioning of the other parties and witnesses.

A party may reject this appointment and choose their own Advisor, but they may not proceed without an Advisor. If the party’s Advisor will not conduct questioning, the University will appoint an Advisor
who will do so thoroughly, regardless of the participation or non-participation of the advised party in the hearing itself. Extensive questioning of the parties and witnesses will also be conducted by the Decision-maker during the hearing.

d. Pre-Interview Meetings
Advisors may request to meet with the administrative officials conducting interviews/meetings in advance of these interviews or meetings. This pre-meeting allows Advisors to clarify and understand their role and University policies and procedures.

e. Advisor Violations of University Policy
All Advisors are subject to the same University policies and procedures, whether they are attorneys or not. Advisors are expected to advise their advisees without disrupting proceedings. Advisors should not address RMUoHP officials in a meeting or interview unless invited to (e.g., asking procedural questions). The Advisor may not make a presentation or represent their advisee during any meeting or proceeding and may not speak on behalf of the advisee to the Investigator(s) or other Decision-maker(s) except during a hearing proceeding, during indirect questioning.

The parties are expected to ask and respond to questions on their own behalf throughout the investigation phase of the resolution process. Although the Advisor generally may not speak on behalf of their advisee, the Advisor may consult with their advisee, either privately as needed, or by conferring or passing notes during any resolution process meeting or interview. For longer or more involved discussions, the parties and their Advisors should ask for breaks to allow for private consultation.

Any Advisor who oversteps their role as defined by this policy will be warned only once. If the Advisor continues to disrupt or otherwise fails to respect the limits of the Advisor role, the meeting will be ended, or other appropriate measures implemented. Subsequently, the Title IX Coordinator will determine how to address the Advisor’s non-compliance and future role, up to and including removing the party’s Advisor from future proceedings.

f. Sharing Information with the Advisor
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions expects that the parties may wish to have the University share documentation and evidence related to the allegations with their Advisors. Parties may share this information directly with their Advisor or other individuals if they wish. Doing so may help the parties participate more meaningfully in the resolution process.

The University also provides for written consent that authorizes the University to share such information directly with their Advisor. The parties must either complete and submit a form to the Institutional Equity Officer or provide similar documentation demonstrating consent to a release of information to the Advisor before the University is able to share records with an Advisor.

If a party requests that all communication be made through an attorney serving as an Advisor, the University will not comply with that request. All parties must personally be part of the process.

g. Privacy of Records Shared with Advisor

---

15 Subject to the state law provisions or University policy above.
Advisors are expected to maintain the privacy of the records shared with them. Any and all records shared by RMUoHP may not be shared with third parties, disclosed publicly, or used for purposes not explicitly authorized by the University. RMUoHP may seek to restrict the role of any Advisor who does not respect the sensitive nature of the process or who fails to abide by University privacy expectations.

h. Expectations of an Advisor
The University generally expects an Advisor to adjust their schedule to allow them to attend University meetings when planned but may change scheduled meetings to accommodate an Advisor’s inability to attend, if doing so does not cause an unreasonable delay.

The University may also make reasonable provisions to allow an Advisor who cannot attend in person to attend a meeting by telephone, video conferencing, or other similar technologies as may be convenient and available.

i. Expectations of the Parties with Respect to Advisors
A party may elect to change Advisors during the process and is not obligated to use the same Advisor throughout. The parties are expected to inform the Investigator(s) of the identity of their Advisor at least two (2) business days before the date of their first meeting with Investigators (or as soon as possible if a more expeditious meeting is necessary or desired).

The parties are expected to provide timely notice to the Institutional Equity Officer if they change Advisors at any time. It is assumed that if a party changes Advisors, consent to share information with the previous Advisor is terminated, and a release for the new Advisor must be secured. Parties are expected to inform the Title IX Coordinator of the identity of their hearing Advisor at least two (2) business days before the hearing.

j. Assistance in Securing an Advisor
Complainants may wish to contact organizations such as:
- The Victim Rights Law Center (http://www.victimrights.org),
- The Time’s Up Legal Defense Fund: https://nwlc.org/times-up-legal-defense-fund/

For representation, Respondents may wish to contact organizations such as:
- FACE (http://www.facecampusequality.org)
- SAVE (http://www.saveservices.org).

6. Resolution Processes
Resolution proceedings are private. All persons present at any time during the resolution process are expected to maintain the privacy of the proceedings in accordance with University policy, including this Handbook. Although there is an expectation of privacy around what Investigators share with parties during interviews, the parties have discretion to share their own knowledge and evidence with others if they so choose, with the exception of information the parties agree not to disclose related to the Informal Resolution, outlined below. Advisors are bound by the confidentiality expectations in 5g, above. RMUoHP encourages parties to discuss any sharing of information with their Advisors before doing so.

a. Informal Resolution
Informal Resolution can include three different approaches:

- When the parties agree to resolve the matter through an alternate resolution mechanism as described below, usually before a formal investigation takes place; see discussion in b., below;
- When the Respondent accepts responsibility for violating policy, and desires to accept a sanction and end the resolution process; similar to above, but usually occurs post-investigation; see discussion in 6b., below; or
- When the Title IX Coordinator can resolve the matter informally by providing supportive measures (only) to remedy the situation.

To initiate Informal Resolution, a Complainant needs to submit a formal complaint, as defined above. A Respondent who wishes to initiate Informal Resolution should contact the Title IX Coordinator.

It is not necessary to pursue Informal Resolution first in order to pursue a Formal Grievance Process, and any party participating in Informal Resolution can stop the process at any time and begin or resume the Formal Grievance Process.

Prior to implementing Informal Resolution, the University will provide the parties with written notice of the reported misconduct and any sanctions or measures that may result from participating in such a process, including information regarding any records that will be maintained or shared by the University.

The University will obtain voluntary, written confirmation that all parties wish to resolve the matter through Informal Resolution before proceeding and will not pressure the parties to participate in Informal Resolution.

b. Alternate Resolution Mechanism
Alternate Resolution is an informal mechanism, including mediation, conflict resolution, or similar methods, by which the parties reach a mutually agreed upon resolution of an allegation. All parties must consent to the use of an Alternate Resolution mechanism.

The Title IX Coordinator may look to the following factors to assess whether Alternate Resolution is appropriate, or which form of Alternate Resolution may be most successful for the parties:

- The parties’ amenability to Alternate Resolution;
- Likelihood of potential resolution, taking into account any power dynamics between the parties;
- The parties’ motivation to participate;
- Civility of the parties;
- Results of a violence risk assessment/ongoing risk analysis;
- Disciplinary history;
- Whether an emergency removal is needed;
- Skill of the Alternate Resolution facilitator with this type of allegation;
- Complaint complexity;
- Emotional investment/capacity of the parties;
- Rationale of the parties;
- Goals of the parties;
- Adequate resources to invest in Alternate Resolution (time, staff, etc.)

The ultimate determination of whether Alternate Resolution is available or successful is to be made by
c. Respondent Accepts Responsibility for Alleged Violations
The Respondent may accept responsibility for all or part of the alleged policy violations at any point during the resolution process. If the Respondent indicates an intent to accept responsibility for all of the alleged misconduct, the formal process will be paused, and the Title IX Coordinator will determine whether Informal Resolution can be used according to the criteria in 6a above.

If Informal Resolution is applicable, the Title IX Coordinator will determine whether all parties and the University are able to agree on responsibility, sanctions, and/or remedies. If so, the Title IX Coordinator implements the accepted finding that the Respondent is in violation of University policy and implements agreed-upon sanctions and/or remedies, in coordination with other appropriate administrator(s), as necessary.

This result is not subject to appeal once all parties indicate their written assent to all agreed upon terms of resolution. When the parties cannot agree on all terms of resolution, the Formal Grievance Process will resume at the same point where it was paused.

When a resolution is accomplished, the appropriate sanction or responsive actions are promptly implemented in order to effectively stop the harassment or discrimination, prevent its recurrence, and remedy the effects of the discriminatory conduct, both on the Complainant and the community.

d. Negotiated Resolution
The Title IX Coordinator, with the consent of the parties, may negotiate and implement an agreement to resolve the allegations that satisfies all parties and the University. Negotiated Resolutions are not appealable.

7. Grievance Process Pool
The Formal Grievance Process relies on a pool of administrators (“the Pool”) to carry out the process. Members of the Pool are announced in an annual distribution of this policy to all students, parents/guardians of students, employees, prospective students, and prospective employees. They are also listed in the Annual Title IX Report published by the Office of Institutional Equity and the Director of Operations.

