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When Is Due Process Due?:
The Impact of Title IX Sexual Assault Adjudication on the Rights of University Students

Abstract

As a part of the Educational Amendments of 1972, Title IX was created to address sex discrimination in sports programs receiving federal funding. However, its scope has ballooned tremendously over the years to include a variety of conduct occurring on college campuses. Currently, Title IX is the primary legislation governing sexual assault and harassment allegations stemming from universities.

This Note explores the use of Title IX in universities and addresses the concerns that arise when a civil rights law becomes the primary mechanism for adjudicating allegations of criminal conduct. Specifically, this Note addresses the due process concerns that arise when accused students face allegations of sexual assault without the procedural protections traditionally afforded by the criminal justice system, such as a heightened standard of proof, impartial adjudicators, and the right to cross-examination. Ultimately, this Note offers solutions and suggestions for improving the adjudication systems on campuses in order to protect the rights of both victims and accused students.
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I. Introduction

Situation One: John and Jane meet at a party on campus. The two converse, go back to John’s apartment, and have sex. Jane later reports the encounter as nonconsensual to her Title IX coordinator. With no other witnesses, the university is forced to rely on only the accounts of the two participants. The single investigator handling the case reviews the written evidence and decides with 51% confidence that John assaulted Jane. John is expelled from school.

Situation Two: John and Jane meet at a party on campus. The two converse, go back to John’s apartment, and have sex. Jane later reports the encounter as nonconsensual to her Title IX coordinator. With no other witnesses, the university is forced to rely on only the accounts of the two participants. The single investigator handling the case reviews the written evidence and decides with 51% confidence that John did not assault Jane. John receives no punishment.

Sexual violence towards women on college campuses is often regarded as an epidemic. According to the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, 23.1% of female undergraduate students and 8.8% of female graduate students have been raped or sexually assaulted during their time in school. Universities have historically failed to protect victims of sexual violence; a nine-month investigation in 2010 conducted by the Center for Public Integrity revealed that campus adjudications were often confusing, “shrouded in secrecy,” and marked by lengthy delays. Additionally, more than half of the incidents went
unpunished or resulted in merely a reprimand, even for the assailants who were deemed responsible—the equivalent of guilty. As the issue gained publicity, universities were denounced for their inaction, ultimately prompting both the federal government and individual campuses to revamp their procedures in handling sexual violence. In 2011, the Obama administration issued the Dear Colleague Letter (which has since been rescinded by the Trump administration), offering guidance to educational institutions receiving federal funding on how to structure their sexual misconduct policies. The Dear Colleague Letter, together with increasing awareness of sexual assault through mediums such as the #MeToo movement, inspired universities to create policies that were considerably more protective of sexual violence survivors.


4. Goral, supra note 3; see also Nick Anderson, Colleges Often Reluctant to Expel for Sexual Violence, WASH. POST (Dec. 15, 2014), https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/colleges-often-reluctant-to-expel-for-sexual-violence--with-u-va-a-prime-example/2014/12/15/307c5648-7b4e-11e4-b821-503cc7efed9e_story.html?utm_term=.064f72691b3e. As of 2014, the University of Virginia had not expelled a student for sexual misconduct in over ten years, despite dismissing many students for academic misconduct such as cheating. Id. Nationally in 2014, only 12% of the 478 sanctions for sexual assault on university campuses were expulsions, meaning that the other 88% of guilty perpetrators received some other form of discipline (or none at all). Id.

5. Juliet Eilperin, Biden and Obama Rewrite the Rulebook on College Sexual Assaults, WASH. POST (July 3, 2016), https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/biden-and-obama-rewrite-the-rulebook-on-college-sexual-assaults/2016/07/03/0773302e-3654-11e6-a254-2b336e293a3c_story.html?utm_term=.e48f55679643. The Obama administration’s response was motivated in part by survivors who publicly denounced their universities’ unresponsiveness to their sexual assault allegations. Id. Additionally, President Obama and Vice President Biden were individually passionate about sexual violence issues on college campuses. Id.

6. See infra notes 40–43 and accompanying text; see also S. Daniel Carter, In Defense of the Title IX Dear Colleague Letter, HUFFINGTON POST (Sept. 16, 2017, 10:45 PM), https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/in-defense-of-the-title-ix-dear-colleague-letter_us_59bddd9ae4b06b71800c3a2f. A 2009 and 2010 investigation by the Center for Public Integrity found that perpetrators of sexual assault on university campuses often had no repercussions despite being found guilty. Id. Even cases of repeat offenders “rarely lead[d] to tough punishments like expulsion.” Sexual Assault on Campus, CTR. FOR PUB. INTEGRITY, https://publicintegrity.org/topics/education-sexual-assault-on-campus/ (last visited Mar. 26, 2015). It was against this backdrop that the Obama Administration issued the Dear Colleague Letter, which both reiterated existing Title IX requirements and created new recommendations to assist in the adjudication process. See Carter, supra.

However, universities are now facing harsh criticism for “overcorrection,” as many of the newly reformed policies fail to institute procedural protections and consequently disregard the rights of accused students.\(^8\) The issues plaguing current university procedures are wide in scope, including topics ranging from whether the parties are entitled to attorneys to what standard of proof is appropriate in proceedings that are often adjudicated by university officials, who lack the appropriate experience and training to handle sexual assault claims.\(^9\) Because so many of the new procedures lack safeguards for the alleged perpetrators, many campuses have faced litigation initiated by students alleging that their due process rights were violated by inadequate investigations, insufficient hearings, and hasty decisions by unqualified adjudicators.\(^10\) University tribunals, tasked with striking the delicate balance between the rights of the victims and the rights of the accused, have struggled to decide such claims with the limited resources, contradictory protocol, and vague guidelines presently available.\(^11\) Although the motivation behind these changes was noble—preventing sexual misconduct on campuses and strengthening existing policies to better protect victims who have historically been disregarded—“many of the remedies that have been pushed on campus in recent years are unjust to men, infantilize women, and ultimately undermine the legitimacy of the fight against sexual violence.”\(^12\) Some of the backdrop, universities have implemented several sexual assault prevention programs, such as mandatory training for incoming students on the intricacies of consent and how to be an active bystander. \(\text{id.}\) Campuses are also offering specific support groups, counseling, and health services for survivors of sexual assault. \(\text{id.}\) The prevention programs were encouraged by the Obama administration, which passed a public-awareness campaign called “It’s On Us” to encourage active intervention before sexual assault occurs. \(\text{See Eilperin, supra note 5}\) (describing the effect of the Dear Colleague Letter on universities’ policies).

8. Gregg Bernstein, An Overcorrection on Campus Sexual Assault Policies?, BALT. SUN (Feb. 15, 2015, 6:00 AM), https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bs-ed-bernstein-0215-20150214-story.html; \(\text{see also}\) Thomas-Peter, supra note 2 (noting that because of the structure of current university policies, “be[ing] accused of some sort of sexual misconduct virtually assures that you will be found responsible”).

