



---

# Title IX Decision-Maker Training for K-12 Districts & COEs

---

**2022 Title IX Training Academy  
Module 3 (Session 1)**

**December 8, 2022**

**Presented by:**

**Eve Fichtner, Partner**

epeekfichtner@aalrr.com • (916) 923-1200

**Georgelle Cuevas, Partner**

gcuevas@aalrr.com • (925) 227-9200

**Ashlee Reece, Associate**

ashlee.reece@aalrr.com • (562) 653-3200

**aalrr** Atkinson, Andelson  
Loya, Ruud & Romo  
A Professional Law Corporation





**aa/r/r** Title IX

# Title IX Decision-Maker Training for K-12 Districts

Session One | December 8, 2022

PRESENTED BY:  
*Eve Fichtner, Partner*  
*Georgelle Cuevas, Partner*  
*Ashlee Reece, Associate*

Cerritos • Fresno • Irvine • Marin • Pasadena • Pleasanton • Riverside • Sacramento • San Diego

## Agenda

- Definitions for Training
- Review Title IX Decision-Maker Role
- Review Final Investigative Report
- Facilitate Written Questions for the Parties
- Review Hypothetical “Cross-Examination” Questions
- Preparation for Session Two



**aa/r/r**

1

## Definitions for Training

- Complainant/Respondent
- Parties
- Witness
- Advisor
- Grievance Process
- Final Investigative Report
- Written Cross-Examination Questions
- Determination of Responsibility

## Title IX Team: Decision-Maker

### Decision-Maker Role:

- Reviews Final Investigative Report with “fresh eyes” to see if information is missing or incomplete
- Facilitates relevant written questions & “cross-examination” from parties for parties and witnesses; must be trained on issues of relevance
- Reviews all evidence, identifies the disputed issues, and weighs the evidence

## Title IX Team: Decision-Maker

### Decision-Maker Role:

- Makes conclusions about whether alleged conduct occurred and determines responsibility
- Prepares written determination with findings of fact, policy conclusions, and rationale for the result as to each allegation
- If applicable, recommends sanctions for Respondent and remedies for Complainant
- Provides written determination and appeal rights to the parties/advisors simultaneously

## REVIEW FINAL INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

## Review Final Investigative Report

- **Review your Title IX Board Policies and/or Administrative Regulations**

- Look at the policies and regulations cited in the Final Investigative Report and the Notice of Allegations
- Review your role as Decision-Maker, and determine the scope of your decision
  - Are you deciding if there is a preponderance of evidence to find quid pro quo sexual harassment, hostile environment sexual harassment, sexual assault, fondling, stalking, and/or dating violence, etc. under the Title IX administrative regulations? (Federal Law)
  - Are you deciding if there is a preponderance of evidence to find quid pro quo sexual harassment, hostile environment sexual harassment, sexual assault, and/or sexual battery, etc. under the Board Policies prohibiting sexual harassment? (State Law)

## Review Final Investigative Report

- **Read Final Investigative Report and Review Attachments**

- Take notes, and create a list of questions (if any)

- **Calendar timelines to accommodate these phases:**

- Process to ask questions of Parties and exchange written “cross examination” questions between Parties or from the Parties to witnesses
- Decision-Maker analyzes the evidence, writes the decision, and Title IX Coordinator, administrator or legal advisor reviews for thoroughness and readability
- Deliver written decision to the Complainant, Respondent, Advisors (if any), and Title IX Coordinator with notice of appeal rights

- **Plan and Schedule the Process with the Parties**

- If needed, seek help from Title IX Coordinator to schedule and plan logistics

## Discuss *Hypothetical* Final Investigative Report

- Review Table of Contents for Roadmap
- Read the Notice of Allegations and Formal Complaint
- Tips for what to look for in the Investigative Report
  - Note the steps taken in the Title IX complaint process **for this matter** because that information will likely be “copied” into your decision
  - Note where Complainant or others describe an **impact on the educational environment** (e.g., how did the matter affect Complainant’s access to or actual education?)
  - Note where Complainant or others describe the **desired remedy** (e.g., what result does the Complainant want from the formal complaint?)