The list of Pool members and a description of the Pool can be found at rm.edu/institutional-equity/.

a. Pool Member Roles
Members of the Pool are trained annually, and can serve in the following roles, at the direction of the Title IX Coordinator:

- To provide appropriate intake of and initial guidance pertaining to complaints
- To act as an Advisor to the parties
- To serve in a facilitation role in Informal Resolution or Alternate Resolution if appropriately trained in appropriate resolution modalities
● To perform or assist with initial assessment
● To investigate complaints
● To serve as a hearing facilitator (process administrator, no decision-making role)
● To serve as a Decision-maker regarding the complaint
● To serve as an Appeal Decision-maker

b. Pool Member Appointment
The Title IX Coordinator, in consultation with the President, appoints the Pool, which acts with independence and impartiality. Although members of the Pool are typically trained in a variety of skill sets and can rotate amongst the different roles listed above in different cases, RMUoHP may also designate permanent roles for individuals in the Pool, using others as substitutes or to provide greater depth of experience when necessary. This process of role assignment may be the result of particular skills, aptitudes, or talents identified in members of the Pool that make them best suited to particular roles.

c. Pool Member Training
The Pool members receive annual training based on their respective roles. This training includes, but is not limited to:

● The scope of the University’s Discrimination and Harassment Policy and Procedures
● How to conduct investigations and hearings that protect the safety of Complainants and Respondents, and promote accountability
● Implicit bias
● Disparate treatment and impact
● Reporting, confidentiality, and privacy requirements
● Applicable laws, regulations, and federal regulatory guidance
● How to implement appropriate and situation-specific remedies
● How to investigate in a thorough, reliable, and impartial manner
● How to uphold fairness, equity, and due process
● How to weigh evidence
● How to conduct questioning
● How to assess credibility
● Impartiality and objectivity
● How to render findings and generate clear, concise, evidence-based rationales
● The definitions of all offenses
● How to apply definitions used by the University with respect to consent (or the absence or negation of consent) consistently, impartially, and in accordance with policy
● How to conduct an investigation and grievance process including hearings, appeals, and informal resolution processes
● How to serve impartially by avoiding prejudgment of the facts at issue, conflicts of interest, and bias
● Any technology to be used at a live hearing
● Issues of relevance of questions and evidence
● Issues of relevance to create an investigation report that fairly summarizes relevant evidence
● How to determine appropriate sanctions in reference to all forms of harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation allegations
● Recordkeeping
Specific training is also provided for Appeal Decision-makers, intake personnel, Advisors (who are University employees), and Chairs. All Pool members are required to attend these trainings annually. The materials used to train all members of the Pool are publicly posted on our website, at https://rm.edu/institutional-equity.

d. Pool Membership
The Pool includes at a minimum:

- The IEO, the Provost, and the HR Manager (serving in most cases as the Decision-makers or Hearing Panel Chairs).
- At least two members from Academic Affairs.
- At least two members of the non-academic administration and/or staff.
- At least one representative from the Department of Student Affairs.
- At least one member from Institutional Technology (IT).

Pool members are usually appointed to three-year terms. Individuals who are interested in serving in the Pool are encouraged to contact the Title IX Coordinator.

The Title IX Coordinator will provide written notice of the investigation and allegations (the “NOIA”) to the Respondent upon commencement of the Formal Grievance Process. This facilitates the Respondent’s ability to prepare for the interview and to identify and choose an Advisor to accompany them. The NOIA is also copied to the Complainant, who is to be given advance notice of when the NOIA will be delivered to the Respondent.

The NOIA will include:

- A meaningful summary of all of allegations,
- The identity of the involved parties (if known),
- The precise misconduct being alleged,
- The date and location of the alleged incident(s) (if known),
- The specific policies implicated,
- A description of the applicable procedures,
- A statement of the potential sanctions/responsive actions that could result,
- A statement that the University presumes the Respondent is not responsible for the reported misconduct unless and until the evidence supports a different determination,
- A statement that determinations of responsibility are made at the conclusion of the process and that the parties will be given an opportunity to inspect and review all directly related and/or relevant evidence obtained during the review and comment period,
- A statement about the University policy on retaliation,
- Information about the privacy of the process,
- Information on the need for each party to have an Advisor of their choosing and suggestions for ways to identify an Advisor,
- A statement informing the parties that the University’s policy prohibits knowingly making false statements, including knowingly submitting false information during the resolution process,
- Detail on how the party may request disability accommodations during the interview process,
• A link to the RMUoHP VAWA Brochure,
• The name(s) of the Investigator(s), along with a process to identify, in advance of the interview process, to the Title IX Coordinator any conflict of interest that the Investigator(s) may have, and
• An instruction to preserve any evidence that is directly related to the allegations.

Amendments and updates to the NOIA may be made as the investigation progresses and more information becomes available regarding the addition or dismissal of various charges.

Notice will be made in writing and may be delivered by one or more of the following methods: in person, mailed to the local or permanent address(es) of the parties as indicated in official University records, or emailed to the parties’ RMUoHP-issued email or designated accounts. Once mailed, emailed, and/or received in-person, notice will be presumptively delivered.

9. Resolution Timeline
The University will make a good faith effort to complete the resolution process within a sixty-to-ninety (60-90) business day time period, including appeal, which can be extended as necessary for appropriate cause by the Title IX Coordinator. If an extension is required, the Title IX Coordinator will provide notice and rationale for any extensions or delays to the parties as appropriate, as well as an estimate of how much additional time will be needed to complete the process.

10. Appointment of Investigators
Once the decision to commence a formal investigation is made, the Title IX Coordinator appoints Pool members to conduct the investigation (typically using a team of two Investigators), usually within two (2) business days of determining that an investigation should proceed.

11. Ensuring Impartiality
Any individual materially involved in the administration of the resolution process, including the Title IX Coordinator, Investigator(s), and Decision-maker(s) may neither have nor demonstrate a conflict of interest or bias for a party generally, or for a specific Complainant or Respondent.

The Title IX Coordinator will vet the assigned Investigator(s) to ensure impartiality by ensuring there are no actual or apparent conflicts of interest or disqualifying biases. The parties may, at any time during the resolution process, raise a concern regarding bias or conflict of interest, and the Title IX Coordinator will determine whether the concern is reasonable and supportable. If so, another Pool member will be assigned and the impact of the bias or conflict, if any, will be remedied. If the source of the conflict of interest or bias is the Title IX Coordinator, concerns should be raised with the one of the Deputy Title IX Coordinators who, along with the University President, will determine which Deputy will take charge and act with independence.

The Formal Grievance Process involves an objective evaluation of all relevant evidence obtained, including evidence that supports that the Respondent engaged in a policy violation and evidence that supports that the Respondent did not engage in a policy violation. Credibility determinations may not be based solely on an individual’s status or participation as a Complainant, Respondent, or witness.

The University operates with the presumption that the Respondent is not responsible for the reported misconduct unless and until the Respondent is determined to be responsible for a policy violation by the “preponderance of the evidence” standard of proof.
12. Investigation Timeline
Investigations are completed expeditiously, normally within thirty (30) business days, though some investigations may take weeks or even months, depending on the nature, extent, and complexity of the allegations, availability of witnesses, police involvement, etc.

The University will make a good faith effort to complete investigations as promptly as circumstances permit and will communicate regularly with the parties to update them on the progress and timing of the investigation.

13. Delays in the Investigation Process and Interactions with Law Enforcement
The University may undertake a short delay in its investigation (several days to a few weeks) if circumstances require. Such circumstances include, but are not limited to: a request from law enforcement to temporarily delay the investigation, the need for language assistance, the absence of parties and/or witnesses, and/or accommodations for disabilities or health conditions.

The University will communicate in writing the anticipated duration of the delay and reason to the parties and provide the parties with status updates if necessary. RMUoHP will promptly resume its investigation and resolution process as soon as feasible. During such a delay, the University will implement supportive measures as deemed appropriate.

University actions or processes are not typically altered or precluded on the grounds that civil or criminal charges involving the underlying incident(s) have been filed or that criminal charges have been dismissed or reduced.

14. Steps in the Investigation Process
All investigations are thorough, reliable, impartial, prompt, and fair. Investigations involve interviews with all relevant parties and witnesses; obtaining available, relevant evidence; and identifying sources of expert information, as necessary.

All parties have a full and fair opportunity, through the investigation process, to suggest witnesses and questions, to provide evidence and expert witnesses, and to fully review and respond to all evidence on the record.

The Investigator(s) typically take(s) the following steps, if not already completed (not necessarily in this order):

- Determine the identity and contact information of the Complainant
- In coordination with campus partners (e.g., the Title IX Coordinator), initiate or assist with any necessary supportive measures
- Identify all policies implicated by the alleged misconduct and notify the Complainant and Respondent of all of the specific policies implicated
- Assist the Title IX Coordinator with conducting a prompt initial assessment to determine if the allegations indicate a potential policy violation
- Commence a thorough, reliable, and impartial investigation by identifying issues and developing a strategic investigation plan, including a witness list, evidence list, intended investigation timeframe, and order of interviews for all witnesses and the parties
- Meet with the Complainant to finalize their interview/statement, if necessary
• Prepare the initial Notice of Investigation and Allegation (NOIA). The NOIA may be amended with any additional or dismissed allegations
  o Notice should inform the parties of their right to have the assistance of an Advisor, who could be a member of the Pool or an Advisor of their choosing present for all meetings attended by the party
• Provide each interviewed party and witness an opportunity to review and verify the Investigator’s summary notes (or transcript) of the relevant evidence/testimony from their respective interviews and meetings
• Make good faith efforts to notify the parties of any meeting or interview involving the other party, in advance when possible
• When participation of a party is expected, provide that party with written notice of the date, time, and location of the meeting, as well as the expected participants and purpose
• Interview all available, relevant witnesses and conduct follow-up interviews as necessary
• Allow each party the opportunity to suggest witnesses and questions they wish the Investigator(s) to ask of the other party and witnesses, and document in the report which questions were asked, with a rationale for any changes or omissions.
• Complete the investigation promptly and without unreasonable deviation from the intended timeline
• Provide regular status updates to the parties throughout the investigation.
• Prior to the conclusion of the investigation, provide the parties and their respective Advisors (if so desired by the parties) with a list of witnesses whose information will be used to render a finding
• Write a comprehensive investigation report fully summarizing the investigation, all witness interviews, and addressing all relevant evidence. Appendices including relevant physical or documentary evidence will be included
• Gather, assess, and synthesize evidence, but make no conclusions, and render no recommendations as part of their report
• Prior to the conclusion of the investigation, provide the parties and their respective Advisors (if so desired by the parties) a secured electronic or hard copy of the draft investigation report as well as an opportunity to inspect and review all of the evidence obtained as part of the investigation that is directly related to the reported misconduct, including evidence upon which the University does not intend to rely in reaching a determination. Both parties will then have a ten (10) business day review and comment period so that each party may meaningfully respond to the evidence. The parties may elect to waive the full ten days. Each copy of the materials shared will be watermarked on each page with the role of the person receiving it (e.g., Complainant, Respondent, Complainant’s Advisor, Respondent’s Advisor).
• The Investigator(s) may elect to respond in writing in the investigation report to the parties’ submitted responses and/or to share the responses between the parties for additional responses
• The Investigator(s) will incorporate relevant elements of the parties’ written responses into the final investigation report, include any additional relevant evidence, make any necessary revisions, and finalize the report. The Investigator(s) should document all rationales for any changes made after the review and comment period
• The Investigator(s) shares the report with the Title IX Coordinator for their review and feedback as necessary throughout the process
• The Investigator will incorporate any relevant feedback, and the final report is then shared with all parties and their Advisors through secure electronic transmission or hard copy at
least ten (10) business days prior to a hearing. The parties are also provided with a file of any directly related evidence that was not included in the report.