9. See Bernstein, supra note 8 (noting several of the issues with university proceedings).

10. \(\text{See infra Part III.B.}\)


12. \(\text{See id.; see also}\) Stephanie Saul, ‘Victim Feminism’ and Sexual Assault on Campus, N.Y. TIMES (Nov. 3, 2017), https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/03/education/dl/life/christina-hoff-somers-sexual-assault-feminism.html [https://nyti.ms/2iYP3BQ]. Christina Hoff Sommers, a scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, argues that the Obama administration’s sexual assault policies view women as fragile and weak, a phenomenon she refers to as “victim feminism.” \(\text{Id.}\) She believes that
policy changes have gone as far as perpetuating “bureaucratic regulation of sexual conduct that is voluntary, non-harassing, nonviolent, and does not harm others,” which has been regarded as “counterproductive to the goal of actually addressing the harms of rape, sexual assault, and sexual harassment.”

This Note examines the methods that college campuses currently utilize to adjudicate sexual misconduct claims and emphasizes the need for policy improvement in order to protect the rights of both victims and accused students. Part II of this Note provides an overview of the history of Title IX adjudication, including how current sexual assault claims are handled on university campuses, and the convoluted definitions that underlie the policies. Part III discusses the procedural due process concerns prompted by current procedures and subsequent litigation, including a recent Sixth Circuit case that decided in favor of the accused student; it also examines affirmative consent laws and the alleged shift of the burden of proof that they engender. Part IV offers proposals to improve current university policies to protect the due process rights of all parties, including increasing the standard of proof, utilizing independent adjudicators, defining consent consistently and universally across campuses, and encouraging cooperation between Title IX officials and law enforcement. Part V concludes that the implementation of mechanisms such as a higher standard of proof will more effectively protect the rights of university students.

the current attitude towards female sexual assault on campus has “collapsed the distinction between regretted sex and rape.” Id.

13. Jacob Gersen & Jeannie Suk, The Sex Bureaucracy, 104 CALIF. L. REV. 881, 882 (2016). By requiring that schools report incidents that are not considered prosecutable criminal conduct, the federal bureaucracy is able to “expand its regulatory reach.” Id. at 893.

14. See infra Parts III, IV.

15. See infra Part II.

16. See infra Part III.

17. See infra Part IV.

18. See infra Part V.
II. THE EVOLUTION OF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT ADJUDICATION

Sexual misconduct allegations are notoriously difficult to adjudicate. While sexual misconduct was initially very narrowly defined and limited to specific situations involving physical force, its definition has expanded throughout the years, although the current definitions vary greatly. Because sexual misconduct on university campuses now falls under the umbrella of Title IX regulation, the result has been adjudicatory proceedings that allegedly fail to protect the constitutional rights of the involved students.

A. Unclear Definitions

At its crux, the controversy surrounding sexual assault on university campuses centers on the reality that the concept itself is ill-defined, convoluted, and inconsistent. The meaning of the word “rape” has evolved over the years; in 2011, for the first time in eighty years, the Federal Bureau of Investigation updated its definition to “[p]enetration, no matter how slight, of

19. See Alexandra Topping & Caelainn Barr, Rape Conviction Crisis: The Systemic Failures That Deny Justice for Victims, GUARDIAN (Oct. 6, 2018), https://www.theguardian.com/membership/2018/oct/06/conviction-crisis-rape-uk-cps (describing the failures of the criminal justice system in adjudicating sexual assault claims); see also What to Expect from the Criminal Justice System, RAPE ABUSE & INCEST NAT’L NETWORK, https://www.rainn.org/articles/what-expect-criminal-justice-system (last visited Oct. 2, 2019) (noting the issues with sexual assault cases, such as the prosecutor’s ability to decline to press charges). Because the final decision on whether to press charges is ultimately up to the prosecutor, many sexual assault claims go unprosecuted. Id. These cases are especially difficult due to the lack of physical evidence and inability of the survivor to identify the perpetrator. Id. Consequently, per every one thousand rape cases, only seven will result in a felony conviction. Id.

20. Korin Miller, What Is Sexual Assault (and What Isn’t), According to the Law, SELF (Nov. 3, 2017), https://www.self.com/story/sexual-assault-definition. “[T]he legal definition of sexual assault varies depending on which state [the individual is] in, and can even be different depending on where [the individual was] when the assault happened.” Id. For example, the definition of sexual assault in California is different on university campuses than within the criminal justice system; consequently, the standard used may vary depending on the forum that the allegation is reported to. Id.

21. See infra Part III.A.

22. See Miller, supra note 20 (describing the variance of sexual assault definitions among states).

23. Estelle B. Freedman, Women’s Long Battle to Define Rape, WASH. POST (Aug. 24, 2012), https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/womens-long-battle-to-definerape/2012/08/24/aa960280-ed34-11e1-a80b-9b98562d010_story.html. Rape was initially defined as “the carnal knowledge of a woman when achieved by a man other than her husband.” Id. Because a woman’s person and property were under her husband’s authority, legally, a husband could not rape his wife. Id. Over the years, the definition evolved to include rape that was not achieved by physical force and rape that was committed by a perpetrator known to the victim. Id. The definition of rape is still at issue today.
the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the victim.\textsuperscript{24} The term “sexual assault” has faced a similar evolution; it is currently defined by the U.S. Department of Justice as “any nonconsensual sexual act proscribed by Federal, tribal, or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.”\textsuperscript{25} Although the federal definitions of these offenses have been updated, the concepts of sexual assault, sexual harassment,\textsuperscript{26} and consent are still ill-defined on university campuses, which largely retain discretion in defining and prescribing sexual misconduct policies.\textsuperscript{27}

What constitutes “consent” in sexual assault is a pivotal issue in state—and consequently, campus—policy.\textsuperscript{28} States differ immensely on how consent is defined in the context of sexual crimes, and over half of the states fail to “explicitly define consent in their statutes at all.”\textsuperscript{29} In some states, consent


\textsuperscript{26} The definition of what actions constitute sexual harassment is particularly contentious in light of the proposed changes to the Obama-era guidelines. Editorial Board, \textit{Needed Update to Campus Sexual-Harassment Policy Goes Too Far}, SEATTLE TIMES (Dec. 2, 2018, 12:01 PM), https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/editorials/needed-update-to-campus-sexual-harassment-policy-goes-too-far/. The proposal narrows sexual harassment to behavior that is “so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively denies a person equal access to education,” a definition that victims’ rights advocates say would “leave some students subjected to ongoing harassment that doesn’t meet the actionable threshold.” Id. (quoting another source).

\textsuperscript{27} See Miller, supra note 20; see also Erica L. Green, \textit{New U.S. Sexual Misconduct Rules Bolster Rights of Accused and Protect Colleges}, N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 28, 2018), https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/29/us/politics/devos-campus-sexual-assault.html [https://nyti.ms/2wq9EDb] (noting that under the proposed changes to Title IX enforcement and regulation, universities would have discretion in whether to use the preponderance of the evidence standard or the higher clear and convincing evidence standard).

\textsuperscript{28} Kimberly Lawson, \textit{Half of the Country Doesn’t Have a Legal Definition of Consent}, VICE (June 11, 2018, 3:30 PM), https://vice.com/en_us/article/bj3p35/state-definition-of-consent-legislation (noting that the idea of consent is “the critical thing most people look [at] to understand the nature of a sexual encounter,” but the United States lacks “even . . . a consensus definition”).

\textsuperscript{29} Id. Consent is defined a variety of ways by different people. Id.

