

From: Eric Rosenberg
Sent: Sun, 6 Jun 2021 07:28:27 -0400
To: T9PublicHearing
Subject: Comment on Revisions to 34 C.F.R. 106
Attachments: 20210604 Comment On Proposed Title IX Rulemaking.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern:

I respectfully submit the attached written comment which addresses the Department's proposed revisions to 34 C.F.R. §106.

Sincerely,

Eric Rosenberg, Esq.
Rosenberg & Ball Co. LPA
205 South Prospect Street
Granville, Ohio 43203
888.680.6797 office
740.644.1027 direct
866.498.0811 fax
erosenberg@rosenbergball.com

Confidentiality Notice

This e-mail message is intended for use only by the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This message may contain information that is privileged or confidential. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, anyone other than the named addressee (or a person authorized to receive and deliver it to the named addressee). If you have received this transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error by reply e-mail. Thank you.

Written Comment: Title IX Public Hearing Regarding
Potential Revisions to 34 C.F.R. §106

We the undersigned are a group of attorneys, academics, and other commentators with a strong interest in fairness for all students in Title IX proceedings. We write to provide comments in advance of OCR's June 7 to 11, 2021 public hearing addressing the current Title IX regulations OCR adopted in May 2020.

We first offer the following three suggestions for improving the regulations by making important clarifications or changes.

First, we believe 34 C.F.R. § 106.45(b)(6)(i) has been misconstrued beyond its intended meaning and would benefit from clarification regarding the consequences of a party or witness's failure to submit to cross-examination. This section provides in relevant part that:

If a party or witness does not submit to cross-examination at the live hearing, the decision-maker(s) must not rely on any statement of that party or witness in reaching a determination regarding responsibility; provided, however, that the decision-maker(s) cannot draw an inference about the determination regarding responsibility based solely on a party's or witness's absence from the live hearing or refusal to answer cross-examination or other questions.

We believe this portion of the regulations was designed to address fact patterns such as those seen in 2017 cases at the University of Cincinnati and Miami University.¹ In these cases, a complainant or witnesses supporting the complainant gave a statement to investigators and then declined to testify at a subsequent hearing. In each case, the disciplinary panel nevertheless relied on the statements in imposing a finding of responsibility, which led courts to conclude the process was unfair.

We do not believe that, contrary to what some have argued, this provision was intended to prevent use of evidence of an admission against interest just because a party declines to submit to cross-examination. Such an admission could consist of a confession of responsibility by the respondent or a statement by a complainant that a complaint is unfounded or was filed in bad faith. To eliminate any doubt, we propose adding the following sentence: *"A party's refusal to submit to cross-examination at a hearing does not preclude the decision-maker(s) from relying on a prior statement by that party against his or her own interest."*

Second, we propose that OCR eliminate the distinction in the current regulations between harassment occurring within the context of a school's education program and activity, which is governed by the Title IX regulations, and harassment purportedly falling outside those confines, which may be subject to a separate and parallel disciplinary process. See 34 C.F.R. §106.45(b)(3)(i). This "dual track" disciplinary system can be confusing to schools and students. It can also lead to disparities in rights for similar disciplinary adjudications, as the same harassing conduct could be subject to different procedures depending on whether it occurred in a school-owned dorm or in a private apartment across the street. And, it potentially exposes schools to litigation risk: at least one court found that a school's establishing

¹ See *Doe v. Univ. of Cincinnati*, 872 F.3d 393, 400-06 (6th Cir., 2017); *Nokes v. Miami Univ.*, Case No. 1:17-cv-482, 2017 WL 3674910 at *12-13, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136880, *37-39 (S.D. Ohio Aug. 25, 2017).

dual track disciplinary processes can constitute evidence of sex discrimination under Title IX when the school designs the second track to provide fewer protections than OCR's regulations.² We respectfully suggest that schools who wish to receive federal funding should have a single process for harassment offenses that is governed by the regulations, without regard for "education program or activity" distinction.