## Discuss *Hypothetical* Final Investigative Report

- Tips for what to look for in the Investigative Report, continued :
  - Note the evidence from Complainant and Respondent
    - Pay attention to **timing** of statements (e.g., What’s in the NOA vs. the Formal Complaint? When did Respondent know of allegations?)
    - Pay attention to **content** of statements (e.g., vague, offering too much or too little information, full or partial denial, conditional denial - “I would never”)
    - Pay attention to where they **disagree** about what happened
    - Pay attention to what makes one more **credible** than the other
      - Credible: The person offers reasonable grounds for being believed
      - You must articulate your credibility observations in a deliberate, systematic, and objective process (e.g., look at corroboration; consistency/inconsistency; admissions against interest; plausibility; motive to lie/falsify, etc.)

## FACILITATE WRITTEN QUESTIONS BETWEEN PARTIES OR FOR WITNESSES

### Written Questions Between Parties

**Before making a decision about responsibility, the Decision-Maker must facilitate a question process:**

The Decision-maker must afford *each party the opportunity to submit written, relevant questions that a party wants asked of any party or witness*, provide each party with the answers, and allow for additional, limited follow-up questions from each party. (34 CFR 106.45(b)(6)(ii).)

Purposes for the questions may include:

- The opportunity for the parties to seek information that may shed light on someone's credibility
- The opportunity for the Decision-Makers to ask questions and observe the credibility of Complainant, Respondent and witnesses, since they did not conduct the investigation

## Written Questions Between Parties

### Requirements for Questions

- Questions must be **relevant**
- Questions and evidence about the Complainant's sexual predisposition or prior sexual behavior are **not** relevant...
  - Unless such questions and evidence about 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 Complainant's prior sexual behavior with respect to the Respondent and are offered to prove consent.
- You must explain any decision to **exclude** a party's question as irrelevant

## Written Questions Between Parties

### Definition of Relevance

- Having significant and demonstrable bearing on the matter at hand
- Affording evidence tending to prove or disprove the matter at issue or under discussion
- **Synonyms:** applicable, material, pertinent  
*(Merriam-Webster)*
- Legalistic definition of relevance:
  - That quality of evidence which renders it properly applicable in determining the truth and falsity of the matters at issue between the parties.*(Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition)*

## Written Questions Between Parties

### Guidelines for Questions

- Questions should not be repetitive
  - Ask the party to ask another question intended to elicit different information
- Questions should be clear
  - Ask the party to clarify the question
- Avoid compound questions
  - Ask the party to separate the questions
- Avoid questions with difficult words
  - Ask the party to rephrase the question
- Avoid argumentative questions
  - Ask the party to rephrase the question

## REVIEW HYPOTHETICAL “CROSS EXAMINATION” QUESTIONS

## PREPARATION FOR SESSION TWO

### Homework Between Sessions

#### ***Hypothetical*** Investigative Report

- Weigh the evidence and determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether Respondent was flirty or friendly with Complainant before the August 21 incidents.
- If you find that Respondent was flirty, write factual findings to demonstrate the flirting.
- If you find the Respondent was friendly in a non-sexual way, write factual findings to demonstrate the non-sexual friendliness.
- Your factual findings should include who, what, where, when, why & how of what happened that was flirty or friendly.
- Explain why you made that finding; what was your rationale.
- **GOAL:** We may disagree, but did you adequately explain your rationale?