One person’s idea of consent is that no one is screaming or crying, Erin Murphy, a professor at New York University School of Law, told the Associated Press in December [of 2017]. [She continued,] “[a]nother person’s idea of consent is someone saying, ‘Yes, I want to do this.’ And in between, of course, is an enormous spectrum of behavior, both verbal and nonverbal, that people engage in to communicate desire or lack of desire.”
is narrowly defined; California, for example, codifies consent as an “affirmative, conscious, and voluntary agreement to engage in sexual activity.”30 In contrast, other states offer vast definitions of what actions can constitute consent, such as Alabama’s interpretation, where consent is merely the “acquiescence or compliance [with the proposition of another]31 and Louisiana’s approach, which defines consent by simply listing circumstances in which it is not able to be given.32 Because the definitions of consent are varied at best and completely contradictory at worst, universities have struggled with creating policies to encapsulate sexual violence offenses, create consistent punishment, and ensure that adequate procedure is in place to protect all parties involved.33

Id.; see also infra note 31 and accompanying text (noting that Wyoming does not define consent by statute at all).

30. CAL. EDUC. CODE § 67386(a)(1) (West 2016). In section 67386, California codified the requirement that consent be verbal and ongoing throughout the entire sexual act. Aaron Mendelson, California Passes ‘Yes-Means-Yes’ Campus Sexual Assault Bill, REUTERS (Aug. 29, 2014, 2:25 AM), https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-california-sexcrimes/california-passes-yes-means-yes-campus-sexual-assault-bill-idUSKBN0GT0U920140829. The bill “mark[ed] the first time a U.S. state require[d] such language to be a central tenet of school sexual assault policies.” Id. “In contrast to California, however, Ohio does not define consent in its laws . . . . There, a woman can be drugged and sexually assaulted legally by her husband, as long he does not use force and they’re not technically separated.” Lawson, supra note 28.

31. Consent Laws: Arkansas & Alabama & Wyoming, RAPE ABUSE & INCEST NAT’L NETWORK, https://apps.rainn.org/policy/compare.cfm (follow hyperlink; select Arkansas, Alabama, and Wyoming in the “Select Up to Three States or Territories” field; select “Consent Laws” in the “Select up to Two Topics” field; then Submit). For example, Arkansas law states that there is a lack of consent if sexual contact is engaged in “forcible compulsion or with a person who is incapable of consent because he or she is physically helpless, mentally defective or mentally incapacitated.” ARK. CODE, §§ 5-14-103, 5-14-125 (2019). Other aspects of consent also vary by state, such as the age that individuals must be to consent, whether intoxication affects the ability to consent, and whether the difference in age between the victim and the actor affects the victim’s ability to consent. See Consent Laws, supra.

32. Consent Laws: Kentucky & Louisiana & California, RAPE ABUSE & INCEST NAT’L NETWORK, https://apps.rainn.org/policy/compare.cfm (follow hyperlink; select Kentucky, Louisiana, and California in the “Select Up to Three States or Territories” field; select “Consent Laws” in the “Select up to Two Topics” field; then Submit). Louisiana consent laws are exceptionally vague, limiting sex crimes to situations in which the victim resisted or could not resist because of intoxication or disability. Id. Contrary to affirmative consent laws in states like California, consent in states like Louisiana can be interpreted from silence. Id.

33. See Howard, supra note 7; see also Lawson, supra note 28 (noting that the lack of a consensus definition of consent across society makes it difficult, if not impossible, to create laws that accurately communicate what constitutes sexual violence).
B. History of Title IX Adjudication of Sexual Assault Claims

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination in federally funded education programs. The text itself simply states: “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” At its inception, Title IX was created to address and correct inequalities in education faced by women, specifically in athletic programs. However, court decisions in the 1980s and ’90s made it clear that Title IX also encompassed other forms of sex discrimination occurring on campuses, including sexual assault and sexual harassment. Although Title IX’s early claims predominantly focused on discrimination in athletics, its scope has largely shifted to focus equally on sexual violence claims. For example, “[i]n 2009, the number of Title IX complaints based on athletics was 1,264. By way of contrast, in the same year, the number of racial harassment/sexual violence complaints was nearly identical at 1,137.”

In 2011, President Barack Obama formally implicated Title IX in universities’ sexual misconduct policies through the Dear Colleague Letter, which provided explicit guidelines for how federally funded schools were to handle

36. Title IX Enacted, HIST. CHANNEL, https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/title-ix-enacted (last updated July 28, 2019). Before Title IX, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) provided no athletic scholarships for women, held no championship games for women’s sports, and failed to supply the same amount of supplies and facilities to women’s teams as to men’s. Id. Title IX was enacted in order to “enforce equal access and quality,” although the amount of money allocated to women’s athletic programs did not need to be equal to men’s. Id.
38. Margaret E. Juliano, Forty Years of Title IX: History and New Applications, 14 DEL. L. REV. 83, 84, 90 (2013). Title IX is still very much relevant, not only in athletic claims (as women “still haven’t reached parity with their male counterparts in major elements”), but also for claims of sexual harassment and assault. Id. at 90.
39. Id.
sexual assault claims.\(^4^0\) The letter explained the rising incidence of sexual violence on school campuses and “provide[d] guidance and examples about key Title IX requirements and how they relate to sexual violence, such as the requirements to publish a policy against sex discrimination . . . and adopt and publish grievance procedures.”\(^4^1\) In describing grievance procedures, the letter specifically barred the use of mediation in sexual assault claims, although it allowed the use of informal mechanisms for some other types of sexual harassment complaints.\(^4^2\) Moreover, although the Office for Civil Rights (“OCR”), a sector of the U.S. Department of Education, is formally tasked with ensuring university compliance with Title IX, the Dear Colleague Letter also required each school receiving funding to appoint a Title IX Coordinator to handle claims on its campus.\(^4^3\) Schools that failed to oblige with the guidelines faced a potential withdrawal of federal funding.\(^4^4\)

The Dear Colleague Letter was met with mixed reviews, especially from scholars, law enforcement, and university personnel.\(^4^5\) Proponents of the Dear Colleague Letter, including the National Women’s Law Center, asserted that it urged institutions to better investigate and adjudicate cases of campus sexual assault. It explained how the department interprets Title IX of


\(^{41}\) Dear Colleague Letter: Sexual Violence Background, Summary and Fast Facts, U.S. DEP’T OF EDUC., OFFICE FOR C.R. (Apr. 4, 2011), https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-factsheet-201104.html. For example, the Dear Colleague Letter provided a list of obligations that each school had under Title IX, which included taking immediate action once it knew or should have known of possible sexual violence, taking steps to protect the complainant, providing a grievance procedure (using the preponderance of the evidence standard) for students to file complaints of sex discrimination, and notifying both parties of the outcome of the complaint. Id.

\(^{42}\) Dear Colleague Letter, supra note 40. Some scholars argue that mediation is not even appropriate for sexual harassment cases—let alone sexual assault cases—which require “a mechanism that involves fact-finding and decision making.” See Mori Irvine, Mediation: Is It Appropriate for Sexual Harassment Grievances?, 9 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 27, 28 (1993). Mediation in sexual misconduct cases “risks trivializing the seriousness” of the claims and perpetuating an imbalance of power between males and females. Id.

\(^{43}\) Diane Heckman, On the Eve of Title IX’s 25th Anniversary: Sex Discrimination in the Gym and Classroom, 21 NOVA L. REV. 545, 547 (1997); see also Dear Colleague Letter, supra note 40.

\(^{44}\) Dear Colleague Letter, supra note 40; see also Yoffe, supra note 11 (describing the loss of federal funding as “an action that would be devastating to most schools”).