15. Role and Participation of Witnesses in the Investigation
Witnesses (as distinguished from the parties) who are employees of the University are expected to cooperate with and participate in the University’s investigation and resolution process. Failure of such witnesses to cooperate with and/or participate in the investigation or resolution process constitutes a violation of policy and may warrant discipline.

Although in-person interviews for parties and all potential witnesses are ideal, circumstances (e.g., study abroad, summer break) may require individuals to be interviewed remotely. Skype, Zoom, FaceTime, WebEx, or similar technologies may be used for interviews if the Investigator(s) determine that timeliness or efficiency dictate a need for remote interviewing. The University will take appropriate steps to reasonably ensure the security/privacy of remote interviews.

Witnesses may also provide written statements in lieu of interviews or choose to respond to written questions, if deemed appropriate by the Investigator(s), though not preferred. If a witness submits a written statement but does not intend to be and is not present for indirect questioning at a hearing, their written statement may not be used as evidence.

16. Recording of Interviews
No unauthorized audio or video recording of any kind is permitted during investigation meetings. If Investigator(s) elect to audio and/or video record interviews, all involved parties must be made aware of audio and/or video recording. Failure to do so may result in sanctions or related actions.

17. Evidentiary Considerations in the Investigation
The investigation does not consider: 1) incidents not directly related to the possible violation, unless they evidence a pattern; 2) the character of the parties; or 3) questions and evidence about the Complainant’s sexual predisposition or prior sexual behavior, unless

a) such questions and evidence about the Complainant’s prior sexual behavior are offered to prove that someone other than the Respondent committed the conduct alleged by the Complainant, or
b) if the questions and evidence concern specific incidents of the Complainant’s prior sexual behavior with respect to the Respondent and are offered to prove consent.

18. Referral for Hearing
Provided that the complaint is not resolved through Informal Resolution, once the final investigation report is shared with the parties, the Title IX Coordinator will refer the matter for a hearing.

The hearing cannot be less than ten (10) business days from the conclusion of the investigation—when the final investigation report is transmitted to the parties and the Decision-maker—unless all parties and the Decision-maker agree to an expedited timeline.

The Title IX Coordinator will select an appropriate Decision-maker(s) from the Pool depending on whether the Respondent is an employee or a student. Allegations involving student-employees in the context of their employment will be directed to the appropriate Decision-maker depending on the context and nature of the alleged misconduct.
19. Hearing Decision-maker Composition
The University will designate a single Decision-maker or a three-member panel from the Pool, at the discretion of the Title IX Coordinator. The single Decision-maker will also Chair the hearing. With a panel, one of the three members will be appointed as Chair by the Title IX Coordinator.

The Decision-maker(s) will not have had any previous involvement with the investigation. The Title IX Coordinator may elect to have an alternate from the Pool sit in throughout the hearing process in the event that a substitute is needed for any reason.

Those who have served as Investigators will be witnesses in the hearing and therefore may not serve as Decision-makers. Those who are serving as Advisors for any party may not serve as Decision-makers in that matter.

The overseeing Title IX Coordinator or Deputy may not serve as a Decision-maker or Chair in the matter but may serve as a Decision-maker or Hearing Panel Chair if their previous role(s) in the matter do not create a conflict of interest. Otherwise, a designee may fulfill this role. The hearing will convene at a time determined by the Decision-maker, Chair or designee.

20. Evidentiary Considerations in the Hearing
Any evidence that the Decision-maker(s) determine(s) is relevant and credible may be considered. The hearing does not consider: 1) incidents not directly related to the possible violation, unless they evidence a pattern; 2) the character of the parties; or 3) questions and evidence about the Complainant’s sexual predisposition or prior sexual behavior, unless such questions and evidence about the 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 the Complainant’s prior sexual behavior with respect to the Respondent and are offered to prove consent.

Previous disciplinary action of any kind involving the Respondent may be considered in determining an appropriate sanction upon a determination of responsibility, as Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions uses a progressive discipline system where prior sanctions may be seen as an aggravated issue if repeated. This information is only considered at the sanction stage of the process, and is not shared until then.

The parties may each submit a written impact statement prior to the hearing for the consideration of the Decision-maker(s) at the sanction stage of the process when a determination of responsibility is reached.

After post-hearing deliberation, the Decision-maker(s) renders() a determination based on the preponderance of the evidence; whether it is more likely than not that the Respondent violated the Policy as alleged.

21. Notice of Hearing
No less than ten (10) business days prior to the hearing, the Title IX Coordinator or the Chair will send notice of the hearing to the parties. Once mailed, emailed, and/or received in-person, notice will be presumptively delivered.
The notice will contain:

- A description of the alleged violation(s), a list of all policies allegedly violated, a description of the applicable procedures, and a statement of the potential sanctions-responsive actions that could result.
- The time, date, and location of the hearing and a reminder that attendance is mandatory, superseding all other campus activities.
- Any technology that will be used to facilitate the hearing.
- Information about the option for the live hearing to occur with the parties located in separate rooms using technology that enables the Decision-maker(s) and parties to see and hear a party or witness answering questions. Such a request must be raised with the Title IX Coordinator at least five (5) business days prior to the hearing.
- A list of all those who will attend the hearing, along with an invitation to object to any Decision-maker on the basis of demonstrated bias. This must be raised with the Title IX Coordinator at least two (2) business days prior to the hearing.
- Information on how the hearing will be recorded and on access to the recording for the parties after the hearing.
- A statement that if any party or witness does not appear at the scheduled hearing, the hearing may be held in their absence, and the party’s or witness’s testimony and any statements given prior to the hearing will not be considered by the Decision-maker(s). For compelling reasons, the Chair may reschedule the hearing.
- Notification that the parties may have the assistance of an Advisor of their choosing at the hearing and will be required to have one present for any questions they may desire to ask. The party must notify the Title IX Coordinator if they do not have an Advisor, and the University will appoint one. Each party must have an Advisor present. There are no exceptions.
- A copy of all the materials provided to the Decision-maker(s) about the matter, unless they have been provided already.\(^{16}\)
- An invitation to each party to submit to the Chair an impact statement pre-hearing that the Decision-maker will review during any sanction determination.
- An invitation to contact the Title IX Coordinator to arrange any disability accommodations, language assistance, and/or interpretation services that may be needed at the hearing, at least seven (7) business days prior to the hearing.
- Whether parties can or cannot bring mobile phones or other electronic devices into the hearing.

To remain within the 60-90 business day goal for resolution, hearings for possible violations that occur near or after the end of an academic term that are unable to be resolved prior to the end of term will typically be held immediately after the end of the term or during breaks, as needed (assuming the Respondent is still subject to this Policy).

In these cases, if the Respondent is a graduating student, a hold may be placed on graduation and/or official transcripts until the matter is fully resolved (including any appeal). A student facing charges under this Policy may not be classified in good standing to graduate.

### 22. Alternative Hearing Participation Options

\(^{16}\) The final investigation report may be shared using electronic means that preclude downloading, forwarding, or otherwise sharing.
If a party or parties prefer not to attend or cannot attend the hearing in person, the party should request alternative arrangements from the Title IX Coordinator or the Chair at least five (5) business days prior to the hearing.

The Title IX Coordinator or the Chair can arrange to use technology to allow remote testimony without compromising the fairness of the hearing. Remote options may also be needed for witnesses who cannot appear in person. Any witness who cannot attend in person should let the Title IX Coordinator or the Chair know at least five (5) business days prior to the hearing so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

23. Pre-Hearing Preparation
The Chair or Hearing Officer, after any necessary consultation with the parties, Investigator(s) and/or Title IX Coordinator, will provide the names of persons who will be participating in the hearing, all pertinent documentary evidence, and the final investigation report to the parties at least ten (10) business days prior to the hearing.