## Homework Between Sessions

### **Hypothetical** Investigative Report

- Review the definition of sexual fondling (pg. 4 of Report)
- Review the evidence in the Investigative Report related to touching the Complainant's groin, crotch, or private parts
- Weigh the evidence and determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether Respondent touched Complainant's groin area
- If you find that Respondent touched Complainant's groin, determine what kind of physical touch **and** if Complainant permitted **and** was touch for sexual gratification
- Write a factual finding (who, what, where, when, why & how of the allegation)
- Explain why you made that finding; what was your rationale
- **GOAL:** We may disagree, but did you adequately explain your rationale?

Question & Answer  
Session

## Disclaimer

This AALRR presentation is intended for informational purposes only and should not be relied upon in reaching a conclusion in a particular area of law. Applicability of the legal principles discussed may differ substantially in individual situations. Receipt of this or any other AALRR presentation/publication does not create an attorney-client relationship. The firm is not responsible for inadvertent errors that may occur in the publishing process.



© 2022 Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo



20

# Thank You

For questions or comments, please contact:

{  
Eve Fichtner  
(916) 923-1200  
epeekfichtner@aalrr.com  
}

{  
Georgelle Cuevas  
(925) 227-9200  
gcuevas@aalrr.com  
}

{  
Ashlee B. Reece  
(562) 653-3200  
Ashlee.Reece@aalrr.com  
}

**aalrr** Title IX



## Eve P. Fichtner

Partner

916-923-1200

epeekfichtner@aalrr.com



I go beyond identifying potential legal problems. I try to anticipate our clients' strategic options which are consistent with their values.

Eve Peek Fichtner represents school districts, county offices of education, community colleges, and private employers for personnel matters, student issues, and all forms of discrimination and harassment claims. Ms. Fichtner has certification and significant experience conducting impartial, prompt, thorough, and effective workplace investigations and Title IX investigations. She also serves as a hearing officer for K-12 expulsion matters and for Title IX hearings with the University of California, the California State University system, and private universities. In addition, Eve provides resolution-based services to clients, including workplace coaching for employees and supervisors, conflict resolution training, and facilitated meetings.

Ms. Fichtner provides representation, advice, and counsel on numerous school and employment matters, including employee leave, evaluation, discipline and dismissal, student discipline, bullying, reasonable accommodation, interactive meetings, release of public records, search and seizure law, restraining orders, and motions to quash defective subpoenas. Ms. Fichtner has represented clients before state courts and administrative bodies. She has served as General Counsel to several school districts, including Davis Joint Unified School District for over ten years.

Ms. Fichtner is an experienced and effective trainer on a variety of legal issues, including Title IX sexual misconduct matters; prevention of sexual harassment, discrimination, bullying and retaliation; understanding student discipline laws; conducting internal investigations; addressing electronic misconduct; effective conflict resolution techniques; and the FRISK® Documentation Model.

### OFFICE

2151 River Plaza Drive  
Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95833

### EDUCATION

J.D., University of California, Davis  
School of Law  
B.A., University of California, Santa  
Barbara

### ADMISSIONS

1994, California  
U.S. District Court, Eastern District of  
California

### PRACTICE AREAS

Board Governance  
Discrimination & Harassment  
Education  
Employee Performance & Evaluation  
Equity in Education/Office for Civil  
Rights  
Investigations  
Student Discipline  
Workplace Training

## Eve P. Fichtner

---

### Events & Speaking Engagements

Ms. Fichtner developed a comprehensive Title IX training series for K-12 and CCD's to address the new Title IX regulations released in 2020. She also developed an investigation training seminar, PROOF, which she has presented throughout California. She has prepared and presented workshops on a variety of other topics as well, including sexual harassment prevention, cyber-misconduct, bullying, free speech/religion, the Brown Act, California Public Records Act, employee evaluation, student discipline, and ADA/FMLA.

### Publications

Ms. Fichtner contributes to the firm's publications and education law blog.

