

Standard Operating Procedures for Student Discriminatory Misconduct Allegations

Effective Date: January 1, 2026

The University of Oregon is committed to equal access to programs, course offerings, facilities, admission, and employment for all its students, employees, and community members. It is the policy of the University to maintain an environment free of prohibited harassment and discrimination against any person because of: race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, pregnancy (including pregnancy-related conditions), age, physical or mental disability, genetic information (including family medical history), ancestry, familial status, citizenship, service in the uniformed services (as defined in federal and state law), veteran status, expunged juvenile record, and/or the use of leave protected by state or federal law.

In recognition of this commitment, the University has established these procedures to implement the student conduct process as it relates to allegations of Discriminatory Misconduct consistent with the Student Conduct Code. Throughout these procedures, the term “Code” refers to the Student Conduct Code. If there is a conflict between the Code and these procedures, the Code controls. In cases where allegations are related to both Discriminatory Misconduct and other forms of Prohibited Conduct under the Code, these procedures may be utilized to resolve all potential violations associated with the alleged misconduct.

These procedures provide for the prompt, fair, and equitable resolution of allegations of Discriminatory Misconduct for all participants.

The student conduct process is designed to fit within the University’s larger education mission and does not function as a court of law. As such, these procedures use language that is designed to be both educationally focused and procedurally neutral. Throughout these procedures, the term “Director” is used to refer to the Director of Student Conduct and Community Standards or their designee. The term “Chief Civil Rights Officer” is used to refer to the Title IX Coordinator/Chief Civil Rights Officer” or designee. For a glossary of additional important terms, see Appendix A. Throughout these procedures, references to “days” are references to calendar days unless otherwise noted.

Throughout these procedures, various university officials, such as the Chief Civil Rights Officer, are assigned responsibility for performing specific functions. Named officials are authorized to delegate responsibility to other appropriate university officials and

contracted consultants. Additionally, named officials and their designees may consult with appropriate university officials, including the Office of the General Counsel and subject-matter experts.

Section I: Preliminary Considerations

Access Accommodations

Requests for accommodations should be submitted to OEOA via email to eoaa@uoregon.edu. For student disability-related requests, OEOA may contact the Accessible Education Center (AEC), if assistance is needed to implement the requested accommodation. For employees, OEOA may consult with Workplace ADA. Participants may request language interpretation or translation services.

All requests for accommodations should be made as soon as possible to ensure the University has sufficient time to review and process the accommodation request.

Amnesty

The University recognizes that Students who have consumed alcohol and/or other intoxicants (“substances”) or have engaged in other misconduct may be hesitant to report allegations of Discriminatory Misconduct or participate in investigations. Therefore, any student who participates in a university disciplinary process related to Discriminatory Misconduct as a Complainant, Respondent, or Witness will not face discipline for use of substances or other misconduct unless there is evidence that (1) another individual needed medical assistance and (2) the student failed to seek medical assistance for the individual.

Supportive Measures and Confidential Resources

All Students who have experienced, witnessed, or been accused of Discriminatory Misconduct are entitled to supportive measures, including but not limited to academic arrangements (which may include class withdrawals, incomplete grades and alternative course completion, or extension of deadlines), campus escort services, assistance with housing, transportation, and other support services, ombudsperson services, legal advice, confidential support persons, referrals to community agencies, and/or other reasonable measures. Students may also seek confidential resources such as health and counseling services, as well as financial assistance, visa and immigration assistance, and safety planning. Students may access these supportive measures and confidential resources regardless of whether the University initiates a formal investigation.

Interim Action

If allegations of Discriminatory Misconduct present an immediate and substantial threat to the health or safety of any person(s), the Director, in consultation with the Chief Civil Rights Officer and/or other qualified campus officials, will determine whether interim action, as outlined in Section VI of the Code, is necessary. This determination must be made on a case-by-case basis through an individual and objective assessment of the Parties' needs and of the Respondent's alleged misconduct.

If interim action is to be taken, the following will occur:

- When possible, the Complainant will be informed of any interim action prior to its implementation.
- The Respondent will receive written Notice of the interim action (which may occur simultaneously with the implementation of the interim action) and be provided an opportunity for a meeting with the Director, to occur within two (2) business days of the Notice. During the meeting, Respondent may ask questions and agree to the interim action or request that the interim action be amended or rescinded.
- Within one (1) business day of the meeting, the Parties will receive an interim action decision from the Director.
- Both Parties may request a review of the Director's interim action decision by the Vice President of Student Life or their designee. A final decision will be issued to both Parties within ten (10) business days of the request.

If, after an interim action has been taken, the Complainant declines to further participate in the adjudication of the alleged misconduct and there is insufficient other evidence to adjudicate the alleged misconduct, the interim action may be rescinded. The University may offer Complainant and Respondent other supportive and/or remedial measures designed to ensure their continued access to their education and ensure the health and safety of the Complainant and campus community.