\(^{45}\) See infra notes 46–47 and accompanying text.
the Education Amendments of 1972, and . . . it has been the guiding document for colleges hoping to avoid a federal civil rights investigation into how they handle complaints of sexual violence.46

Meanwhile, critics of the Dear Colleague Letter argued that under the purported authority of Title IX—which merely bans discrimination based on sex—“the government ha[d] concocted a right to micromanage schools’ disciplinary procedures” by creating binding law under the guise of guidelines.47 Additionally, university officials maintained that the new investigative practices that accompanied the Dear Colleague Letter, including a public list kept by the OCR of the schools at which it was investigating Title IX violations, were unfairly biased and sought to find the schools guilty rather than fairly determine whether a violation had occurred.48 The Trump administration rescinded the Dear Colleague Letter in 2017 and provided new proposals that purport to offer clearer guidance to universities as to the requirements for their adjudication processes.

The proposed policy changes would drastically impact the current mechanisms of adjudication.49 Unlike the Dear Colleague Letter, which was passed without a comment period by the public and was officially designated as non-binding guidance for universities, the administration’s new rules would be legally binding, even without a congressional act.50 The proposed rules would


47. George F. Will, Due Process Is Still Being Kicked Off Campus, WASH. POST (May 13, 2016), https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/due-process-is-still-being-kicked-off-campus/2016/05/13/cb3ec6e-1860-11e69e62e5a123aa62story.html?utm_term=.4b5a9e92a11 [http://wapo.st/1TLR75r]. Although the Dear Colleague Letter was released as a set of guidelines for universities, its critics “argue that the department’s Office for Civil Rights treats the guidance as far more than a series of recommendations” by using it to track which schools are violating Title IX, and threatening the loss of federal funds to institutions that fail to comply. Jake New, Colleges Frustrated by Lack of Clarification on Title IX Guidance, INSIDE HIGHER ED (Feb. 25, 2016), https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/02/25/colleges-frustrated-lack-clarification-title-ix-guidance. Critics argue that this treatment is apparent in Title IX investigations, where the OCR relies on the recommendations as mandates to determine whether schools are treating sexual assault allegations appropriately. Id.

48. Yoffe, supra note 11.

49. See Green, supra note 27.

50. See id. The Dear Colleague Letter, although it was technically mere guidance for universities, had “the teeth of binding regulations,” as the administration threatened to pull federal funding from institutions that did not comply with the letter’s suggestions. See New, supra note 47.
“narrow the definition of sexual harassment, holding schools accountable only for formal complaints filed through proper authorities and for conduct said to have occurred on their campuses. They would also establish a higher legal standard to determine whether schools improperly addressed complaints.”

Additionally, the rules would allow both parties to have access to all of the evidence discovered during the investigation, to “request evidence from each other[,] and to cross-examine each other.” Moreover, the rules would require mediation, which the Obama administration considered inappropriate in sexual misconduct cases, and allow universities to determine on an individual basis whether to have an appeals process. Because the proposals are still subject to a public comment period and have not been finalized, it is unclear what will ultimately be codified in the formal publication.

C. How Sexual Assault Proceedings Are Currently Handled on Campuses

After the withdrawal of the guidelines instituted by the Dear Colleague Letter, universities’ policies regarding the investigation and adjudication of sexual violence claims have been varied. All schools have policies in place

---

51. See Green, supra note 27. DeVos is facing major backlash on the proposal that universities would only be responsible for investigating sexual assault alleged to have occurred on campus because “only 14% of all college students . . . live on campus . . . [while] 70% of all sexual assaults happen in the victim’s home or living quarters.” Amy Carleton, Instead of Protecting Victims, Title IX Changes Would Favor Institutions and Perpetrators, WBUR (Sept. 12, 2018), https://www.wbur.org/cogsci/2018/09/12/campus-sexual-harassment-amy-carleton. This provision would remove a majority of sexual assault claims from university jurisdiction, which arguably would result in less active university participation in ensuring campus safety. Id.

52. See Green, supra note 27.

53. See id.; see also Irvine, supra note 42 (arguing that grievance mediation in sexual harassment cases is inappropriate, likening the power structure of these types of cases to domestic violence or criminal assault). Women may not be aware of the power imbalance that exists in sexual harassment scenarios; however, mediation will never produce a fair resolution because women do not have equal bargaining power in the discussion. Id. at 39. Some sexual assault survivors echo this sentiment, arguing that mediation is only appropriate in settings where two parties share blame, not in sexual violence cases where one party is at fault. Grace Watkins, Sexual Assault Survivor to Betsy DeVos: Mediation Is Not a Viable Resolution, TIME (Oct. 2, 2017), http://time.com/4957837/campus-sexual-assault-mediation/. Additionally, mediation fosters compromise and rarely results in punishment, which is unsuitable for sexual violence situations. Id.

54. See Green, supra note 27.

to address such claims; however, the substance of each differs widely.\(^{56}\) Disciplinary hearings, present at most schools, are “often made up of teachers and students, some with little training, acting as prosecutor, judge[,] and jury.”\(^{57}\) Others have been described as informal proceedings, even as limited as “conversations with deans in separate meetings between the accusing student and the accused student.”\(^{58}\) Many schools lack even informal proceedings; commonly, university “investigators look into a case and make a decision without ever holding a hearing.”\(^{59}\) Problematically, universities lack the resources to examine meaningful evidence even if there are hearings, as they “can’t subpoena witnesses to compel relevant testimony or put people under oath; they rarely have access to forensic evidence or processes for discovery.”\(^{60}\)

Additionally, the standard of evidence used during the hearing—if there is one—is discretionary.\(^{61}\) Universities can decide whether to use the “preponderance of evidence” standard included in the Dear Colleague Letter guidelines or to use the higher “clear and convincing” evidence standard.\(^{62}\) Moreover, while the Dear Colleague Letter required all reports of sexual violence to be recorded and addressed, it did not prescribe a consistent standard for how the investigations should be run.\(^{63}\) Although the guidelines established by the Dear Colleague Letter faced substantial criticism, such as
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56. Id. Schools now have substantial deference in addressing cases of sexual misconduct on campus, including the ability to choose which standard of proof to apply and whether to offer an appeals process to one party or both. Id.


58. How College Campuses Handle Sexual Assaults, supra note 3.


60. Kathryn Joyce, The Takedown of Title IX, N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 5, 2017), https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/05/magazine/the-takedown-of-title-ix.html [https://nyti.ms/2kok6ba]. Advocates of the lower preponderance standard emphasize that because Title IX hearings are administrative rather than criminal proceedings, the standard of proof currently required follows an established legal principle. Id. The rationale behind the lower civil standard was that Title IX employs the same preponderance standard that is used in civil sexual harassment claims. Id. However, Nancy Gertner, a Harvard law professor, pointed out that civil trials that employ the lower standard of proof still have substantial discovery proceedings. Id. She noted that Title IX hearings on campus are “the worst of both worlds, the lowest standard of proof coupled with the least protective procedures.” Id.