Third, we believe there needs to be clarification that 34 C.F.R. § 106.45(b)(5)(iii), which states that a school cannot "restrict the ability of either party to discuss the allegations under investigation," is subordinated to 34 C.F.R. § 106.71(a), which provides that retaliation is prohibited. We have noticed a troubling trend on campus where parties to a sexual harassment grievance proceeding have been subjected to retaliatory harassment and defamation campaigns on social media and other public outlets by the other party based on that other party's dissatisfaction with the disciplinary process or result. Schools should be reminded that they have an obligation to prevent both complainants and respondents from suffering such extrajudicial retaliation.

We finally wish to reiterate the importance of the right to a live hearing and cross-examination as codified in the OCR regulations. The right to a live hearing and cross-examination are critical fact-finding tools to facilitate a school's ability to investigate the credibility of the parties and, in turn, the truth of any reported sexual misconduct. 34 C.F.R. § 106.45(b)(6) is consistent with the modern trend in both state and federal judicial decisions across the country, which have recognized the importance of cross-examination in cases that necessitate credibility assessments by a disciplinary panel—as most campus sexual misconduct cases do.³

² See *Doe v. Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.*, No. 1:20-CV-1185, 2020 WL 6118492, at *7 (N.D.N.Y. Oct. 16, 2020) ("[A] school's conscious and voluntary choice to afford a plaintiff, over his objection, a lesser standard of due process protections when that school has in place a process which affords greater protections, qualifies as an adverse action.").

³ See, e.g., *Doe v. Univ. of Scis.*, 961 F.3d 203, 215 (3d Cir. 2020) ("USciences's contractual promises of 'fair' and 'equitable' treatment to those accused of sexual misconduct require at least a real, live, and adversarial hearing and the opportunity for the accused student or his or her representative to cross-examine witnesses—including his or her accusers."); *Haidak v. Univ. of Mass.-Amherst*, 933 F.3d 56, 69 (1st Cir. 2019) ("[D]ue process in the university disciplinary setting requires 'some opportunity for real-time cross-examination, even if only through a hearing panel.'"); *Doe v. Baum [University of Michigan]*, 903 F.3d 575, 581 (6th Cir. 2018); *Doe v. Univ. of Cincinnati*, 872 F.3d 393, 401 (6th Cir. 2017) ("The ability to cross-examine is most critical when the issue is the credibility of the accuser."); *Lee v. Univ. of New Mexico*, 449 F. Supp. 3d 1071, 1128 (D.N.M. 2020) ("Lee did not receive a 'meaningful opportunity to be heard' because UNM did not allow for any cross-examination in determining credibility, and because UNM's procedures unreasonably hindered Lee's ability to present a meaningful defense."); *Doe v. Univ. of So. Miss.*, No. 2:18-cv-00153-KS-MTP, Docket 35 (S.D. Miss., Sept. 26, 2018) ("Writing a rebuttal after the testimony is complete is not the same as cross examination, which provides the opportunity to assess the person's demeanor when asked certain questions and flesh out inconsistencies in a search for the truth."); *Doe v. Rhodes College*, No. 2:19-cv-02336-JTF-tmp, Docket 33 (W.D. Tenn., June 14, 2019) (cross-examination right for accused students "invokes due process concerns under Title IX"); *Doe v. Univ. of Miss.*, 361 F. Supp. 3d 597, 613 (S.D. Miss. 2019); *Doe v. Univ. of Mich.*, No. 2:18-cv-11776-AJT-EAS, Docket 30, (E.D. Mich. July 6, 2018), *rev'd on other grounds*, 2019 WL 3501814 (6th Cir. Apr. 10, 2019); *Doe v. Brandeis Univ.*, 177 F. Supp. 3d 561, 605 (D. Mass. 2016); *Doe v. Univ. of S. Cal. (USC)*, 241 Cal. Rptr. 3d 146, 167 (Cal. Ct. App. 2018) (decision-maker must be able to see witness respond to questions); *Doe v. Claremont McKenna Coll. (CMC)* 25 Cal. App. 5th 1055, 1070 (Cal. Ct. App. 2018).