Mutual No Contact Directives

When a Student requests a No Contact Directive, a mutual No Contact Directive will be issued to both Students. The Director may also decide to issue a mutual No Contact Directive between Student Parties. A mutual No Contact Directive applies equally to both Students. Generally, a mutual No Contact Directive remains in effect until otherwise stated. The Director may remove the directive by petition from both Students or when circumstances warrant its removal.

A violation of a No Contact Directive should be reported to the Director. If a Student has questions regarding whether certain actions would or would not violate a No Contact Directive, that Student should contact the Director immediately. Failure to comply with a No Contact Directive may constitute a separate student conduct violation and may be considered by the University in determining whether to issue an interim action and/or in determining an Action Plan if a Student is found responsible at the conclusion of the investigative process.

Law Enforcement Delay

At the request of law enforcement, including the University of Oregon Police Department, the University may temporarily delay the student conduct process. The decision to delay the student conduct process will be made taking into consideration the health and safety of the campus community. If a student conduct action has already been initiated, the University will notify the Party or Parties of any decision to delay the student conduct process and of any resulting timeline changes.

Concurrent Interviews: In cases where there are concurrent criminal and conduct processes, both investigations may proceed concurrently, and the Investigator may conduct interviews jointly with law enforcement as appropriate. However, the student conduct process and the law enforcement processes are separate processes, each with its own timeline and other requirements.

Privacy

The University of Oregon recognizes that Parties and other Participants are often concerned about the privacy of information. The University's Prohibited Discrimination and Retaliation policy requires that "Information received in connection with the reporting, investigation, and resolution of allegations of Discriminatory Misconduct will be treated as private and will not be disclosed except to those individuals whom the University determines are necessary to conduct an appropriate investigation, to provide assistance and resources to parties, to perform other appropriate university functions, or in accordance with applicable law." Where the Complainant and/or Respondent are students, their student conduct records are education records and are also protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Similar privacy protections apply to employee personnel records including under ORS 352.226. Disclosure of investigation records and information learned during the investigation process to individuals other than a party's advisor may constitute retaliation.

Record Retention: Student conduct records will be maintained for a minimum of seven (7) years in accordance with State of Oregon records policies and in compliance with federal legislation such as FERPA, the Clery Act, and Title IX.

Privileged Information: The University will not require, allow, rely upon, or otherwise use evidence or questions that constitute, or seek disclosure of, information protected under a legally recognized privilege, unless the person holding such privilege has given voluntary, written consent to waive the privilege. When a party voluntarily provides privileged records to OEOA, privilege is waived.

Request by Complainant that the University Not Initiate a Formal Investigative Process

A Complainant may request that the University not initiate a Formal Investigative Process. The University will seek to honor a Complainant's wishes to the extent possible while also meeting its obligation to protect the health and safety of the Complainant and the university community. In determining whether a Complainant's wishes can be honored, the University will consider: (1) Complainant's request to not proceed with an investigation; (2) Complainant's reasonable safety concerns; (3) the risk that further Discriminatory Misconduct may occur if an investigation is not initiated; (4) the severity of the allegations, including whether the Respondent would be removed from campus or another sanction would be necessary to end the alleged conduct and prevent its recurrence; (5) the age and relationship of the parties, including whether the Respondent is a university employee; (6) the scope of the alleged discrimination, including information suggesting a pattern, ongoing misconduct, or multiple individuals were impacted by the alleged discrimination; (7) the availability of evidence; and (8) whether the University could end the alleged discriminatory misconduct and prevent its recurrence without a formal investigation.

Where the University can honor a Complainant's request to not initiate the Formal Investigation Process, the University may take other appropriate steps designed to eliminate the alleged conduct, prevent its reoccurrence, and address its impact on the Complainant and/or university community. Where the University is unable to honor a Complainant's request to not initiate a Formal Investigation Process, the Complainant will be notified that a Formal Complaint will be filed.

Prohibition on Retaliation

Retaliation is prohibited by university policy. The University does not tolerate retaliation in any form against any individual who makes an allegation, files a report, serves as a witness, assists a Complainant or Respondent, or participates in an investigation under these procedures.

Allegations of retaliation should be immediately reported to the University. Retaliation is further defined in the Prohibited Discrimination and Retaliation Policy and the Student Conduct Code.

Participation Expectations

Honest Participation: All Participants are required to be honest and forthright throughout the process. False statements are statements that a Participant knows to be untrue and include statements that intentionally omit a material fact.

Selective Participation: The University will not draw an adverse inference against a Party who chooses to remain silent during the process. However, if a Party or Witness chooses to answer some material questions but not others or chooses to participate in some portions of the process but not others, the University may consider how that affects the credibility or weight of the evidence that Party or Witness chooses to provide.