61. Green, supra note 27.

62. Id.

63. Id.
“lack[ing] appropriate procedural protections and . . . undermin[ing] confidence in the reliability of the outcomes of investigations of sexual harassment allegations,”64 without any guidance at all besides rumors of proposed new rules, universities must now blindly attempt to adjudicate claims of severe crimes that far surpass typical academic misconduct.65

III. TENSION BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES AND STUDENTS ON WHAT PROCESS IS DUE

Tasked with the adjudication of sexual misconduct allegations, universities have struggled to effectively handle claims against the backdrop of limited resources and convoluted regulations.66 Consequently, the inconsistent handling of sexual violence claims by universities has sparked controversy from all parties involved, with victims arguing that universities do not do enough to address their claims, and accused students lamenting the loss of their constitutional rights in campus adjudication procedures.67

A. An Overview of the Alleged Deprivation on Campus

Many accused students contend that university proceedings impinge on their due process rights, as an adjudication before unqualified teachers, administrators, and students does not provide the procedural safeguards guaranteed by the Constitution.68 Their contention also concerns the standard of proof employed on campuses, with opponents arguing that the “preponderance of the evidence” standard is inappropriate in the adjudication of claims that hold weightier consequences than the typical civil cases where the standard is employed.69 Critics assert that used in this context, the preponderance

64. Id.
65. Ganim & Black, supra note 57.
66. See supra Part II.A.
67. See cases cited infra note 89; Abby Jackson, American Colleges Have a Massive Rape Problem, and There's No Clear Solution in Sight, BUS. INSIDER (Apr. 2, 2018, 1:22 PM), https://www.businessinsider.com/colleges-rape-problem-title-iv-2018-4 (noting that universities not only fail to adequately conduct sexual assault hearings, but also fail to punish convicted assailants appropriately).
68. See cases cited infra note 89.
69. Adam Johnson, Opinion, Against the Preponderance of Evidence Standard, STAN. DAILY (May 21, 2012), https://www.stanforddaily.com/2012/05/21/op-ed-against-the-preponderance-of-evidence-standard/. In contrast, an argument in favor of the preponderance of the evidence standard focuses on the unique allocation of power in sexual assault cases. See Matthew R. Triplett, Note, Sexual Assault on College Campuses: Seeking the Appropriate Balance Between Due Process and
of evidence standard violates “one of the core tenets of our judicial system: the presumption of innocence,” maintaining that the dire consequences of sexual assault claims warrant a higher standard of proof.\(^{70}\) Because the regulations guiding university adjudication of sexual violence claims are murky and inconsistent, a mounting number of students have filed suit against their universities, arguing that the current proceedings failed to afford them a fair investigation.\(^{71}\)

The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments forbid federal and state governmental action that deprives a person of “life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”\(^{72}\) However, the specific procedural protections that due process affords to students who are accused of sexual assault on university campuses are widely unclear and largely contextual.\(^{73}\) Many courts have attempted to clarify the necessary procedures through years of cases.\(^{74}\) In *Goss v. Lopez*, the Court examined student due process rights and decided that students accused of misconduct were entitled to notice and an informal hearing in order to “provide a meaningful hedge against erroneous action.”\(^{75}\)

---

\(^{70}\) Johnson, supra note 69.

\(^{71}\) Jake New, *Suits From the Accused*, INSIDE HIGHER ED (May 1, 2015), https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/05/01/students-accused-sexual-assault-struggle-win-gender-bias-lawsuits (“[S]ome men are forcing colleges to back down with lawsuits that focus more on due process and violations of colleges’ own rules than they do on gender bias.”).

\(^{72}\) U.S. CONST. amend. V, XIV.

\(^{73}\) SILVERGLATE & GEWOLD, supra note 73, at 31.


\(^{75}\) Goss v. Lopez, 419 U.S. 565, 583 (1975). In *Goss*, the Court examined the necessary procedural due process protection for a ten-day suspension. Id. The Court concluded a hearing must be conducted for a suspension; more stringent punishments, such as expulsion, would require a higher level of procedural due process. Id. at 583–84.
Mathews v. Eldridge, the Court once again established the right to be heard “at a meaningful time and in a meaningful manner,” and held that the specific process due in a given administrative situation should be determined by consideration of three distinct factors: First, the private interest that will be affected by the official action; second, the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and finally, the Government’s interest, including the function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirement would entail.

In cases involving sexual misconduct on university campuses, courts have recognized the competing interests of the university, the complaining student, and the accused student. To clarify what process is due to accused students, individual courts have identified a variety of processes that must be provided to them, including the right to cross-examine all witnesses, the right to see all the evidence against them, and the right to present relevant evidence in their defense. However, because various circuits have ruled differently and the Supreme Court has not yet spoken directly on the issue, there is not yet a consistent national standard outlining what specific due process rights are owed to accused students.

Indeed, there have been university challenges to the new methods for handling sexual violence claims on campus. Oklahoma Wesleyan, an evangelical Christian university, filed a suit against the Department of Education in 2016, alleging that the Obama-era interpretation of Title IX imposed a “one-

---

77. Id. at 335.
81. Id. at 60–61.
82. Hansen, supra note 55.
size-fits-all mandate which essentially require[d] colleges to negate the constitutional rights of [their] students.”

The university claimed that although it supported Title IX as written in 1972, the interpretation by the Department of Education in 2011 pushed a social agenda inconsistent with the original reading of Title IX, and forced universities to deprive their students of fairness and due process. 

Oklahoma Wesleyan ultimately dropped the suit in early 2018 when the Trump administration rescinded the Dear Colleague Letter, calling the dismissal “a significant victory for the university and the rule of law.”

Nonetheless, despite the resistance from Oklahoma Wesleyan and other schools that have demanded due process rights for their students, procedures by many universities allegedly continue to deprive accused students of constitutional guarantees.

B. Recent Litigation Facing Universities Regarding Due Process Violations

Courts have seen an influx of litigation from accused students who allege their due process rights were infringed upon due to the lack of consistent regulation and guidance regarding sexual assault adjudication on university campuses. The allegations have included failing to allow the accused student to provide an expert witness, failing to provide the accused student with the evidence against him, and failing to allow him to face his accuser. The common thread in the recent litigation has concerned the lack of fair procedure.

---

84. Id.
85. Id.
88. See cases cited infra note 90.
89. See Doe v. Baum, 903 F.3d 575, 581–85 (6th Cir. 2018) (determining that the University of Michigan violated student’s due process by failing to allow him to cross examine accuser/adverse
afforded to accused students.\textsuperscript{90}

In a recent notable holding described as “an unparalleled decision and a win for those who feel due process has been shunned in campus investigations of sexual assault,”\textsuperscript{91} a Sixth Circuit judge determined that the due process rights of an accused student were violated when he was denied the opportunity to have a hearing or to cross-examine his accuser.\textsuperscript{92} In that case, entitled Doe v. Baum, John Doe and Jane Roe, both students at the University of Michigan, met at a fraternity party and had sex; two days later, Roe filed a complaint, alleging that she was too intoxicated to consent.\textsuperscript{93} John Doe and Jane Roe told two very different stories about the night in question; John Doe alleged that Roe did not appear intoxicated and had expressly consented to the sexual encounter, while Roe alleged that Doe had sex with her while she “laid there in a hazy state of black out.”\textsuperscript{94}

After weighing the two stories as well as the testimony of twenty-three witnesses, the university investigator ultimately determined that the school should rule in Doe’s favor and close the case.\textsuperscript{95} However, when Roe appealed, the university reversed the holding without hearing any new witnesses or considering any new evidence, deciding that Roe and her witnesses were more credible than Doe and his.\textsuperscript{96} Doe, faced with expulsion, withdrew from the university and filed suit in federal court, alleging, in part, that the school’s failure to give him a hearing and allow him to cross-examine the witnesses

\textsuperscript{90} See New, supra note 71.