The rationale for this requirement is twofold:

Not only does cross-examination allow the accused to identify inconsistencies in the other side's story, but it also gives the fact-finder an opportunity to assess a witness's demeanor and determine who can be trusted. So if a university is faced with competing narratives about potential misconduct, the administration must facilitate some form of cross-examination in order to satisfy due process.⁴

In *Doe v. University of Cincinnati*, the Sixth Circuit observed that cross-examination also benefits the decision-makers:

UC assumes cross-examination is of benefit only to Doe. In truth, the opportunity to question a witness and observe her demeanor while being questioned can be just as important to the trier of fact as it is to the accused. "A decision relating to the misconduct of a student requires a factual determination as to whether the conduct took place or not." [] "The accuracy of that determination can be safeguarded by the sorts of procedural protections traditionally imposed under the Due Process Clause." Few procedures safeguard accuracy better than adversarial questioning. In the case of competing narratives, cross-examination has always been considered a most effective way to ascertain truth.⁵

In *Doe v. Baum*, the Sixth Circuit reiterated that

due process requires cross-examination in circumstances like these because it is 'the greatest legal engine ever invented' for uncovering the truth. Not only does cross-examination allow the accused to identify inconsistencies in the other side's story, but it also gives the fact-finder an opportunity to assess a witness's demeanor and determine who can be trusted. [] So if a university is faced with competing narratives about potential misconduct, the administration must facilitate some form of cross-examination in order to satisfy due process.⁶

In a case against Miami University, U.S. District Judge Michael Barrett addressed the school's argument that cross-examination would only matter if the accused student could independently claim the complainant or other inculpatory witnesses would produce answers that would definitely help the accused student's case. The university, the judge observed, missed "the point of cross examination,"

which allows the fact-finder to assess witness demeanor and responses in order to 'assess the credibility of those who disclaim any improper motivations.' If anything, [Miami's] claim that no amount of cross-examination could have changed the minds of the hearing panel members arguably undercuts the fairness of the hearing.⁷

⁴ *Doe v. Baum [University of Michigan]*, 903 F.3d 575, 581 (6th Cir. 2018).

⁵ *Doe v. Univ. of Cincinnati*, 872 F.3d 393, 401 (6th Cir. 2017) (citing *Bd. of Curators of Univ. of Missouri v. Horowitz*, 435 U.S. 78, 95 n.5 (1978) (Powell, J. concurring)), *Watkins v. Sowders*, 449 U.S. 341, 349 (1981), and *Maryland v. Craig*, 497 U.S. 836, 846 (1990) ("[C]ross-examination 'ensur[es] that evidence admitted against an accused is reliable and subject to the rigorous adversarial testing that is the norm of Anglo-American criminal proceedings'").

⁶ *Doe v. Baum [University of Michigan]*, 903 F.3d 575, 581 (6th Cir. 2018).

⁷ *Nokes v. Miami Univ.*, Case No. 1:17-cv-482, 2017 WL 3674910 at *12 n.10, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136880, at *39 n.10 (S.D. Ohio Aug. 25, 2017).

We are aware that questioning a complainant about his/her allegations could be re- traumatizing. 34 C.F.R. §106.45(b)(6) goes a long way to ensure this possibility is minimized by allowing advisors and not parties to question an opposing party, as well as by providing that parties may be situated in different locations while still being visible to each other and the decision-makers. Section 106.45(b)(6)(i)-(ii) also protects complainants (but not respondents) from questions or evidence about the complainant's prior sexual behavior or sexual predisposition, mirroring rape shield protections applied in federal courts.

As the Sixth Circuit noted,

A case that “resolve[s] itself into a problem of credibility” cannot itself be resolved without a mutual test of credibility, at least not where the stakes are this high . . . One-sided determinations are not known for their accuracy.⁸

The interests of the respective parties must be weighed, and we believe maintaining the right to a live hearing and cross-examination with the current safeguards in place will achieve a balanced solution.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly C. Lau, Esq.
Education Lawyer
New York, NY

Daniel Asia, M.M.
Fred Fox School of Music
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

Veronica N. Norris, JD, RN, PHN
Attorney At Law
Orange, CA

KC Johnson
Professor, Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, NY

Mark R. Lee
School of Law
University of San Diego
San Diego, CA

David Potts, PhD
Department of Social Sciences
City College of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA

Eric Rosenberg, Esq.
Rosenberg & Ball Co. LPA
Granville, OH

Gerald E. Loeb, M.D.
Department of Biomedical Engineering
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA

Richard H. Reeb Jr.
Barstow Community College, Retired
Helendale, CA

Max Hocutt Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy, Retired
The University of Alabama
Tuscaloosa, AL

James E. Moore, II, PhD
Departments of Public Policy
Industrial & Systems Engineering and
Civil & Environmental Engineering
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA

Richard H. Sander
Distinguished Professor of Law
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA

Terrance B. Kearns
Retired Professor of English
University of Central Arkansas
Conway, AR

Stanley W. Trimble
Professor of Geography Emeritus
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA

⁸ *Doe v. Univ. of Cincinnati*, 872 F.3d 393, 403 (6th Cir. 2017) (citations omitted).

Sylvia Wasson, Ed.D.
Professor Emeritus
Foreign Languages
Santa Rosa Junior College
Santa Rosa, CA

Ralph Dave Westfall PhD
Computer Information Systems
Department, Emeritus
California State Polytechnic
University
Pomona, CA

Jay Bergman PhD
Department of History
Central Connecticut State
University
New Britain, CT

Justin Dillon
KaiserDillon PLLC
Washington, DC

Lynn V. Gilbert, Esq.
KaiserDillon PLLC
Washington, DC

Stephen Leckar
Kalbian Hagerty LLP
Washington, DC

Stuart Taylor, Jr.
Journalist and author
Washington, DC

Arthur E. Wilmarth, Jr.
Professor Emeritus of Law
George Washington University
Law School
Washington, DC

Jan H. Blits, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus
University of Delaware
Newark, DE

Shelley S. Dempsey, Esq.
Naples, FL

J. J. Arias, PhD
Department of Economics
& Finance
Georgia College & State
University
Milledgeville, GA

Robert J. D'Agostino
Professor of Law
Atlanta's John Marshall Law School
Atlanta, GA

G. Robert Blakey
William J. & Dorothy K. O'Neill
Professor of Law Emeritus
Notre Dame Law School
Notre Dame, IN

Maarten van Swaay, PhD
Retired Computer Science
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS

David Bradshaw
Department of Philosophy
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY

Catharine Savage Brosman, Ph.D.
Professor of French, Emerita
Tulane University
New Orleans, LA

KT Noell, MD
Director of Radiation Oncology (retired)
Duke University Medical Center
Lafayette, LA

Elizabeth Bartholet
Professor of Law
Harvard Law School
Cambridge, MA

Richard D. Parker
Williams Professor of Law
Harvard Law School
Cambridge, MA

Stacey Elin Rossi, Esq.
Rossi Legal Practice
Williamstown, MA

Professor Daniel Barnhizer
College of Law
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI

John Lyon
Hillsdale College
Hillsdale, MI

David Nacht
NachtLaw PC
Ann Arbor, MI

Paul A. Rahe, Ph.D.
Department of History
Hillsdale College
Hillsdale, MI

Daniel S. Kleinberger
Professor Emeritus – Mitchell Hamline
School of Law
St. Paul, MN

Ian Maitland
Carlson School of Management
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN

Joseph Olson, JD, LIM
Professor of Law Emeritus
Hamline University
Saint Paul, MN

Jonathan Katz
Professor of Physics
Washington University
St. Louis, MO

Meredith Hubbard
Dysart Willis Houchin &
Hubbard PLLC
Raleigh, NC

Gregory J. Josefchuk
President
National Coalition For Men
Carolinas (NCFMC)
Sherrills Ford, NC

Cathy J. Green
Shaheen & Gordon, PA
Concord, NH

S. Amy Spencer
Shaheen & Gordon, PA
Concord, NH

Thomas Figueira
Department of Classics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ

Robert P. George, JD, DPhil,
DCL, DLitt
McCormick Professor of
Jurisprudence
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ

James Bradfield, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus of Economics
Hamilton College
Clinton, NY

Kevin M. Clermont
Professor, Cornell Law School
Ithaca, NY

Gregory W. Ebert, Ph.D
Department of Chemistry (Retired)
SUNY College at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY

Stephen P. Garvey
A. Robert Noll Professor of Law
Cornell Law School
Ithaca, NY

Kara Gorycki, Esq.
Nesenoff & Milteberg
New York, NY

Susan Kaplan, PhD, Esq.
The Kaplan Law Office
New York, NY

Margaret L. King, PhD
Department of History, emerita
Brooklyn College, City University of
New York
Brooklyn, NY

Barry Latzer, JD, PhD
Professor of Criminal Justice (Emeritus)
John Jay College of Criminal Justice,
CUNY
New York, NY

Scott Limmer
The Law Offices of Scott J. Limmer
Mineola, NY

Michael Maller, PhD
Department of Mathematics, Emeritus
Queens College CUNY
Flushing, NY

Juliana Geran Pilon, Ph.D.
Senior Fellow
The Alexander Hamilton Institute for
the Study of Western Civilization
Clinton, NY

Ronald Radosh, PhD
Prof. Emeritus of History, CUNY
New York City, NY

Glenn M. Ricketts, Ph. D
Public Affairs Director
National Association of Scholars
New York, NY

David Seidemann, PhD
Department of Earth and Environmental
Sciences
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, NY

Richard Sypher
Department of English
Hofstra University (retired)
Hempstead, NY

Joan G. Wexler, J.D.
President, Dean and Professor of
Law Emerita
Brooklyn Law School
Brooklyn, NY

Rina Yarmish, PhD
Professor & Chairperson
Department of Mathematics
City University of NY,
Kingsborough CC
Brooklyn, NY

Jill L. Yonkers, Esq.
Rupp Baase Pfalzgraf
Cunningham, LLC
Buffalo, NY

Fred Baumann, PhD
Department of Political Science
Kenyon College
Gambier, OH

Prof. (Emer.) George W. Dent, Jr.
Case Western Reserve University
School of law
Cleveland, OH

Bruce P. Frohnen, JD, PhD
Professor of Law
Ohio Northern University
College of Law
Ada, OH

Madelyn J. Grant
Friedman & Nemecek, L.L.C.
Cleveland, OH

Bruce Heiden
Professor of Classics
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH

Eric F. Long, Esq.
Friedman & Nemecek, L.L.C.
Cleveland, OH

Dale W. Schaefer
Professor Emeritus
Department of Chemical and
Environmental Engineering
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH

Richard Vedder
Department of Economics
Ohio University
Athens, OH

Tyler J. Walchanowicz
Friedman & Nemecek, L.L.C.
Cleveland, OH

Fran T. Ward
Fran T. Ward Law, LLC
Columbus, OH

Buddy Ullman, PhD
Retired Professor
Department of Biochemistry
and Molecular Biology
The Oregon Health & Science
University
Portland, OR

Patricia M. Hamill, Esquire
Conrad O'Brien P.C.
Philadelphia, PA

Raul Jauregui, Esq.
Jauregui Law Firm
Philadelphia, PA

Alan Charles Kors, PhD
Henry Charles Lea Professor
Emeritus of History
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

William R. Sneed, III, Esq
Independent Education &
Career Counselor
Flourtown, PA

Adam D. Zucker, Esq.
Mudrick & Zucker, P.C.
Blue Bell, PA

Michelle Owens, Esq.
Law offices of Agee Owens &
Cooper
Nashville, TN

Thomas L. Pangle, PhD
Joe R. Long Endowed Chair in
Democratic Studies
Department of Government
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX

Lorraine Pangle, PhD
Professor of Government
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX

Nicholas H. Wolfinger, PhD
Department of Family &
Consumer Studies
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT

Robert Benne, PhD
Department of Religion and
Philosophy
Roanoke College
Salem, VA

Lloyd Cohen, PhD JD
Professor Law
Scalia Law School
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Margaret C. Valois, Esq.
James River Legal Associates
Lynchburg, VA

Lowell S. Brown, PhD
Emeritus Professor
Physics Department
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

Cynthia P. Garrett
Educational Attorney
Anacortes, WA

Donald Downs
Emeritus Professor of Political
Science and Law
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI

Jeffrey M. Jones, MD, PhD
Professor Emeritus of Medicine
University of Wisconsin School
of Medicine and Public Health
Madison, WI