Any witness scheduled to participate in the hearing must have been first interviewed by the Investigator(s) or have proffered a written statement or answered written questions, unless all parties and the Chair assent to the witness’s participation in the hearing. The same holds for any evidence that is first offered at the hearing. If the parties and Chair do not assent to the admission of evidence newly offered at the hearing, the Chair may delay the hearing and instruct that the investigation needs to be re-opened to consider that evidence.

The parties will be given a list of the names of the Decision-maker(s) at least five (5) business days in advance of the hearing. All objections to any Decision-maker must be raised in writing, detailing the rationale for the objection, and must be submitted to the Title IX Coordinator as soon as possible and no later than one full day prior to the hearing. Decision-makers will only be removed if the Title IX Coordinator concludes that their bias or conflict of interest precludes an impartial hearing of the allegation(s).

The Title IX Coordinator will give the Decision-maker(s) a list of the names of all parties, witnesses, and Advisors at least five (5) business days in advance of the hearing. Any Decision-maker who cannot make an objective determination must recuse themselves from the proceedings when notified of the identity of the parties, witnesses, and Advisors in advance of the hearing. If a Decision-maker is unsure of whether a bias or conflict of interest exists, they must raise the concern to the Title IX Coordinator as soon as possible.

During the ten (10) business day period prior to the hearing, the parties have the opportunity for continued review and comment on the final investigation report and available evidence. That review and comment can be shared with the Chair at the pre-hearing meeting or at the hearing and will be exchanged between each party by the Chair.

24. Pre-Hearing Meetings
The Chair may convene a pre-hearing meeting(s) with the parties and/or their Advisors to invite them to submit the questions or topics they (the parties and/or their Advisors) wish to ask or discuss at the hearing, so that the Chair can rule on their relevance ahead of time to avoid any improper evidentiary introduction in the hearing or provide recommendations for more appropriate phrasing. However, this advance review opportunity does not preclude the Advisors from asking a question for the first time at
the hearing or from asking for a reconsideration based on any new information or testimony offered at
the hearing. The Chair must document and share with each party their rationale for any exclusion or
inclusion at a pre-hearing meeting.

The Chair, only with full agreement of the parties, may decide in advance of the hearing that certain
witnesses do not need to be present if their testimony can be adequately summarized by the
Investigator(s) in the investigation report or during the hearing.

At each pre-hearing meeting with a party and their Advisor, the Chair will consider arguments that
evidence identified in the final investigation report as relevant is, in fact, not relevant. Similarly,
evidence identified as directly related but not relevant by the Investigator(s) may be argued to be
relevant. The Chair may rule on these arguments pre-hearing and will exchange those rulings between
the parties prior to the hearing to assist in preparation for the hearing. The Chair may consult with legal
counsel and/or the Title IX Coordinator, or ask either or both to attend pre-hearing meetings.

The pre-hearing meeting(s) will be recorded. Recordings and all relevant written materials will be kept
per the Recordkeeping requirement of seven years, listed under 40, below

25. Hearing Procedures
At the hearing, the Decision-maker(s) has the authority to hear and make determinations on all
allegations of discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation and may also hear and make
determinations on any additional alleged policy violations that have occurred in concert with the
discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation, even though those collateral allegations may not
specifically fall within the policy on Equal Opportunity, Harassment, and Nondiscrimination.

Participants at the hearing will include the Chair, any additional panelists, the Investigators who
conducted the investigation, the parties, Advisors to the parties, any called witnesses, the Title IX
Coordinator, and anyone providing authorized accommodations or assistive services.

The Chair will answer all questions of procedure. Anyone appearing at the hearing to provide
information will respond to questions on their own behalf.

The Chair will allow witnesses who have relevant information to appear at a portion of the hearing in
order to respond to specific questions from the Decision-maker(s) and the parties and the witnesses will
then be excused.

Unless requested by all parties, the default for all hearings is through a secure Zoom or Google Meet
video link, with parties attending electronically. RMU being a campus where videoconferencing and
distance education is a standard, this may only be changed to having all parties physically present in a
single location with the request of the parties, the Title IX Coordinator, and the Chair.

26. Joint Hearings
In hearings involving more than one Respondent or in which two (2) or more Complainants have
accused the same individual of substantially similar conduct, the default procedure will be to hear the
allegations jointly.

However, the Title IX Coordinator may permit the investigation and/or hearings pertinent to each
Respondent to be conducted separately if there is a compelling reason to do so. In joint hearings,
separate determinations of responsibility will be made for each Respondent with respect to each alleged policy violation.

27. The Order of the Hearing – Introductions and Explanation of Procedure
The Chair explains the procedures and introduces the participants. This may include a final opportunity for challenge or recusal of the Decision-maker(s) on the basis of bias or conflict of interest. The Chair will rule on any such challenge unless the Chair is the individual who is the subject of the challenge, in which case the Title IX Coordinator will review and decide the challenge.

An appointed hearing facilitator may be used to aid with the flow of the hearing. A hearing facilitator may attend to: logistics of electronic or physical rooms for various parties/witnesses as they wait; flow of parties/witnesses in and out of the hearing space; ensuring recording and/or virtual conferencing technology is working as intended; copying and distributing materials to participants, as appropriate, etc.

28. Investigator Presents the Final Investigation Report
The Investigator(s) will then present a summary of the final investigation report, including items that are contested and those that are not, and will be subject to questioning by the Decision-maker(s) and the parties (through their Advisors). The Investigator(s) will be present during the entire hearing process, but not during deliberations.

Neither the parties nor the Decision-maker(s) should ask the Investigator(s) their opinions on credibility, recommended findings, or determinations, and the Investigators, Advisors, and parties will refrain from discussion of or questions about these assessments. If such information is introduced, the Chair will direct that it be disregarded.

29. Testimony and Questioning
Once the Investigator(s) present their report and are questioned, the parties and witnesses may provide relevant information in turn, beginning with the Complainant, and then in the order determined by the Chair. The parties/witnesses will submit to questioning by the Decision-maker(s) and then by the parties through their Advisors (indirect questioning).

All questions are subject to a relevance determination by the Chair. The Advisor, who will remain seated during questioning, will pose the proposed question orally, electronically, or in writing (orally is the default, but other means of submission may be permitted by the Chair upon request if agreed to by all parties and the Chair), the proceeding will pause to allow the Chair to consider the question and/or the format of the question (and state it if it has not been stated aloud), and the Chair will determine whether the question will be permitted, disallowed, or rephrased.

The Chair will limit or disallow questions on the basis that they are irrelevant, unduly repetitious (and thus irrelevant), or abusive. The Chair has final say on all questions and determinations of relevance. The Chair may consult with legal counsel on any questions of admissibility. The Chair may ask Advisors to frame why a question is or is not relevant from their perspective but will not entertain argument from the Advisors on relevance once the Chair has ruled on a question.

If the parties raise an issue of bias or conflict of interest of an Investigator or Decision-maker at the hearing, the Chair may elect to address those issues, consult with legal counsel, and/or refer them to the Title IX Coordinator, and/or preserve them for appeal. If bias is not in issue at the hearing, the Chair
should not permit irrelevant questions that probe for bias.

30. Refusal to Submit to Indirect Questioning and Inferences
If a party or witness chooses not to submit to indirect questioning at the hearing, either because they do not attend the meeting, or they attend but refuse to participate in questioning, then the Decision-maker(s) may not rely on any prior statement made by that party or witness at the hearing (including those contained in the investigation report) in the ultimate determination of responsibility. The Decision-maker(s) must disregard that statement. Evidence provided that is something other than a statement by the party or witness may be considered.

If the party or witness attends the hearing and answers some cross-examination questions, only statements related to the indirect questions they refuse to answer cannot be relied upon. However, if the statements of the party who is refusing to submit to cross-examination or refuses to attend the hearing are the subject of the allegation itself (e.g., the case is about verbal harassment or a quid pro quo offer), then those statements are not precluded from admission. Similarly, statements can be relied upon when questions are posed by the Decision-maker(s), as distinguished from questions posed by Advisors through cross-examination.

The Decision-maker(s) may not draw any inference solely from a party’s or witness’s absence from the hearing or refusal to answer cross-examination or other questions.

If charges of policy violations other than sexual harassment are considered at the same hearing, the Decision-maker(s) may consider all evidence it deems relevant, may rely on any relevant statement as long as the opportunity for cross-examination is afforded to all parties through their Advisors, and may draw reasonable inferences from any decision by any party or witness not to participate or respond to questions.

If a party’s Advisor of choice refuses to comply with the University established rules of decorum for the hearing, the University may require the party to use a different Advisor. If a University-provided Advisor refuses to comply with the rules of decorum, RMUoHP through the Chair, Decision-makers(s) or Title IX Coordinator may provide that party with a different Advisor to conduct cross-examination on behalf of that party.

31. Recording Hearings
Hearings (but not deliberations) are recorded by the University for purposes of review in the event of an appeal. The parties may not record the proceedings and no other unauthorized recordings are permitted.

The Decision-maker(s), the parties, their Advisors, and appropriate administrators of the University will be permitted to listen to the recording in a controlled environment determined by the Title IX Coordinator. No person will be given or be allowed to make a copy of the recording without permission of the Title IX Coordinator.

31. Recording Hearings
Hearings (but not deliberations) are recorded by the University for purposes of review in the event of an appeal. The parties may not record the proceedings and no other unauthorized recordings are permitted.
The Decision-maker(s), the parties, their Advisors, and appropriate administrators of RMUoHP will be permitted to listen to the recording in a controlled environment determined by the Title IX Coordinator. No person will be given or be allowed to make a copy of the recording without permission of the Title IX Coordinator.