\textsuperscript{92} Baum, 903 F.3d at 581–85.

\textsuperscript{93} Id. at 578–79.

\textsuperscript{94} Id. at 579.

\textsuperscript{95} Id. at 579–80.

\textsuperscript{96} Id. at 580.
violated his procedural due process rights.\textsuperscript{97} The district court dismissed Doe’s claim, but on appeal, the Sixth Circuit reversed the decision, stating that Doe had asserted a plausible claim for relief under the Due Process Clause.\textsuperscript{98} The judge noted that cross-examination was even more crucial in university cases, as the “university’s fact-finding procedures are [far removed] from the tried and true methods invoked by courts.”\textsuperscript{99} Calling cross-examination “the greatest legal engine ever invented” for credibility determinations, the judge asserted that universities must provide accused students with an opportunity for cross-examination in order to satisfy due process.\textsuperscript{100} When weighing the interests of Doe against the interests of the school, the judge determined that Doe had substantial interests at stake—being regarded as a sex offender, withdrawing from classes, being forced to move out of his university housing, and having trouble obtaining employment later in life.\textsuperscript{101} In contrast, the administrative burden of “providing Doe a hearing with the opportunity for cross-examination would have cost the university very little.”\textsuperscript{102} Ultimately, the judge determined that in cases that depend entirely on credibility, such as university sexual assault adjudications, due process mandates the right to a hearing and an opportunity for cross-examination.\textsuperscript{103}

However, other circuits have responded differently to the allegations of due process violations.\textsuperscript{104} In \textit{Plummer v. University of Houston}, the Fifth Circuit determined that the University of Houston had provided sufficient due process rights to two expelled students after they were allowed to cross-examine witnesses via written questions, testify, and present their own witnesses.\textsuperscript{105} In that case, two students were implicated in sexual misconduct—one by directly assaulting another student, and the other by encouraging and facilitating the assault, which was captured on videotape.\textsuperscript{106} After a hearing

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{97} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{98} Id. at 585.
  \item \textsuperscript{99} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{100} Id. at 581.
  \item \textsuperscript{101} Id. at 582.
  \item \textsuperscript{102} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{103} Id. at 581.
  \item \textsuperscript{104} See \textit{Plummer v. Univ. of Hous.}, 860 F.3d 767, 772 (5th Cir. 2017), \textit{as revised} (June 26, 2017).
  \item \textsuperscript{105} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{106} Id. at 771.
\end{itemize}
during which the victim was not present, the two accused students were ultimately expelled.\textsuperscript{107} Despite the students’ allegations that they were denied the ability to confront their accuser, the Fifth Circuit utilized the \textit{Mathews} factors to determine that the students had “multiple, meaningful opportunities to challenge the University’s allegations, evidence, and findings,” and therefore, the university’s policies afforded sufficient due process protections.\textsuperscript{108} Cases such as \textit{Baum} and \textit{Plummer} evidence the crux of the current dispute about whether university adjudication affords sufficient due process rights to the accused.\textsuperscript{109} Though some circuits have determined that due process requires a hearing and cross-examination, other circuits have responded differently, and the Supreme Court has not spoken on the issue.\textsuperscript{110} With the current muddy state of the laws surrounding university proceedings, litigation on the topic is likely to continue to rise.\textsuperscript{111}

\subsection*{C. The Practical Problem of Affirmative Consent}

The issue of what constitutes consent has continued to be “hotly debated.”\textsuperscript{112} In sexual assault cases, the notion of “no means no” was the accepted standard until relatively recently.\textsuperscript{113} However, the concept of affirmative consent—a verbal, ongoing, and voluntary agreement—has been on the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{107}] Id. at 772.
\item[\textsuperscript{108}] Id. at 773–75. The \textit{Mathews} factors—“(a) the student’s interests that will be affected; (b) the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interests through the procedures used and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and (c) the university’s interests, including the burden that additional procedures would entail”—are often used by courts in determining whether sufficient due process is afforded in school settings. \textit{Id.} at 773 (citing \textit{Mathews v. Eldridge}, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976)).
\item[\textsuperscript{110}] McKeon, supra note 109.
\item[\textsuperscript{111}] Ganim & Black, supra note 57. Alison Kiss, who runs the Clery Center for Security on Campus, says that historically, accusers, not the accused, dubbed the litigation process unfair because of the commonness of interference from outside influences. \textit{Id.} However, now “[e]ven advocates of the process, like Kiss, say many universities aren’t handling this the right way.” \textit{Id.} Kiss believes that because “[s]chools were so eager to reverse years of mistreatment of victims . . . some put procedures into place that led to an unfair process.” \textit{Id.} As recently as December 2018, a California appellate court ruled that the accused student was denied a fair hearing when the university failed to assess the credibility of critical witnesses and request crucial evidence for the student’s defense. Doe v. Univ. of S. Cal., 29 Cal. App. 5th 1212, 1238 (2018).
\item[\textsuperscript{112}] See Lawson, supra note 28.
\item[\textsuperscript{113}] Katie Mettler, ‘\textit{No Means No’ to ‘Yes Means Yes’}: How Our Language Around Sexual Consent
rise in university policies. Critics of affirmative consent laws have argued that they shift the burden of proof to the accused to prove that he received consent, rather than relying on the prosecutor to prove that he did not. For example, when one of the authors of California’s Senate Bill 967, Bonnie Lowenthal, was asked how innocent people could prove they received verbal consent, she replied, “Your guess is as good as mine.” Critics also note that there is a profound disconnect between the “policy’s bureaucratic requirements for sexual interaction and human sexuality as a lived and various experience.” Although meant to protect victims (commonly, women) from situations in which they feel powerless to expressly refuse, affirmative consent laws in effect impose a duty on the accused student to prove he obtained consent, which violates the fundamental presumption of innocence that is integral to the justice system.
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114. See Mendelson, supra note 30; Mettler, supra note 113. The concept of affirmative consent was first adopted by Antioch College in Ohio in the early 1990s. Tara Culp-Ressler, The First College to Use Affirmative Consent Was a Laughingstock, THINK PROGRESS (Oct. 30, 2014, 6:41 PM), https://thinkprogress.org/the-first-college-to-use-affirmative-consent-was-a-laughingstock-now-the-tide-is-turning-a912c34401d9/. When adopted, the standard was considered so ridiculous and mechanical that it was mocked on national platforms such as Saturday Night Live. Id. The concept did not take hold in other places until two decades later, when states like California and New York began to integrate an affirmative consent standard into their sexual assault policies. Id.


116. Id.


118. Mock v. Univ. of Tenn. at Chattanooga, No. 14-1687-II (Tenn. Ch. Ct. Aug. 10, 2015), https://chronicle-assets.s3.amazonaws.com/5/items/biz/pdf/memorandum-mock.pdf. In that case, Corey Mock was accused of sexually assault and was ultimately expelled. Id. In the hearing, the UTC Chancellor “erroneously shifted the burden of proof onto Mr. Mock, when the ultimate burden of proving a sexual assault remained on the charging party, UTC.” Id. at 11. The judge noted that [the accused] must come forward with proof of an affirmative verbal response that is credible in an environment in which there are seldom, if any, witnesses to an activity which requires exposing each party’s most private body parts. Absent the tape recording of a
Proponents of affirmative consent laws maintain that these laws encourage open communication about sex and protect women who were “too frightened or shocked to object” to sexual encounters. They argue that all too often, women are “told that they were not raped because they never physically resisted or verbally rejected their aggressor’s attempts to engage in sexual contact.” Therefore, proponents of affirmative consent laws maintain that they effectively narrow the circumstances in which consent is valid, providing women with protection and autonomy over their sexual encounters.