Expectations of the Parties: To help ensure a timely and fair process for both Parties:

- Parties are expected to promptly respond to case-related communication, including communications seeking to schedule a meeting with the Investigator.
- Parties must not delete, destroy, or otherwise alter information or evidence which is related to the allegations. This includes attempting to influence the participation or statements of Witnesses. Failure to comply with this expectation may result in a negative inference as to the information or evidence destroyed or altered.
- Parties must adhere to the confidentiality expectations set forth in university policy and these procedures, including the requirement that they not disclose or use confidential information received during the investigation outside of the investigation unless all Parties and the University consent to the disclosure or as otherwise required by law or policy.

Advisors: Except in Title IX cases where parties have the right to the advisor of their choice, an advisor may not also serve as a witness in an investigation. To designate an Advisor, a Party must submit an Advisor Designation form, signed by the Advisor to demonstrate their agreement to serve in that role. If a Party incurs costs to retain an Advisor of that Party's choosing, the Party will be responsible for those costs. For Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims, the University will offer each Party an Advisor free of charge.

By signing the Advisor Designation form, the Party and the Advisor agree to abide by the University's expectations for Advisors including that the Advisor will participate in any required informational meeting and/or training and adhere to the University's privacy policies and expectations. Unless specifically stated otherwise, a person designated as a

Party's Advisor is also that Party's support person for purposes of the Code. Each Party may only have one person at a time who is designated as their Advisor. Parties may designate a new Advisor by submitting a new designation for

Section II: Initiating Student Conduct Allegations

Review of Initial Report

When a report is received, the University will consider the following:

- Whether the report contains information that, if substantiated, could constitute discriminatory misconduct under university policy and the Conduct Code;
- Whether the University has jurisdiction over the Respondent and underlying allegations; and
- Whether the report requires a formal response, taking into consideration the totality of the information and the wishes of the Complainant.

Notice of Allegations

In cases where the University decides to conduct a formal investigation, the University will simultaneously issue a written Notice of Allegations to the Complainant and Respondent. The Notice of Allegations includes the Formal Complaint, describes the alleged violations of the Student Conduct Code, and sets forth applicable rights and procedures. A full description of the Notice as well as additional information pertaining to the Notice can be found in Appendix B.

If the investigation reveals the existence of additional or different allegations, the University may issue an Amended Notice of Allegations.

Consolidation of Complaints

The University may consolidate two or more complaints into one investigation where the allegations of Discriminatory Misconduct are intertwined and concern the same Parties.

Presumption of Non-Responsibility and Standard of Proof

The Respondent is presumed "not in violation" unless and until the Respondent accepts responsibility or a Decision-maker renders a decision finding the Respondent responsible.

To find the Respondent in violation of the Code, the Decision-maker must determine by a preponderance of the evidence that the Respondent violated university policy or the Code. This means that the Decision-maker must find that it is more likely than not that the

Respondent engaged in the alleged prohibited conduct. The Decision-maker may find by a preponderance of the evidence that some but not all of the alleged conduct occurred.

Acceptance of Responsibility

At any time during the conduct process, a Respondent may accept responsibility and elect to be found in violation of the Code for some or all of the alleged violations. If a Respondent accepts responsibility, the University will impose a sanction. Either Party may appeal the sanction in accordance with Section V below.

Alternative Resolution

Alternative resolution processes allow the Parties to have significant influence over the resolution process and the outcome. Alternative resolution may not be an appropriate option for all cases but is appropriate where consistent with the University's obligations and values and where it will be an effective method to end the conduct, prevent its reoccurrence, and address or remedy its effects. Either Party may request the opportunity to participate in alternative resolution at any time. Upon receiving such a request, the University will ask the other Party about their interest in alternative resolution. If (1) both Parties agree to attempt alternative resolution and to place the Formal Investigation Process on hold for a reasonable period while pursuing alternative resolution, and (2) the University determines that the agreed-upon form of alternative resolution is appropriate, then arrangements will be made to start the alternative resolution process.

The following also applies to alternative resolution:

- A party may request to engage in alternative resolution at any time and are encouraged to do so as early as possible in the process; in addition, either Party may end alternative resolution and return to the formal investigation process at any time before an agreement is reached.
- The University must approve all agreements reached through alternative resolution. The University will only approve terms in an alternative resolution agreement that are enforceable by the University.
- Agreements reached through alternative resolution must be in writing and shall be the final resolution of the case. Failure to adhere to the terms of an agreement reached through alternative resolution may constitute a separate violation of the Student Conduct Code and/or result in reopening of the original student conduct allegations. Whether the original student conduct case is reopened will depend on the term(s) of the agreement alleged to have been violated.

Resolution by Agreement: The Parties may agree on a resolution. An agreed-upon resolution must include Respondent acknowledging responsibility for at least one of the alleged violations. If the Parties agree on the violation but cannot agree on a sanction, the University can impose a sanction. In that event, either Party may appeal the sanction in accordance with Section V below but may not otherwise appeal the agreement.

Mediation and Restorative Justice: Mediation is a resolution option where a trained third-party facilitator assists the parties in reaching an agreement. One type of mediation is restorative justice. Restorative justice allows Parties, with the guidance of a facilitator, to collectively identify and discuss issues, focus on the impacts that resulted from an incident, and develop their own solutions. Communications made during mediation are confidential, subject to ORS 36.220, and may not be used in any University process, including a hearing or appeal.