32. Deliberation, Decision-making, and Standard of Proof

The Decision-maker(s) will deliberate in closed session to determine whether the Respondent is responsible or not responsible for the policy violation(s) in question. If a panel is used, a simple majority vote is required to determine the finding. The preponderance of the evidence standard of proof is used. A hearing facilitator may be invited to attend the deliberation by the Chair, but is there only to facilitate procedurally, not to address the substance of the allegations.

When there is a finding of responsibility on one or more of the allegations, the Decision-maker(s) may then consider the previously submitted party impact statements in determining appropriate sanction(s). The Chair will ensure that each of the parties has an opportunity to review any impact statement submitted by the other party(ies). The Decision-maker(s) may at their discretion consider the statements, but they are not binding.

The Decision-maker(s) will review the statements (and any pertinent conduct history provided by RMU disciplinary officers) and will determine appropriate sanction(s) in consultation with any other appropriate RMU officers and administrators, as required.

The Chair will then prepare a written deliberation statement and deliver it to the Title IX Coordinator, detailing the determination, rationale, the evidence used in support of its determination, the evidence not relied upon in its determination, credibility assessments, and any sanctions.

This report is typically three (3) to five (5) pages in length and must be submitted to the Title IX Coordinator within two (2) business days of the end of deliberations, unless the Title IX Coordinator grants an extension. If an extension is granted, the Title IX Coordinator will notify the parties.

33. Notice of Outcome

Using the deliberation statement, the Title IX Coordinator will work with the Chair to prepare a Notice of Outcome. The Title IX Coordinator will then share the letter, including the final determination, rationale, and any applicable sanction(s) with the parties and their Advisors within five (5) business days of receiving the deliberation statement from the Decision-makers.

The Notice of Outcome will then be shared with the parties simultaneously. Notification will be made in writing and may be delivered by one or more of the following methods: in person, mailed to the local or permanent address of the parties as indicated in official RMU records, or emailed to the parties’ RMU-issued email or otherwise approved account. Once mailed, emailed, and/or received in-person, notice will be presumptively delivered.

The Notice of Outcome will articulate the specific policy(ies) reported to have been violated, including the relevant policy section. The Notice of Outcome will contain a description of the procedural steps taken by the University from the receipt of the misconduct report to the determination, including any and all notifications to the parties, interviews with parties and witnesses, site visits, methods used to obtain evidence, and hearings held.
The Notice of Outcome will specify
• the finding on each alleged policy violation;
• the findings of fact that support the determination;
• conclusions regarding the application of the relevant policy to the facts at issue;
• a statement of, and rationale for, the result of each allegation to the extent the University is permitted to share such information under state or federal law;
• any sanctions issued which the University is permitted to share according to state or federal law; and
• any remedies provided to the Complainant designed to ensure access to the University’s educational or employment program or activity, to the extent the University is permitted to share such information under state or federal law (this detail is not typically shared with the Respondent unless the remedy directly relates to the Respondent).

The Notice of Outcome will also include information on when the results are considered by the University to be final, any changes that occur prior to finalization, and the relevant procedures and bases for any available appeal options.

34. Statement of the Rights of the Parties (see Appendix C)

35. Sanctions
Factors considered when determining a sanction/responsive action may include, but are not limited to:
• The nature, severity of, and circumstances surrounding the violation(s)
• The Respondent’s disciplinary history
• Previous allegations or allegations involving similar conduct
• The need for sanctions/responsive actions to bring an end to the discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation
• The need for sanctions/responsive actions to prevent the future recurrence of discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation
• The need to remedy the effects of the discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation on the Complainant and the community
• The impact on the parties
• Any other information deemed relevant by the Decision-maker(s)

The sanctions will be implemented as soon as is feasible, either upon the outcome of any appeal or the expiration of the window to appeal without an appeal being requested.

The sanctions described in this policy are not exclusive of, and may be in addition to, other actions taken or sanctions imposed by external authorities.

a. Student Sanctions:
The following are common sanctions17 that may be imposed upon students or organizations singly or in combination18:

• Warning: A formal statement that the conduct was unacceptable and a warning that further

---

17 University policies on transcript notation will apply to these proceedings.
18 Subject to University’s Organizational Code of Conduct.
violation of any University policy, procedure, or directive will result in more severe sanctions/responsive actions.

- **Required Counseling**: A mandate to meet with and engage in either RMUoHP-sponsored or external counseling to better comprehend the misconduct and its effects.

- **Conduct Probation**: A written reprimand for violation of institutional policy, providing for more severe disciplinary sanctions in the event that the student or organization is found in violation of any similar institutional policy, procedure, or directive within a specified period of time. Terms of the probation will be articulated and may include denial of specified social privileges, exclusion from co-curricular activities, exclusion from designated areas of campus, no-contact orders, completion of an academic or online course on a topic related to the violation, and/or other measures deemed appropriate.

- **University Probation**: A written reprimand for violation of institutional policy, providing for more severe disciplinary sanctions in the event that the student or organization is found in violation of any institutional policy, procedure, or directive within a specified period of time. Terms of the probation will be articulated and may include denial of specified social privileges, exclusion from co-curricular activities, exclusion from designated areas of campus, no-contact orders, completion of an academic or online course on a topic related to the violation, and/or other measures deemed appropriate.

- **Suspension**: Termination of student status for a definite period of time not to exceed two years and/or until specific criteria are met. Students who return from suspension are automatically placed on probation through the remainder of their tenure as a student at RMUoHP. A transcript notation is considered part of this sanction.

- **Dismissal**: Permanent termination of student status and revocation of rights to be on campus for any reason or to attend RMUoHP-sponsored events. This sanction will be noted permanently as a Conduct Expulsion on the student’s official transcript, subject to any applicable expungement policies.

- **Withholding Diploma**: The University may withhold a student’s diploma for a specified period of time and/or deny a student participation in commencement activities if the student has an allegation pending or as a sanction if the student is found responsible for an alleged violation.

- **Revocation of Degree**: The University reserves the right to revoke a degree previously awarded from Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions for fraud, misrepresentation, and/or other violation of University policies, procedures, or directives in obtaining the degree, or for other serious violations committed by a student prior to graduation.

- **Organizational Sanctions**: Deactivation, loss of recognition, loss of some or all privileges (including RMUoHP enrollment or advancement within a cohort) for a specified period of time.

- **Other Actions**: In addition to or in place of the above sanctions, the University may assign any other sanctions as deemed appropriate.

### b. Employee Sanctions/Responsive Actions

Responsive actions for an employee who has engaged in harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation include:

- **Warning – Verbal or Written**
- **Performance Improvement Plan/Management Process**
- **Enhanced supervision, observation, or review**
- **Required Counseling**
- **Required Training or Education**
• Probation
• Denial of Annual Pay Increase/Pay Grade
• Loss of Oversight or Supervisory Responsibility
• Demotion
• Transfer
• Reassignment
• Assignment to a new supervisor
• Restrictions of stipends, research, and/or professional development resources
• Suspension with pay
• Suspension without pay
• Termination
• Other Actions: In addition to or in place of the above sanctions/responsive actions, the University may assign any other responsive actions as deemed appropriate.

36. Withdrawal or Resignation While Charges Pending

Students: If a student has an allegation pending for violation of the Policy on Equal Opportunity, Harassment, and Nondiscrimination, the University may place a hold on a student’s ability to graduate and/or to receive an official transcript/diploma.

Should a student decide to not participate in the resolution process, the process proceeds absent their participation to a reasonable resolution. Should a student Respondent permanently withdraw from the University, the resolution process ends, as the University no longer has disciplinary jurisdiction over the withdrawn student.

However, the University will continue to address and remedy any systemic issues, variables that may have contributed to the alleged violation(s), and any ongoing effects of the alleged harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation. The student who withdraws or leaves while the process is pending may not return to the University. Such exclusion applies to all campuses and programs of the University. They may also be barred from University property and/or events.

If the student Respondent only withdraws or takes a leave for a specified period of time (e.g., one semester or term), the resolution process may continue remotely and that student is not permitted to return to RMUoHP unless and until all sanctions have been satisfied.

Employees: Should an employee Respondent resign with unresolved allegations pending, the resolution process ends, as the University no longer has disciplinary jurisdiction over the resigned employee.

However, the University will continue to address and remedy any systemic issues, variables that contributed to the alleged violation(s), and any ongoing effects of the alleged harassment or discrimination.

The employee who resigns with unresolved allegations pending is not eligible for rehire with the University or any campus or program of the University, and the records retained by the Title IX Coordinator will reflect that status.

All University responses to future inquiries regarding employment references for that individual will include that the former employee resigned during a pending disciplinary matter.
37. Appeals
Any party may file a request for appeal (“Request for Appeal”), but it must be submitted in writing to the Title IX Coordinator within five (5) working days of the delivery of the Notice of Outcome. A single Appeal Decision-maker will Chair the appeal. No Decision-maker will have been involved in the process previously, including any dismissal appeal that may have been heard earlier in the process.