Both sides of the debate acknowledge that the inconsistency surrounding sexual encounters and how to prove consent contributes to the mishandling of sexual assault cases, often leaving victims without justice due to administrative blunders or lack of physical evidence. However, although affirmative consent laws ideally protect potential victims, in reality they are impracticable to follow, impossible to prove, and provide “a confusing and legally unworkable standard for consent to sexual activity.”

IV. DUE PROCESS REQUIRES BRIGHT-LINE REGULATIONS OF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT ON CAMPUS

The influx of litigation facing universities illustrates an urgent need for revisions in campus adjudication proceedings and applicable legislation. Because college campuses lack many of the constitutional protections afforded by the court systems, clearly enumerated standards, including the implementation of a higher standard of proof and the guarantee of independent adjudicators, are necessary to safeguard the rights of accused students and victims alike.

verbal consent or other independent means to demonstrate that consent was given, the ability of an accused to prove the complaining party’s consent strains credulity and is illusory.

*Id.* at 12.


120. *Id.* at 613.

121. *Id.*

122. See Jackson, *supra* note 67 (noting that colleges both respond too weakly to sexual assault allegations and simultaneously botch the hearings of the claims they investigate).


124. See *supra* Part III.B.

A. The Mathews Factors Are Insufficient for Determining Due Process Rights in Sexual Assault Proceedings

In *Mathews v. Eldridge*, the Supreme Court laid out a flexible balancing test to determine what process was due in an administrative capacity.\(^{126}\) However, the scope of Title IX has reached far beyond the limited arena that it was created to address.\(^{127}\) Title IX encompasses sexual misconduct that, despite falling within the adjudication power of universities, has more severe ramifications than can be adequately safeguarded by laws intended to address administrative violations.\(^{128}\)

While balancing tests may be effective for regulating procedures in public schools, in which courts have generally agreed that certain rights can be limited, students on university campuses who are accused of sexual misconduct should have enumerated due process protections in regards to their hearings and investigations.\(^{129}\) Additionally, although a more flexible, factor-based approach may allow discretion in fact-specific circumstances, a uniform framework actually benefits both victims and accused students.\(^{130}\) With consistent and stable regulations, universities will be able to respond to allegations of sexual misconduct “without fear of liability for violating an alleged perpetrator’s due-process rights” and thus be more effective and confident in protecting victims.\(^{131}\) Consequently, enumerated regulations will benefit both accused students and victims of sexual misconduct by guaranteeing a process


\(^{127}\) Title IX Legislative Chronology, HOLLAND SENTINEL (Dec. 27, 2017, 10:00 AM), https://www.hollandsentinel.com/news/20171227/title-ix-legislative-chronology. Over the years, the government afforded Title IX with varying levels of power. *Id.* For example, in 1984, the scope of Title IX was limited to athletic scholarships. *Id.* However, in 1988, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 restored Title IX’s institution-wide coverage. *Id.* In subsequent years, the power and scope of Title IX continued to vary until 2011, when the Obama administration issued the Dear Colleague Letter reaffirming the power of Title IX’s protections. *Id.*

\(^{128}\) See Johnson, *supra* note 69.

\(^{129}\) E.A. Gjelten, *When Can Schools Limit Students’ Free Speech Rights?*, LAWYERS.COM, https://www.lawyers.com/legal-info/research/education-law/when-can-schools-limit-students-free-speech-rights.html (last visited Oct. 3, 2019). For example, public school students still have First Amendment rights, but schools can restrict students’ speech in certain situations, such as if it is lewd, disruptive to the school environment, or promotes illegal drug use. *Id.*

\(^{130}\) See Triplett, *supra* note 69, at 491.

\(^{131}\) Id. Balancing obligations to both survivors of sexual assault and accused students creates a liability trap for institutions that are unsure how to proceed in the face of the “competing legal considerations.” *Id.* at 506.
that enables full and fair investigations of claims. Therefore, although courts often balance the three Mathews factors in order to determine whether sufficient due process is afforded in school settings, the precarious nature of university adjudications requires bright-line regulations to ensure that campus regulations universally provide students with constitutionally mandated protections.

B. Proposals for Mechanisms that Better Protect Due Process Rights

1. Raise the Standard of Proof to “Clear and Convincing”

The requisite standard of proof varies by case classification. Civil cases have historically required a much lower standard of proof than criminal cases (by a preponderance of the evidence as opposed to beyond a reasonable doubt), as the punishments in civil adjudications are less severe, and the violations are considered less morally blameworthy. The application of this civil standard of proof to Title IX adjudications on college campuses, although helpful in ensuring that the guilty are punished, results in a significant risk of wrongful convictions for crimes that stray widely from the traditional civil violation. Additionally, the use of the lowest burden of proof in sexual

---

132. Id. Currently, the level and quality of procedures provided is university-dependent; thus, “students are subjected to fundamentally different processes depending on the institution they attend.” Id. Students attending private universities are less protected than their public-school counterparts, as courts have determined that students are protected only when the procedures are fundamentally unfair. Id. at 498. Although it is outside of the scope of this Note to address the difference in due process rights between publicly and privately funded universities, it would be in the best interests of students nationwide if sexual assault policies and procedures were consistent regardless of the type of institution a student attended. Id. at 511.

133. See, e.g., Plummer v. Univ. of Hous., 860 F.3d 767, 772 (5th Cir. 2017), as revised (June 26, 2017).


135. Id. Because crimes are considered offenses against society as a whole and have much greater consequences than civil violations, criminal cases are harder to prove and provide many more procedural protections to the defendant. Id.

136. John Villasenor, A Probabilistic Framework for Modelling False Title IX ‘Convictions’ Under the Preponderance of the Evidence Standard, 15 L. PROBABILITY & RISK 223, 235 (2016), https://doi.org/10.1093/lpr/mgw006. Under a study using even the most conservative framework, “an innocent defendant faces a five times higher risk of being wrongly found guilty when a preponderance of the evidence standard is used as opposed to under a beyond a reasonable doubt standard.” Id. at 237. More realistic models (“relative to the conservative model” mentioned) expose a much larger
misconduct cases “dismantles constitutional due process rights for the accused with the imposition of a mere preponderance of the evidence standard for purported felony-level criminal conduct.” In order to ensure that sexual assault crimes on campuses are adjudicated fairly, the standard of proof must be raised to match the gravity and reprehensibility of the crime.

According to the Dear Colleague Letter, the preponderance standard was required for campus adjudications. Under the current administration, campuses are permitted to choose between the preponderance standard (defined as “the greater weight of evidence,” which boils down to whether the respondent “more likely than not” committed the offense) and the “clear and convincing” standard, which is met in cases where “the evidence is highly and substantially more likely to be true than untrue; the fact finder must be convinced that the contention is highly probable.” Although Title IX is a federal civil rights law, and therefore courts would typically employ the preponderance of the evidence standard characteristic of civil cases,

[civil trials afford] many fundamental protections that are typically absent from campus tribunals, including impartial judges, unbiased juries of one’s peers, representation by counsel, mandatory “discovery” processes to ensure that all parties have access to relevant information, restrictions on unreliable evidence like hearsay or prior bad acts, and sworn testimony under penalty of perjury.

margin, indicating that the preponderance of the evidence standard is much more likely to result in the conviction of innocent defendants than a more stringent standard. While the consequences of conviction are undoubtedly less severe than in a criminal court, it is still important to examine the effect of a substantially heightened false-conviction risk on accused university students. Id. at 66. The argument for using a preponderance of the evidence standard in campus tribunals centers around capturing more guilty students, but it fails to take into account the fundamental reason for a more stringent standard for criminal acts: when liberty interests are at stake, there must be heightened protection against their deprivation. Id.