Early Dismissal

The University has discretion to dismiss the Notice of Allegations, either in whole or in part, at any time after the Complainant has had the opportunity to speak with the Investigator. A dismissal is appropriate only in cases where (a) upon viewing the information in the light most favorable to the Complainant, there is insufficient information to find that the Respondent violated university policy; (b) the Complainant notifies the Investigator in writing that they would like to withdraw the complaint or any allegations in the Notice of Allegations, or (c) the Respondent is no longer employed by the University and the University determines that it is in the institution's interest to not further pursue the investigation. A dismissal should not be based on an assessment of the credibility of a party or witness and is intended only in rare cases where a full Investigation Report and/or Notice of Findings is deemed unnecessary under the circumstances. The parties will both receive notice of any dismissal and shall have seven (7) days to appeal an early dismissal.

Section III: Formal Investigation Process

The Formal Investigation Process begins when the University sends the Notice of Allegations and concludes within approximately twelve (12) weeks when the Parties receive the Final Investigation Report that includes the Decision-maker's determination.

For Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims, the investigation will transition to a hearing after the Final Investigation Report is issued and will conclude when a Notice of Findings is issued by the Decision-maker (see Section IV).

Fact-Gathering

The University will designate an Investigator who will be responsible for gathering information related to the allegations raised in the Formal Complaint. Parties may identify Witnesses they request to have interviewed and may suggest and provide documents, photographs, text messages or social media communications, or other evidence. The Investigator may also ask the Parties to provide evidence and information about Witnesses, and the Parties' responses to such requests may become part of the Record.

Draft Investigation Report

Once the Investigator finishes interviewing witnesses and gathering information, the Investigator will prepare a Draft Investigation Report that summarizes the relevant evidence but does not make conclusions or determinations as to whether any university policy or the Code has been violated. The Draft Investigation Report will be provided to each Party, who will then have ten (10) days to submit a written response to the Investigator.

Final Investigation Report

After receipt of any written responses, the Investigator may engage in additional fact-finding as necessary. Once fact-gathering is concluded, the Investigator, as Decision-maker, will issue a Final Investigation Report that addresses the Parties' responses as appropriate, includes any additional relevant information, and determines whether a violation of university policy or the Code occurred. When the Decision-maker finds that a university policy or Code has been violated, an Action Plan will be included.

The Action Plan will include:

- The sanction imposed by the University on the Respondent; and
- Any remedies provided to the Complainant designed to restore or preserve access to the University's education program or activity.

A list of administrative sanctions that may be imposed can be found in Appendix C. Factors and guidelines generally considered in creating the Action Plan determination can also be found in Appendix C.

The final decision set forth in the Final Investigation Report including any Action Plan may be appealed within ten (10) business days pursuant to the process set forth in Section V.

Section IV. Additional Procedures for Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims

The following additional procedures apply to Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims (see definition in Appendix A) in accordance with 34 CFR Part 106.

Evidence File

For Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims, Parties will be provided an opportunity to inspect and review all of the evidence obtained as part of the investigation that is directly related to the reported misconduct. This Evidence File will be made available to the Parties at the time they receive the Draft Investigation Report, meaning they will have ten (10) days to review the information and submit a response to the Investigator.

The following information is neither directly related to the allegations, nor relevant, and will be excluded from the Evidence File and Investigation Report, and will not be relied on when reaching a decision about responsibility:

- Information about the Complainant's sexual predisposition or prior sexual behavior unless offered to prove that someone other than the Respondent committed the conduct alleged by the Complainant, or if the information concerns specific incidents of the Complainant's prior sexual behavior with respect to the Respondent and is offered to prove consent;
- Information covered by legal privileges including attorney-client privileged information, medical or counseling records, and communications during alternative resolution. However, when a Party provides medical information about themselves to the University, the medical or counseling information is no longer covered by legal privilege and the University will review the information for relevance and include it in the Record just as any other information.

After the Parties have had the opportunity to submit their responses to the Evidence File and Draft Investigation Report, the Investigator will issue a Final Investigation Report that addresses the Parties' responses as appropriate, includes any additional relevant evidence, and makes any necessary revisions, but does not make any policy findings.

Pre-Hearing Processes

For Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims, Parties may challenge the information contained in the Final Investigation Report in a live hearing. The University will designate a separate Decision-maker who will be responsible for overseeing the hearing process and reaching a decision about responsibility for the alleged violations and, if applicable, the Action Plan. The Decision-maker will receive a copy of the Final Investigation Report.

Pre-Hearing Submissions: Pre-hearing submissions are due ten (10) days after receipt of the Final Investigation Report. Pre-hearing submissions include:

1. A witness list containing the names of those Witnesses interviewed during the investigation phase whom the Party wishes to have participate in the hearing;
2. Petitions a Party wishes to file before the start of the hearing; and
3. Requests for an in-person hearing. A hearing will only be held in person with the agreement of both Parties.