The Request for Appeal will be forwarded to the Appeal Chair for consideration to determine if the request meets the grounds for appeal (a Review for Standing). This review is not a review of the merits of the appeal, but solely a determination as to whether the request meets the grounds and is timely filed.

a. Grounds for Appeal
Appeals are limited to the following grounds:

- Procedural irregularity that affected the outcome of the matter;
- New evidence that was not reasonably available at the time the determination regarding responsibility or dismissal was made, that could affect the outcome of the matter; and
- The Title IX Coordinator, Investigator(s), or Decision-maker(s) had a conflict of interest or bias for or against Complainants or Respondents generally or the specific Complainant or Respondent that affected the outcome of the matter.

If any of the grounds in the Request for Appeal do not meet the grounds in this Policy, that request will be denied by the Appeal Chair and the parties and their Advisors will be notified in writing of the denial and the rationale.

If any of the grounds in the Request for Appeal meet the grounds in this Policy, then the Appeal Chair will notify the other party(ies) and their Advisors, the Title IX Coordinator, and, when appropriate, the Investigators and/or the original Decision-maker(s).

All parties, their Advisors, the Title IX Coordinator, and, when appropriate, the Investigators and/or the original Decision-maker(s) will be mailed, emailed, and/or provided a hard copy of the request with the approved grounds. All will then be given five (5) business days to submit a response to the portion of the appeal that was approved and involves them. All responses will be forwarded by the Chair to all parties for review and comment.

The non-appealing party (if any) may also choose to raise a new ground for appeal at this time. If so, that will be reviewed to determine if it meets the grounds in this Handbook by the Appeal Chair and either denied or approved. If approved, it will be forwarded to the party who initially requested an appeal, the Investigator(s) and/or original Decision-maker(s), as necessary, who will submit their responses in five (5) business days, which will be circulated for review and comment by all parties.

Neither party may submit any new requests for appeal after this time period. The Appeal Chair will collect any additional information needed and all documentation regarding the approved grounds and the subsequent responses and the Chair will render a decision in no more than three (3) business days, barring exigent circumstances.

A Notice of Appeal Outcome will be sent to all parties simultaneously including the decision on each
approved ground and rationale for each decision. The Notice of Appeal Outcome will specify the finding on each ground for appeal, any specific instructions for remand or reconsideration, any sanctions that may result which the University is permitted to share according to state or federal law, and the rationale supporting the essential findings to the extent the University is permitted to share under state or federal law.

Notification will be made in writing and may be delivered by one or more of the following methods: in person, mailed to the local or permanent address of the parties as indicated in official institutional records, or emailed to the parties’ University-issued email or otherwise approved account. Once mailed, emailed and/or received in-person, notice will be presumptively delivered.

b. Sanctions Status During the Appeal
Any sanctions imposed as a result of the hearing are stayed during the appeal process. Supportive measures may be reinstated, subject to the same supportive measure procedures above.

If any of the sanctions are to be implemented immediately post-hearing, but pre-appeal, then emergency removal procedures (detailed above) for a hearing on the justification for doing so must be permitted within 48 hours of implementation.

RMUoHP may still place holds on official transcripts, diplomas, graduations, and course registration pending the outcome of an appeal when the original sanctions included separation.

c. Appeal Considerations
- Decisions on appeal are to be deferential to the original decision, making changes to the finding only when there is clear error and to the sanction(s)/responsive action(s) only if there is a compelling justification to do so.
- Appeals are not intended to provide for a full re-hearing (de novo) of the allegation(s). In most cases, appeals are confined to a review of the written documentation or record of the original hearing and pertinent documentation regarding the specific grounds for appeal.
- An appeal is not an opportunity for Appeal Decision-makers to substitute their judgment for that of the original Decision-maker(s) merely because they disagree with the finding and/or sanction(s).
- The Appeal Chair/Decision-maker may consult with the Title IX Coordinator on questions of procedure or rationale, for clarification, if needed. Documentation of all such consultation will be maintained.
- Appeals granted based on new evidence should normally be remanded to the original Investigator(s) and/or Decision-maker(s) for reconsideration. Other appeals may be remanded at the discretion of the Title IX Coordinator or, in limited circumstances, decided on appeal.
- Once an appeal is decided, the outcome is final: further appeals are not permitted, even if a decision or sanction is changed on remand (except in the case of a new hearing).
- In rare cases where a procedural error cannot be cured by the original Decision-maker(s) (as in cases of bias), the appeal may order a new hearing with a new Decision-maker(s).
  - The results of a new hearing can be appealed, once, on any of the three available appeal grounds.
- In cases in which the appeal results in reinstatement to the University or resumption of privileges, all reasonable attempts will be made to restore the Respondent to their prior status, recognizing that some opportunities lost may be irreparable in the short term.
38. Long-Term Remedies/Other Actions
Following the conclusion of the resolution process, and in addition to any sanctions implemented, the
Title IX Coordinator may implement additional long-term remedies or actions with respect to the parties
and/or the campus community that are intended to stop the harassment, discrimination, and/or
retaliation, remedy the effects, and prevent reoccurrence.

These remedies/actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Referral to counseling and related health services
- Referral to the Employee Assistance Program
- Education to the individual and/or the community
- Permanent alteration of housing assignments
- Permanent alteration of work arrangements for employees
- Provision of campus safety escorts
- Climate surveys
- Policy modification and/or training
- Provision of transportation accommodations
- Implementation of long-term contact limitations between the parties
- Implementation of adjustments to academic deadlines, course schedules, etc., with the
  assistance of the Program Directors and Provost.

At the discretion of the Title IX Coordinator, certain long-term support or measures may also be
provided to the parties even if no policy violation is found.

When no policy violation is found, the Title IX Coordinator will address any remedies owed by the
University to the Respondent to ensure no effective denial of educational access.

The University will maintain the privacy of any long-term remedies/actions/measure, provided privacy
does not impair the University’s ability to provide these services.

39. Failure to Comply with Sanctions, Interim and Long-term Remedies, or Responsive Actions
All Respondents are expected to comply with the assigned sanctions, responsive actions, and/or
corrective actions within the timeframe specified by the final Decision-maker(s), including any Appeal
Chair.

Failure to abide by the sanction(s)/action(s) imposed by the date specified, whether by refusal, neglect,
or any other reason, may result in additional sanction(s)/action(s), including suspension, expulsion,
and/or termination from the University and may be noted on a student’s official transcript or
employment record.

A suspension will only be lifted when compliance is achieved to the satisfaction of the Title IX
Coordinator.

40. Recordkeeping
Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions will maintain for a period of at least seven years
records of:
Each sexual harassment investigation including any determination regarding responsibility and any audio or audiovisual recording or transcript required under federal regulation;

Any disciplinary sanctions imposed on the Respondent;

Any remedies provided to the Complainant designed to restore or preserve equal access to the University’s education program or activity;

Any appeal and the result therefrom;

Any Informal Resolution and the result therefrom;

All materials used to train Title IX Coordinators, Investigators, Decision-makers, and any person who facilitates an Informal Resolution process. RMUoHP will make these training materials publicly available on the University website; and

Any actions, including any supportive measures, taken in response to a report or formal complaint of sexual harassment, including:

- The basis for all conclusions that the response was not deliberately indifferent;
- Any measures designed to restore or preserve equal access to the University’s education program or activity; and
- If no supportive measures were provided to the Complainant, document the reasons why such a response was not clearly unreasonable in light of the known circumstances.

The University will also maintain any and all records in accordance with state and federal laws.

41. Disabilities Accommodations in the Resolution Process

Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions is committed to providing reasonable accommodations and support to qualified students, employees, or others with disabilities to ensure equal access to the University’s resolution process.

Anyone needing such accommodations or support should contact the Institutional Equity Officer, the Director of Student Affairs, or the Human Resources Manager, who will review the request and, in consultation with the person requesting the accommodation and the Title IX Coordinator, determine which accommodations are appropriate and necessary for full participation in the process.

42. Revision of this Handbook and Procedures

This Handbook and procedures supersede any previous Handbooks addressing harassment, sexual misconduct, discrimination, and/or retaliation under Federal Title IX regulations and law, and will be reviewed and updated annually by the Title IX Coordinator. Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions reserves the right to make changes to this document as necessary, and once those changes are posted online, they are in effect.

During the resolution process, the Title IX Coordinator may make minor modifications to procedures that do not materially jeopardize the fairness owed to any party, such as to accommodate summer schedules. The Title IX Coordinator may also vary procedures materially with notice (on the institutional website, with the appropriate effective date identified) upon determining that changes to law or regulation require Handbook or procedural alterations not reflected in this Policy and procedures.

If government laws or regulations change, or court decisions alter, the requirements in a way that impacts this document, this document will be construed to comply with the most recent government regulations or holdings.
In general, this document does not create legally enforceable protections beyond the protection of the background state and federal laws which frame such policies and codes.

This Handbook and procedures are effective 14 August 2020. On May 6, 2020, the United States Department of Education released new Title IX regulations, effective August 14, 2020 (the “2020 Title IX Regulations”). The new 2020 Federal Title IX Regulations may require further modification of this Handbook. However, there are several lawsuits pending which seek to stay, delay or block implementation of some or all of the provisions in the 2020 Title IX Regulations. Should a court delay, stay or strike down, either temporarily or permanently, any portion of the 2020 Title IX Regulations, RMUoHP will make any necessary modifications to this Handbook, which will become effective immediately. If a court delays implementation of or strikes down all of the regulations, the University may revert back or retain the previous version of this Policy (the 2019 Equity Resolution Handbook).
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THIS IS A MODEL POLICY AND PROCEDURES AND IS NOT CONSIDERED TO BE TRAINING MATERIALS, THOUGH TRAINING ON ITS CONTENTS MAY BE DEVELOPED BY RMUoHP.
APPENDIX A: POLICY EXAMPLES

Some examples of possible sexual harassment include:

- A professor offers for a student to have sex or go on a date with them in exchange for a good grade. This constitutes sexual harassment regardless of whether the student accedes to the request and irrespective of whether a good grade is promised or a bad grade is threatened.