### Community & Professional

Ms. Fichtner served as President of the Camerado Springs Middle School Parents Club for 5 years. Additionally, she is a member of the following organizations:

- Association of Title IX Administrators
- Association of Workplace Investigators
- California Council of School Attorneys
- Sacramento Bar Association, Labor and Employment Section

## Georgelle C. Cuevas

Partner

925-227-9200

gcuevas@aalrr.com



I feel privileged to have the opportunity to assist people with their problems.

Georgelle Cuevas regularly assists school districts, county offices of education, and community colleges in navigating the requirements of the Education Code, Public Records Act, the Brown Act, and conflict of interest laws. Ms. Cuevas is experienced in counseling and representing public and private sector employers in all aspects of labor and employment law, including discrimination/harassment, wrongful termination, disability, reasonable accommodation, wage and hour requirements, leave requirements, discipline and dismissal. She has significant experience conducting thorough and effective investigations concerning workplace issues and student complaints.

In addition to being a licensed attorney, Ms. Cuevas is also a certified Senior Professional in Human Resources (SPHR). Ms. Cuevas gained experience in employment law, retirement, education and civil rights at previous firms. Her prior experience also includes internships with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the National Labor Relations Board.

During law school, Ms. Cuevas served as the Vice-President of External Affairs for the Moot Court Honors Society. In addition, she won a CALI award for receiving the highest grade in her Immigration Law class.

### OFFICE

5075 Hopyard Road  
Suite 210  
Pleasanton, CA 94588

### EDUCATION

LL.M., University of California, Berkeley  
School of Law  
J.D., University of Akron School of  
Law  
M.S.M., University of Akron, College of  
Business Administration  
B.F.A., Kent State University

### ADMISSIONS

2012, California  
2012, Florida  
U.S. Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit  
U.S. District Courts, Eastern and  
Northern Districts of California

### PRACTICE AREAS

Collective Bargaining & Labor  
Relations  
COVID-19  
Discrimination & Harassment  
Education  
Employee Performance & Evaluation  
Investigations  
Labor & Employment Law  
Student Discipline

## Georgelle C. Cuevas

---

### Events & Speaking Engagements

Ms. Cuevas conducts engaging and interactive workshops and training seminars on such topics as collective bargaining, Title IX Grievance Process, preventing sexual harassment, the FRISK<sup>®</sup> Employee Documentation Model, employee leaves and accommodations, and maintaining public and student records. Some of the many sessions she has led include:

### Publications

Ms. Cuevas is a contributor to the firm's education publications and blog.

### Community & Professional

Ms. Cuevas volunteered as an attorney coach of the Amador Valley High School Mock Trial Team for the 2018-2019 competition season. She previously served as an attorney scorer for Contra Costa County's moot court and mock trial programs for high school students from 2012-2015.

## Ashlee B. Reece

Associate

(562) 653-3200

Ashlee.Reece@aalrr.com



Ashlee Reece provides counsel and representation to California community college districts, county offices and public school districts in a wide variety of employment and education law matters. Ms. Reece also conducts investigations for school and community college districts with respect to Title VII, Title IX and other discrimination allegations.

Prior to joining Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, Ms. Reece was a labor and employment law associate for a large law firm in Los Angeles where she handled matters including ADA, FEHA, wage and hour, wrongful termination, and Unruh Civil Rights Act litigation. Prior to working in litigation Ms. Reece was an Equity Officer at a private university in St. Louis, Missouri where she conducted Title VII and Title IX investigations.

### Events & Speaking Engagements

Cultural Competence & Sensitivity Institute  
Virtual, February 10, 17 & 24, 2022

### Alerts & Articles

Ms. Reece is a contributor to the firm's publications and blog.

### OFFICE

12800 Center Court Drive  
Suite 300  
Cerritos, CA 90703

### INDUSTRIES

Educational Agencies

### EDUCATION

J.D., Saint Louis University  
B.A., University of Missouri

### ADMISSIONS

2019, California  
2017, Missouri  
United States District Court Central  
District of California

### PRACTICE AREAS

Investigations  
Labor & Employment Law