If a Party wishes to have a Witness participate in the hearing who was not interviewed during the investigation phase or admit evidence not included in the Final Investigation Report, the Party must first submit a petition showing good cause to do so. Petitions must be submitted as part of the pre-hearing submissions or as soon thereafter as the need for the Witness or evidence is known. This requirement does not pertain to information provided orally by a Party during the hearing or to information obtained during Witness cross-examination.

Pre-Hearing Meeting: The Decision-maker may hold a pre-hearing meeting to discuss any issues that could help the hearing proceed more smoothly if discussed ahead of time.

The Hearing

The hearing is an administrative proceeding not comparable to a criminal or civil trial and is not subject to the rules of evidence, the rules of civil procedure, or other rules that apply to court and court-like proceedings.

Notice of the Hearing: At least ten (10) days before the hearing, the University will provide the Parties written notice of the name of the Decision-maker and the date, time, and location of the hearing.

The Decision-maker may postpone the hearing for good cause and will notify the Parties of the new hearing date. The Decision-maker may also determine that it is appropriate to hold portions of a hearing on different dates. This may be done, for example, when the Decision-maker determines that it is appropriate to do so in order to accommodate reasonable scheduling issues with a Party, an Advisor, or a Witness.

Non-Attendance at the Hearing by Either Party: The Parties are not required to attend the hearing. If, despite being notified of the date, time, and location of the hearing, one or both Parties are not in attendance, the hearing may proceed and, if applicable, an Action Plan may be imposed. Where a Party chooses not to attend the hearing, their Advisor may still attend and participate as permitted under these procedures. The non-attendance by a

Party does not grant the Party's Advisor additional rights. The Decision-maker shall not draw an adverse inference about whether a violation occurred based solely on the absence of a Party or Witness from the hearing or refusal to answer cross-examination or other questions.

Parties are expected to notify the University if their Advisor will not be attending the hearing. If a Party's designated Advisor does not attend the hearing, the University will provide an Advisor to conduct cross-examination on behalf of that Party.

Participants to the Hearing: The hearing is a closed proceeding and is not open to the public. The individuals who may be present during the hearing are the Decision-maker, Hearing Facilitator, Complainant, Respondent, Advisors to the Complainant and Respondent, Witnesses, and other individuals the Decision-maker deems appropriate.

Format of the Hearing: Unless otherwise agreed to by the Parties, the hearing will be held remotely using video conferencing technology. The technology used for remote participation must allow the hearing participants to see and hear each other, and the Decision-maker to hear and see all Parties and Witnesses. The Decision-maker and the Parties must be able to simultaneously see and hear the Party or Witness answering questions.

Digital Recording: The hearing will be audio recorded and may also be video recorded. Hearing recordings are the sole property of the University. No other person is permitted to audio or video record any part of the hearing. Failure by the University to record all or part of a hearing shall not be grounds for invalidating the hearing, does not constitute a procedural irregularity, and is not a basis of appeal. The University will make the recording or transcript of the hearing available for the Parties to review upon request.

Hearing Procedures

Rules of Decorum for Participants: The Advisors and Parties will be provided with Rules of Decorum for the hearing. In addition to the rules that specifically apply during the hearing, Parties and Advisors will be expected to continue to adhere to all other expectations outlined in these procedures.

Witness Participation: The Decision-maker will determine whether it is appropriate to have a proposed Witness participate in the hearing. The Decision-maker will confer with the Parties before deciding to not allow a proposed Witness to participate in the hearing. The Decision-maker may also request the participation of any Witness who was interviewed during the investigation phase.

Questioning Parties and Witnesses the Hearing: Each Party's Advisor may ask the other Party and Witnesses all relevant questions and follow-up questions, including questions challenging credibility. The Parties may not themselves question the other Party or Witnesses. Questions may also be asked of witnesses or parties by the Decision-maker.

Evidence at the Hearing: The Decision-maker will admit the Final Investigation Report into evidence at the hearing and has the sole discretion to determine which additional evidence is admitted during the hearing.

The standard of relevance articulated previously also applies to evidence submitted during the hearing. The Decision-maker will also decide the weight to assign to any evidence, and in making that determination may consider whether the Witness submitted to cross-examination, whether the Witness has personal knowledge, and/or other factors affecting the believability or persuasiveness of the evidence. The Decision-maker may tend to give less weight or credibility to the following types of evidence: personal opinion about a Party or Witnesses' general reputation or character trait; witness statements obtained by someone other than the Investigator (or agent of the Investigator); and polygraph examination results. The University will conduct an objective evaluation of all relevant evidence—including both inculpatory and exculpatory evidence—and ensure that credibility determinations are not based on a person's status as a Complainant, Respondent, or Witness.

If the Decision-maker determines that unresolved issues exist that would be clarified by the presentation of additional evidence, the Decision-maker may suspend the hearing in order to obtain such evidence. The Decision-maker may ask the Investigator to conduct further investigation.