- A student repeatedly sends graphic, sexually-oriented jokes and pictures around campus via social media to hundreds of other students. Many don’t find it funny and ask them to stop, but they do not. Because of these jokes, one student avoids the sender on campus and in the residence hall in which they both live, eventually asking to move to a different building and dropping a class they had together.

- A professor engages students in class in discussions about the students’ past sexual experiences, yet the conversations are not in any way germane to the subject matter of the class. The professor inquires about explicit details and demands that students answer them, though the students are clearly uncomfortable and hesitant.

- An ex-partner widely spreads false stories about their sex life with their former partner to the clear discomfort and frustration of the former partner, turning the former partner into a social pariah on campus.

- Chris has recently transitioned from male to non-binary, but primarily expresses as a female. Since their transition, Chris has noticed that their professor, Dr. Jones, pays them a lot more attention. Chris is sexually attracted to Professor Jones and believes the attraction is mutual. Chris decides to act on the attraction. One day, Chris visits Dr. Jones during office hours, and after a long conversation about being non-binary, Chris kisses Dr. Jones. Dr. Jones is taken aback, stops the kiss, and tells Chris not to do that. Dr. Jones explains to Chris that they are not interested in Chris sexually or romantically. Chris takes it hard, crying to Dr. Jones about how hard it is to find someone who is interested in them now based on their identity. Dr. Jones feels sorry for Chris and softens the blow by telling them that no matter whether they like Chris or not, faculty-student relationships are prohibited by the university. Chris takes this as encouragement. One night, Chris goes to a gay bar some distance from campus and sees Dr. Jones at the bar. Chris tries to buy Dr. Jones a drink and, again, tries to kiss Dr. Jones. Dr. Jones leaves the bar abruptly. The next day, Chris makes several online posts that out Dr. Jones as gay and raise questions about whether they are sexually involved with students. Dr. Jones contacts the Title IX Office and alleges that Chris is sexually harassing him.

Examples of Stalking

- Students A and B were “friends with benefits.” Student A wanted a more serious relationship, which caused student B to break it off. Student A could not let go, and pursued student B relentlessly. Student B obtained a campus no-contact order. Subsequently, Student B discovered their social media accounts were being accessed, and things were being posted and messaged as if they were from them, but they were not. Whoever accessed their account posted a picture of a penis, making it look as if they had sent out a picture of themselves, though it was not their penis. This caused them considerable embarrassment and social anxiety. They changed their passwords, only to have it happen again. Seeking help from the Title IX Coordinator, Student B
met with the IT department, which discovered an app on their phone and a keystroke recorder on their laptop, both of which were being used to transmit their data to a third party.

- A graduate student working as an on-campus tutor received flowers and gifts delivered to their office. After learning the gifts were from a student they recently tutored, the graduate student thanked the student and stated that it was not necessary and would appreciate it if the gift deliveries stopped. The student then started leaving notes of love and gratitude on the tutor’s car, both on-campus and at home. Asked again to stop, the student stated by email, “You can ask me to stop, but I’m not giving up. We are meant to be together, and I’ll do anything to make you have the feelings for me that I have for you.” When the tutor did not respond, the student emailed again, “You cannot escape me. I will track you to the ends of the earth. If I can’t have you, no one will.”

**Examples of Sexual Assault:**

- Amanda and Bill meet at a party. They spend the evening dancing and getting to know each other. Bill convinces Amanda to come up to his room. From 11:00 p.m. until 3:00 a.m., Bill uses every line he can think of to convince Amanda to have sex with him, but she adamantly refuses. Despite her clear communications that she is not interested in doing anything sexual with him, Bill keeps at her, questions her religious convictions, and accuses her of being “a prude.” He brings up several rumors that he has heard about how she performed oral sex on a number of other guys. Finally, it seems to Bill that her resolve is weakening, and he convinces her to “jerk him off” (hand to genital contact). Amanda would have never done it but for Bill's incessant advances. He feels that he successfully seduced her and that she wanted to do it all along but was playing shy and hard to get. Why else would she have come up to his room alone after the party? If she really didn't want it, she could have left.

- Jiang is a junior. Beth is a sophomore. Jiang comes to Beth’s residence hall room with some mutual friends to watch a movie. Jiang and Beth, who have never met before, are attracted to each other. After the movie, everyone leaves, and Jiang and Beth are alone. They hit it off, soon become more intimate, and start to make out. Jiang verbally expresses his desire to have sex with Beth. Beth, who was abused by a babysitter at the age of five and avoids sexual relations as a result, is shocked at how quickly things are progressing. As Jiang takes her by the wrist over to the bed, lays her down, undresses, and begins to have intercourse with Beth, Beth has a severe flashback to her childhood trauma. She wants to tell Jiang to stop but cannot. Beth is stiff and unresponsive during the intercourse.

- Kevin and John are at a party. Kevin is not sure how much John has been drinking, but he is pretty sure it’s a lot. After the party, he walks John to his apartment, and John comes on to Kevin, initiating sexual activity. Kevin asks John if he is really up to this, and John says yes. They remove each other’s clothes, and they end up in John’s bed. Suddenly, John runs for the bathroom. When he returns, his face is pale, and Kevin thinks he may have thrown up. John gets back into bed, and they begin to have sexual intercourse. Kevin is having a good time, though he can’t help but notice that John seems pretty groggy and passive, and he thinks John may have even passed out briefly during the sex, but he came to again. When Kevin runs into John the next day, he thanks him for the great night. John remembers nothing and decides to make a report to the Dean.
Examples of Retaliation:

- Student-athlete A alleges sexual harassment by a coach; the coach subsequently cuts the student-athlete’s playing time without a legitimate justification.
- A faculty member alleges gender inequity in pay within her department; the Department Chair then revokes his approval for her to attend a national conference, citing the faculty member’s tendency to “ruffle feathers.”
- A student from Organization A participates in a sexual harassment investigation as a witness whose testimony is damaging to the Respondent, who is also a member of Organization A; the student is subsequently removed as a member of Organization A because of their participation in the investigation.
APPENDIX B: AN ATIXA FRAMEWORK FOR INFORMAL RESOLUTION (IR)

Rocky Mountain University of Health Professions has framed a process for IR that includes:

1. A response based on supportive measures; and/or
2. A response based on a Respondent accepting responsibility; and/or
3. A response based on alternative resolution, which could include various approaches and facilitation of dialogue.

Alternative resolution approaches like mediation, restorative practices, transformative justice, etc., are likely to be used more and more often by colleges and universities. ATIXA does not endorse these approaches as better or worse than other formal or informal approaches.

ATIXA believes that if they are to be used in, and are effective for, sex offenses, they need to be designed and executed carefully and thoughtfully and be facilitated by well-trained administrators who take the necessary time to prepare and lay a foundation for success. Although no approach is a panacea, the framework below can help to lay that foundation, regardless of which approach(es) are used.

Here are the principles to be considered for supporting various approaches to informal resolution:

- IR can be applied in any sex/gender-based interpersonal conflict but may not be appropriate or advisable in cases involving violent incidents (sexual violence, stalking, domestic and dating violence, severe sexual harassment, sexual exploitation, etc.)
- Situations involving dangerous patterns or significant ongoing threat to the community should not be resolved by IR.
- The determination of whether to permit an IR-based resolution is entirely at the discretion of the Title IX Coordinator (TIXC) and in line with the requirements for IR laid out in the Title IX regulations.
- Any party can end IR early-, mid-, or late-process for any reason or no reason.
- IR can be attempted before and in lieu of formal resolution as a diversion-based resolution (although a formal complaint must be filed if you are within Section 106.30, per OCR).
- Alternative approaches can inform formal resolution, as in a formal resolution model infused with restorative practices.
- IR could be deployed after formal resolution, as an adjunct healing/catharsis opportunity (that could potentially mitigate sanctions or be a form of sanction).
- Alternate Resolution approaches to IR must be facilitated by the recipient or a third-party. There may be value in creating clearly agreed-upon ground rules, which the parties must sign in advance and agree to abide by, otherwise the informal resolution process will be deemed to have failed.
- Technology-facilitated IR can be made available, should the parties not be able or willing to meet in person.
- If IR fails, a formal resolution can take place thereafter. No evidence elicited within the “safe space” of the IR facilitation is later admissible in the formal resolution unless all parties consent.
- With cases involving violence, the preferred alternative approach typically involves a minimal number of essential parties and is not a wide restorative circle approach in order to ensure confidentiality.
- Some approaches require a reasonable gesture toward accountability (this could be more than an acknowledgement of harm) and some acceptance, or at least recognition, by the Respondent that catharsis is of value and likely the primary goal of the Complainant. A full admission by the
Respondent is not a prerequisite. This willingness needs to be vetted carefully in advance by the TIXC before determining that an incident is amenable/appropriate for resolution by IR.