Notice of Findings and Action Plan

Notice of Findings: Within twenty-one (21) days of the conclusion of the hearing, the Decision-maker will issue a written Notice of Findings, which will include:

- The provisions of the Code and applicable university policies alleged to have been violated;
- A description of the procedural steps taken from the Formal Complaint through the decision, including any notifications to Parties, interviews with Parties and Witnesses, site visits, methods used to gather other evidence, and the hearing;
- The evidence considered in reaching a decision;
- Findings of fact in support of the determination;

- The conclusion regarding the application of the Code and applicable university policy to the facts;
- A statement of, and rationale for, the determination as to each allegation, including whether the Respondent is in violation; and
- The Action Plan, where the Decision-maker determines that the Respondent violated a university policy.

Mitigation and Impact Statements: In the event the Decision-maker intends to find Respondent responsible for some or all of the conduct at issue, the University will invite the Parties to submit impact and mitigation statements.

Action Plan: The Decision-maker will consult with the Director regarding an appropriate Action Plan when the Respondent is in violation of the Code. The Code includes a list of administrative sanctions that may be imposed individually or in various combinations to form an Action Plan. A list of factors and guidelines generally considered in creating the Action Plan determination can be found in Appendix C.

The Action Plan will include:

- The sanction(s) imposed by the University on the Respondent; and
- Any remedies provided to the Complainant designed to restore or preserve access to the University's education program or activity

The Decision-maker will issue the Notice of Findings and Action Plan, where appropriate, to both Parties at the same time. To the extent possible, the Decision-maker will give the Parties notification at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to sending the Notice of Findings and Action Plan. The final decision set forth in the Notice of Findings and Action Plan may be appealed within ten (10) business days pursuant to the process set forth in Section V.

Section V: Appeal of Final Decision

Either Party may appeal the final decision or the Action Plan, in writing, within ten (10) business days of receiving the decision.

Bases for Appeal

Pursuant to Section V(7) of the Student Conduct Code, Parties may only appeal a final decision on one or more of the following bases:

1. Whether there was a procedural irregularity that affected the outcome of the matter.

2. Whether the Action Plan imposed was commensurate with the violation(s) for which Respondent was found responsible.
3. Whether the finding is supported by a preponderance of the evidence.
4. To consider new evidence that could alter a decision, but only if such evidence could not have been known to the appealing Party at the time of the hearing.

Appeals based on procedural irregularity may include claims that the Investigator, Decision-maker, or the Chief Civil Rights Officer had a conflict of interest or bias for or against complainants or respondents generally or the individual Complainant or Respondent that affected the outcome of the matter.

Requesting a Stay of Sanction Pending Appeal

A Party may request a stay of the sanction pending the outcome of the appeal. If granted, a stay of the sanction will result in a delay of the Action Plan. A Party must request the stay when they file the appeal. The other Party will be notified of the request to stay the sanction(s) and may be provided an opportunity to respond prior to the University issuing a decision. The University will decide whether to stay the sanction pending appeal, taking into account the harm to the requesting Party and the impact on the other Party and larger university community.

Scope of the Appeal

Except as the Appeal Administrator determines necessary when the appeal is based on new evidence, an appeal is limited to the information in the Record.

Processing the Appeal

Appeals should be submitted via email to Office of Equal Opportunity and Access (eoaa@uoregon.edu). The written appeal must indicate the basis or bases for the appeal and may also contain written argument supporting the appeal.

The non-appealing party will be notified of the appeal and will be permitted to review the appeal. The non-appealing party will have seven (7) days to submit a written response.

An Appeal Administrator will be appointed to decide the appeal. The Appeal Administrator may not be the Investigator, the Decision-maker, or the Chief Civil Rights Officer.

Absent extenuating circumstances, the Appeal Administrator will issue a decision within forty-five (45) days of appointment. The decision will be delivered to both Parties at the same time. To the extent possible, the Appeal Administrator will give the Parties notification at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to sending out the decision.

Upholding a Decision

After considering an appeal, the Appeal Administrator may uphold both the finding that a policy violation occurred and the sanction. If both the violation and sanction are upheld, the Action Plan will take effect. This means the Action Plan imposed by the University will remain in effect through any external appeals process unless the reviewing body issues a stay of the Action Plan.

Modifying the Sanction or Changing a Decision

After considering an appeal, the Appeal Administrator may change the decision about whether Respondent is in violation of the Code for one or more alleged violations, may modify the Action Plan, or may recommend additional fact-finding. If the Appeal Administrator changes the decision and finds Respondent in violation of the Code and an Action Plan is needed, the Action Plan will be implemented by the Decision-maker in consultation with the Director. Either Party may then appeal the Action Plan only.

Section VI: Exceptions to Procedures

Petitions by Complainant or Respondent

Either Party may request exceptions to these procedures including requests to extend or shorten timeframes (by submitting a petition).

In order to be considered, petitions must:

- Provide a brief statement (oral or written) describing the reason for requesting the exception; and
- Be made by the date specified in these procedures and, where no date is specified, be made at least one day before the deadline and giving the University a reasonable amount of time to consider the request.

The University has the discretion to grant or deny petitions. Where the outcome of a petition has the potential to impact both Parties, the University may provide the other Party with an opportunity to respond to the petition.

Exceptions by the University

For good cause, the University may make exceptions to these procedures. If an exception is made by the University that significantly impacts timelines or other aspects of the process, the Parties will be notified of the exception within a reasonable time.

Petition for Bias or Conflict of Interest

If a Party believes that an Investigator, Decision-maker, Appeal Administrator, or other individual who makes decisions as part of the process is biased or has a conflict of interest, that Party may make a request for a new individual to be assigned or designated to make the decision in question. Petitions must be submitted as soon as the Party has reason to believe the designated individual is biased, and no later than twenty-four (24) hours prior to the next relevant meeting with the allegedly biased individual.

The following will not, on their own, be sufficient to establish bias:

- The fact that the Investigator has previously or is currently investigating other cases involving the same Party;
- The fact that a Decision-maker has previously decided a case involving the same Party; or
- Previous roles or positions held by the Investigator, Decision-maker, Appellate Body, or other University Decision-maker.

A finding of bias will require specific allegations about why the individual cannot be fair or impartial under the circumstances of a particular case. Upon a finding of bias or conflict of interest, the University will assign a new individual to serve in that role or delegate a new person to make the decision.

Appendix A: Glossary of Important Terms

In addition to the terms below, these procedures incorporate by reference the definitions of the Student Conduct Code and other university policy.

Appeal Administrator – A trained and impartial person assigned to review appeals of final decisions subject to these procedures. The Appeal Administrator is not otherwise involved in the underlying process as a Decision-maker.

Chief Civil Rights Officer – The University of Oregon's Title IX Coordinator and Chief Civil Rights Officer or person serving as their designee.

Complainant – The person who was subjected to Respondent's alleged misconduct. This definition includes Non-participating Complainants and the University where the University brings a claim on behalf of an individual.

Decision-maker – A trained and impartial person designated by the University to adjudicate allegations of Discriminatory Misconduct, including by determining whether a

violation occurred based upon a preponderance of the evidence and imposing an Action Plan if applicable. Also called “Case Manager” under the Code. The Decision-maker may be a university employee or a contracted Decision-maker. Contracted Decision-makers are contractually subject to the same privacy and confidentiality requirements as university employees.

Director – The Director of Student Conduct and Community Standards or person serving as their designee.

Discriminatory Misconduct – Includes conduct based on a protected status in violation of the University’s Prohibited Discrimination and Retaliation policy and as set forth in the Student Conduct Code.

Formal Complaint – A written document, signed by a Complainant or the Chief Civil Rights Officer, that describes basic details about the alleged misconduct, lists the alleged violations of the Student Conduct Code and other applicable university policy, and requests that the University initiate the student conduct process as outlined in these procedures.

Formal Investigation Process – The formal process for resolving student conduct cases which is outlined in the Standard Operating Procedures for Discriminatory Misconduct.

Investigator – A trained and impartial person designated by the University to investigate allegations of Discriminatory Misconduct. The Investigator may be a University employee or a contracted investigator. Contracted investigators are contractually subject to the same privacy and confidentiality requirements as University employees.

Notice/Notification – An official correspondence between the University and the Parties, for example the Notice of Allegations, Notice of Dismissal, Notice of Findings, and Notice of Appeal. Unless otherwise noted in these procedures, the official method of communication with all Students, Witnesses, and other Participants is by university email. All Students and employees of the University are responsible for understanding the content of those emails. Once a communication has been sent to a Student or employee’s university email, then the University considers that person to have received notice of the communication.

****If a Participant does not have a university email, then the individual will receive communications through the email address known to the University. If the Participant does not have an email address known to the University, the Participant will receive communications by first-class mail or an identified preferred method. If notice is sent via first-class mail, it will be considered received three (3) days after it was sent. The address on file in DuckWeb is the address to which communications will be mailed unless a Party**

provides the University with an alternate mailing address in writing, in which case communication will be sent to the alternate mailing address.

Participant – Any Party or Witness or other participant in the student conduct process, including any Advisor.

Party/Parties – The Complainant(s) and/or Respondent(s).

Preponderance of the Evidence – Often described as “more likely than not,” meaning that the greater weight of the evidence establishes that something more likely than not did or did not occur. Preponderance of the evidence is the standard for determining violations of the Student Conduct Code.

Person Reporting – Any person who reports alleged misconduct to the University. This person is not automatically considered the Complainant.

Petition – A written request submitted to the University for an exception to these procedures.