- IR can result in an accord or agreement between the parties (Complainant, Respondent, RMUoHP), which is summarized in writing by and enforced by the University. This can be a primary goal of the process.
- IR can result in the voluntary imposition of safety measures, remedies, and/or agreed-upon resolutions by the parties, that are enforceable by the University. These can be part of the accord/agreement.
- As a secondary goal, IR can result in the voluntary acceptance of “sanctions,” meaning that a Respondent could agree to withdraw, self-suspend (by taking a leave of absence), or undertake other restrictions/transfers/online course options that would help to ensure the safety/educational access of the Complainant, in lieu of formal sanctions that would create a formal record for the Respondent. These are enforceable by RMUoHP as part of the accord/agreement, as may be terms of mutual release, non-disparagement, and/or non-disclosure.
- Although a non-disclosure agreement (NDA) could result from IR, it would have to be mutually agreed-upon by the parties in an environment of non-coercion verified by the TIXC.
- Institutions must develop clear rules for managing/facilitating the conference/meeting/dialogue of alternative resolution approaches, to ensure they are civil, age-appropriate, culturally-competent, reflective of power imbalances, and maximize the potential for the resolution process to result in catharsis, restoration, remedy, etc., for the harmed party(ies).
APPENDIX C: STATEMENT OF RIGHTS OF THE PARTIES

- The right to an equitable investigation and resolution of all credible allegations of prohibited harassment or discrimination made in good faith to RMUoHP officials.

- The right to timely written notice of all alleged violations, including the identity of the parties involved (if known), the precise misconduct being alleged, the date and location of the alleged misconduct (if known), the implicated policies and procedures, and possible sanctions.

- The right to timely written notice of any material adjustments to the allegations (e.g., additional incidents or allegations, additional Complainants, unsubstantiated allegations) and any attendant adjustments needed to clarify potentially implicated policy violations.

- The right to be informed in advance of any public release of information regarding the allegation(s) or underlying incident(s), whenever possible.

- The right not to have any personally identifiable information released to the public without consent provided, except to the extent permitted by law.

- The right to be treated with respect by University officials.

- The right to have University Handbooks, policies and procedures followed without material deviation.

- The right not to be pressured to mediate or otherwise informally resolve any reported misconduct involving violence, including sexual violence.

- The right not to be discouraged by University officials from reporting sexual harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation to both on-campus and off-campus authorities.

- The right to be informed by RMUoHP officials of options to notify proper law enforcement authorities, including on-campus and local police, and the option(s) to be assisted by University authorities in notifying such authorities, if the party so chooses. This also includes the right not to be pressured to report, as well.

- The right to have allegations of violations of this Policy responded to promptly and with sensitivity by Provo Police and State of Utah law enforcement and/or other University officials.

- The right to be informed of available interim actions and supportive measures, such as counseling; advocacy; health care; student financial aid, visa, and immigration assistance; or other services, both on campus and in the community.

- The right to a University-implemented no-contact order [or a no-trespass order against a non-affiliated third party] when a person has engaged in or threatens to engage in stalking, threatening, harassing, or other improper conduct.

- The right to be informed of available assistance in changing academic, living, and/or working situations after an alleged incident of discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation, if such changes
are reasonably available. No formal report, or investigation, either campus or criminal, needs to occur before this option is available. Such actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Relocating an on-campus student’s housing to a different on-campus location
- Assistance from University staff in completing the relocation
- Changing an employee’s work environment (e.g., reporting structure, office/workspace relocation)
- Transportation accommodations
- Visa/immigration assistance
- Arranging to dissolve a housing contract and a pro-rated refund
- Exam, paper, and/or assignment rescheduling or adjustment
- Receiving an incomplete in, or a withdrawal from, a class (may be retroactive)
- Transferring class sections
- Temporary withdrawal/leave of absence (may be retroactive)
- Campus safety escorts
- Alternative course completion options.

- The right to have the RMUoHP maintain such actions for as long as necessary and for supportive measures to remain private, provided privacy does not impair the University’s ability to provide the supportive measures.

- The right to receive sufficiently advanced, written notice of any meeting or interview involving the other party, when possible.

- The right to ask the Investigator(s) and Decision-maker(s) to identify and question relevant witnesses, including expert witnesses.

- The right to provide the Investigator(s)/Decision-maker(s) with a list of questions that, if deemed relevant by the Investigator(s)/Chair, may be asked of any party or witness.

- The right not to have irrelevant prior sexual history or character admitted as evidence.

- The right to know the relevant and directly related evidence obtained and to respond to that evidence.

- The right to fair opportunity to provide the Investigator(s) with their account of the alleged misconduct and have that account be on the record.

- The right to receive a copy of the investigation report, including all factual, policy, and/or credibility analyses performed, and all relevant and directly related evidence available and used to produce the investigation report, subject to the privacy limitations imposed by state and federal law, prior to the hearing, and the right to have at least ten (10) business days to review the report prior to the hearing.

- The right to respond to the investigation report, including comments providing any additional relevant evidence after the opportunity to review the investigation report, and to have that response on the record.
● The right to be informed of the names of all witnesses whose information will be used to make a finding, in advance of that finding, when relevant.

● The right to regular updates on the status of the investigation and/or resolution.

● The right to have reports of alleged Policy violations addressed by Investigators, Title IX Coordinators, and Decision-maker(s) who have received relevant annual training.

● The right to a Hearing Panel that is not single-sex in its composition, if a panel is used.

● The right to preservation of privacy, to the extent possible and permitted by law.

● The right to meetings, interviews, and/or hearings that are closed to the public.

● The right to petition that any University representative in the process be recused on the basis of disqualifying bias and/or conflict of interest.

● The right to have an Advisor of their choice to accompany and assist the party in all meetings and/or interviews associated with the resolution process.

● The right to the use of the appropriate standard of evidence, determined to be a preponderance of the evidence standard at RMUoHP, make a finding after an objective evaluation of all relevant evidence.

● The right to be present, including presence via remote technology, during all testimony given and evidence presented during any formal grievance hearing.

● The right to have an impact statement considered by the Decision-maker(s) following a determination of responsibility for any allegation, but prior to sanctioning.

● The right to be promptly informed in a written Notice of Outcome letter of the finding(s) and sanction(s) of the resolution process and a detailed rationale of the decision (including an explanation of how credibility was assessed), delivered simultaneously (without undue delay) to the parties.

● The right to be informed in writing of when a decision by the University is considered final and any changes to the sanction(s) that occur before the decision is finalized.

● The right to be informed of the opportunity to appeal the finding(s) and sanction(s) of the resolution process, and the procedures for doing so in accordance with the standards for appeal established by the University.

● The right to a fundamentally fair resolution as defined in these procedures.
Threat assessment is the process of assessing the actionability of violence by an individual against another person or group following the issuance of a direct or conditional threat. A Violence Risk Assessment (VRA) is a broader term used to assess any potential violence or danger, regardless of the presence of a vague, conditional, or direct threat.

The implementation of VRAs require specific training and are typically conducted by psychologists, clinical counselors, social workers, case managers, law enforcement officers, student conduct officers, and/or other team members, including any behavioral intervention or threat assessment team.

A VRA occurs in collaboration with any threat assessment team and must be understood as an on-going process, rather than a singular evaluation or meeting. A VRA is not an evaluation for an involuntary behavioral health hospitalization (e.g., 5150 in California, Section XII in Massachusetts, Baker Act in Florida), nor is it a psychological or mental health assessment.

A VRA assesses the risk of actionable violence, often with a focus on targeted/predatory escalations, and is supported by research from the fields of law enforcement, criminology, human resources, and psychology.

When conducting a VRA, the assessor(s) use an evidence-based process consisting of:

1. an appraisal of risk factors that escalate the potential for violence;
2. a determination of stabilizing influences that reduce the risk of violence;
3. a contextual analysis of violence risk by considering environmental circumstances, hopelessness, and suicidality; catalyst events; nature and actionability of threat; fixation and focus on target; grievance collection; and action and time imperative for violence; and
4. the application of intervention and management approaches to reduce the risk of violence.

To assess an individual’s level of violence risk, the Title IX Coordinator will initiate the violence risk assessment process through the appropriate team, who will assign a trained individual(s) to perform the assessment, according to the specific nature of the Title IX case.

The assessor will follow the process for conducting a violence risk assessment and will rely on a consistent, research-based, reliable system that allows for the operationalization of the risk levels.

Some examples of formalized approaches to the VRA process include: The NaBITA Risk Rubric, The Structured Interview for Violence Risk Assessment (SIVRA-35), The Extremist Risk Intervention Scale

---

19 [www.nabita.org/tools]
20 [www.nabita.org/resources/assessment-tools/sivra-35/]
(ERIS), Looking Glass, Workplace Assessment of Violence Risk (WAVR-21), Historical Clinical Risk Management (HCR-20), and MOSAIC.

The VRA is conducted independently from the Title IX process, free from outcome pressure, but is informed by it. The individual(s) conducting the assessment will be trained to mitigate any bias and provide the analysis and findings in a fair and equitable manner.

The team or individual responsible conducts a VRA process and makes a recommendation to the Title IX Coordinator as to whether the VRA indicates there is a substantial, compelling, and/or immediate risk to health and/or safety of an individual or the community.

21 www.nabita.org/resources/assessment-tools/eris/
22 www.nabita.org/looking-glass
23 www.wavr21.com
24 hcr-20.com
25 www.mosaicmethod.com
APPENDIX E: PROCESS B

For all notices, inquiries, and investigations outside of Title IX as described in Process A, the process within the 2019 Equity Resolution Handbook will be the process used. Please see Section 3, Procedures, of the 2019 Equity Resolution Handbook.