Record – The official “Record” of the case includes all evidence available to the Decision-maker when reaching a decision about responsibility and sanctions. In general, the Record includes the Investigation Report, responses, Notice of Findings, Action Plan, petitions, and relevant formal communications. For cases resolved through the hearing process, the Record also includes but is not limited to, the Evidence File or updated version of the Evidence File, audio recordings or transcripts of any pre-hearing meeting(s), the audio recording or transcript of the hearing, and any other evidence deemed relevant for the Decision-maker to consider. Evidence that is deemed not relevant by the Decision-maker or evidence that the Decision-maker declines to admit into evidence is not part of the Record.

Respondent – The person(s) alleged to have violated the Student Conduct Code. The University will not take disciplinary action against a Respondent(s) for refusing to participate in the process. However, the student conduct process may continue consistent with the rights outlined in the Code and these procedures.

Student – Any person with student status as defined in the Student Conduct Code.

Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims – Allegations involving “sexual harassment” as defined by the Title IX Rulemaking at 34 CFR Part 106. This includes conduct on the basis of sex that satisfies one or more of the following: (1) Quid pro quo: An employee of the institution conditioning the provision of an aid, benefit, or service of the University on an individual’s participation in unwelcome sexual conduct; (2) Unwelcome conduct determined by a reasonable person to be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively

denies a person equal access to the recipient's education program or activity; or (3) "Sexual assault" as defined in 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f)(6)(A)(v), "dating violence" as defined in 34 U.S.C. § 12291(a)(10), "domestic violence" as defined in 34 U.S.C. § 12291(a)(8), or "stalking" as defined in 34 U.S.C. § 12291(a)(30). The definition also includes the FBI's definition of "criminal sexual contact." The University will provide a hearing and separate decision-maker for all Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims subject to the University's jurisdiction, even if the conduct occurred off-campus or outside of the University's programs or activities; this constitutes a student conduct code procedure even if not mandated by Title IX.

Witness – Individuals who may have evidence relevant to the allegations, including individuals who may have observed the allegations in question, may be able to provide contextual evidence, or may have other evidence related to the allegations.

Appendix B: Content of Notice of Allegations

The Notice of Allegations will include:

- The name and contact information for the designated Investigator;
- For the Respondent only: The date, time, and location (or access information) for the informational meeting;
- The Formal Complaint, which will include sufficient details about the alleged misconduct, including the identity of the Parties, if known, and the date(s), time(s), and location(s) of alleged misconduct if known by the University at the time the Notice of Allegations is issued;
- A statement of the portion(s) of the Student Conduct Code alleged to have been violated, and any applicable university policy violations being investigated, including which of the allegations, if any, involve Title IX Sexual Harassment Claims, as defined in Appendix A;
- Whether the Respondent may be subject to suspension, expulsion, or negative transcript notation;
- A direct link to the Student Conduct Code and these procedures;
- A statement informing the Parties that the Student Conduct Code prohibits (1) knowingly making false statements, (2) knowingly submitting false information during the student conduct process, and (3) retaliation against any person for participating in the Conduct process;

- Information about supportive measures and confidential resources;
- A statement of the rights and resources to which Parties are entitled, including Respondent's right to be presumed not in violation for the alleged misconduct, a statement that a determination regarding whether the Respondent is in violation will be made at the conclusion of the student conduct process, the right to an Advisor who may be but is not required to be an attorney, and the right to review and respond to the allegations.

In addition, when a Respondent is also employed by the University, the Notice of Allegations will indicate whether the information gathered in the student conduct process may be used to make disciplinary decisions in the employment context. The Notice will describe what, if any, employee process-related rights the Respondent and Complainant may be entitled to during the process (e.g., Respondent's Weingarten rights) and/or additional policy or procedural rights that arise as a result of the Respondent's employment status.

Appendix C: Action Plan Guidelines

The Decision-maker, in consultation with the Director and Chief Civil Rights Officer, will create an Action Plan utilizing the guidelines and criteria outlined below. The Action Plan will consist of outcomes and administrative sanctions as listed in the Student Conduct Code, Section V.6.

Each Action Plan will be individualized and dependent on the full context of the violation that is found to have occurred. The Action Plan is intended to be a proportional response to the violation that occurred and in the best interest of preserving equal access to the institution's educational environment.

To determine what administrative sanctions are appropriate, the University will consider aggravating and/or mitigating factors, such as, but not limited to the following:

- The nature of the conduct underlying the policy violation, including the severity, persistency and/or pervasiveness of the conduct.
- The impact of the conduct on the Complainant and/or the university community.
- Evidence of prior or subsequent misconduct, regardless of whether there has been finding of a policy violation related to that alleged misconduct.
- Whether the Respondent has previously been found in violation of the Code, and if so, the nature and severity of those prior violations.

- Mitigating factors, including without limitation if the Respondent demonstrates a clear understanding of the impact that their behavior has had on the Complainant and/or the community, took immediate steps to address relevant underlying personal issues that may have contributed to the violation, and/or acknowledged wrongdoing.
- Whether a particular sanction is necessary in order to eliminate the conduct, prevent its recurrence and remedy its effects on the Complainant or other university community members.
- Any other mitigating, aggravating or compelling circumstances in order to reach a just, proportional, and appropriate resolution in each case.