138. Johnson, supra note 69.
139. Dear Colleague Letter, supra note 40.
141. FIRE Statement, supra note 117.
Additionally, civil violations generally lack the moral reprehensibility, societal stigma, and grave punishment typical in sexual assault cases.142 Because sexual assault is so distinct from other civil offenses—and Title IX claims are adjudicated in forums that lack the protection typically afforded by courts—the standard of proof used in civil cases is too lax to provide protection for accused students and ensure punishment for guilty perpetrators.143

Proponents of the preponderance standard in Title IX adjudications contend that the lower threshold encourages victims to report their experiences; because sexual assault cases are notoriously difficult to adjudicate, the preponderance standard allows more convictions and requires less exacting evidence.144 Certainly, underreporting is an issue; the Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network reported that four out of every five female, college-aged victims did not report her sexual assault to the police.145 However, although a weaker standard of proof may incentivize victims to report their experiences and ease convictions, it also removes procedural protections for accused students and greatly increases the risk of false condemnations of innocent individuals.146

142. The Differences Between a Criminal Case and a Civil Case, supra note 134; see also Marciniak, supra note 137, at 66. Standards of proof generally reflect the interests at stake for the accused; accordingly, “[h]eightened standards of proof in criminal trials ‘are an expression of fundamental procedural fairness, requir[ing] a more stringent standard . . . than for ordinary civil litigation’ and reflect the liberty interests at stake for an accused.” Id. (quoting In re Winship, 397 U.S. 358, 372 (1970)). Consequently, the preponderance of the evidence standard is inappropriate for sexual assault allegations in campus tribunals because the act itself subjects the perpetrator to the same societal stigma and condemnation as it would in a criminal court. Id.

143. FIRE Statement, supra note 117.


145. The Criminal Justice System: Statistics, RAPE ABUSE & INCEST NAT’L NETWORK, https://www.rainn.org/statistics/criminal-justice-system (last visited Oct. 3, 2019). When asked for their reason for not reporting, 13% of victims responded that they did not believe the police would do anything to help, while 2% responded that they did not believe the police could do anything. Id. However, because 30% of victims did not cite a reason or provided a reason other than the main categories cited (and sexual violence statistics are difficult to measure), it is still unclear how many victims did not report because of a perception of ineffective bureaucratic systems. Id.

146. See Villasenor, supra note 136, at 227. The model relied on the rates of false convictions in the criminal justice system to create a probabilistic model used to determine likely false guilty determinations in Title IX adjudications. Id. at 225. Even under the most conservative version of the model, an innocent person with a 1% probability of being found guilty under the beyond a reasonable doubt standard was five times more likely to be found guilty under the preponderance of the evidence standard. Id. at 237.
A similar argument by proponents of the preponderance standard is its typical use in civil disputes for federal civil rights laws such as Title IX.\textsuperscript{147} However, even though Title IX was intended to address sex discrimination in athletics, its scope now reaches much more broadly and encompasses violations that amount to criminal conduct.\textsuperscript{148} Because the conduct that falls under Title IX campus adjudication is more serious than initially intended, the standard of proof must be increasingly more stringent in order to match the severity of the crimes.\textsuperscript{149} The “middle” standard of proof—clear and convincing evidence—is arguably most appropriate in Title IX claims, at least as long as they remain within university domain.\textsuperscript{150} If universally adopted, this standard would more effectively balance the interests of both the victim and the accused by requiring sufficient evidence of guilt, while stopping short of the high standard used in criminal courts, which possess much broader resources.\textsuperscript{151}

Additionally, some scholars have proposed a “sliding standard of proof that changes with the severity of the punishment or crime,” which would assist in individually identifying the many infractions under the umbrella of Title IX and handling them accordingly.\textsuperscript{152} As discussed previously, the scope of Title IX has broadly expanded to cover discrimination in all educational institutions receiving federal funds, including “recruitment, admissions, and counseling; financial assistance; athletics; sex-based harassment; treatment of pregnant and parenting students; discipline; single-sex education; and employment.”\textsuperscript{153}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See Title IX Legislative Chronology, supra note 127. The scope of Title IX was limited in 1984 by the Supreme Court. \textit{Id.} In 1988, the Civil Rights Restoration Act reestablished the wide breadth of Title IX by mandating that, “[i]f any program or activity in an educational institution receives federal funds, all of the institution’s programs and activities must comply.” \textit{Id.} Over the next twenty years, various government decisions caused the power of Title IX to wax and wane. \textit{Id.} Because the Dear Colleague Letter was rescinded in 2017, it is unclear how powerful Title IX will be in the coming years. \textit{Id.}
\item Chmielewski, \textit{supra} note 144, at 146–47.
\item Johnson, \textit{supra} note 69.
\item \textit{Id.} at 561. With this variable standard of proof, the judge would be able to set the standard on a case-by-case basis based on the individual facts and possible punishment. \textit{Id.} For instance, a judge would be able to employ a higher standard of proof if the accused student faced expulsion, while only a preponderance of the evidence standard would be required if the possible punishment was probation. \textit{Id.}
\item Title IX and Sex Discrimination, U.S. DEP’T EDUC., OFF. FOR C.R., https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix_dis.html (last modified Sept. 25, 2018); see also Nathan R. Cordle, \textit{Title
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Each category requires a vastly different level of treatment; for example, typical Title IX adjudication policies and levels of review may correctly address gender preference in athletic programs, but sexual harassment and assault arguably require a heightened level of scrutiny and care.154 Rather than attempting to create a universal set of policies to handle very different infractions, Title IX violations could be categorized according to their degree of seriousness and handled accordingly.155 This tactic would alleviate the pressure on school administrators to create a catch-all solution for a wide umbrella of problems, while still ensuring that sex discrimination in the educational realm is handled appropriately.156

2. Employ Independent, Impartial Adjudicators

Despite being well-intentioned, the Dear Colleague Letter ultimately created a “parallel justice system for sexual assault” by requiring campuses, which had “generally deferred to the criminal-justice system for the most-serious crimes,” to “conduct their own proceeding for every sexual allegation.”157 Due to regulations imposed by the Dear Colleague Letter, universities were required to adjudicate claims that far surpassed their regular scope, leading to inadequate investigations conducted by university officials who were unequipped to handle claims of that magnitude.158 Additionally, the administration favored a “single investigator” model, “whereby the school appoint[ed] a staff member to act as detective, prosecutor, judge, and jury” to
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154. See Baker, supra note 150, at 558–61; see also Johnson, supra note 69.
155. See Baker, supra note 150, at 561.
156. See id. at 561–63; see also Bernstein, supra note 8 (advocating removal of sexual assault claims to the criminal justice system to allow colleges to focus on “the important and necessary task of presiding over the entire range of sexual harassment behavior that does not amount to criminal activity but results in a hostile environment—the original intent behind Title IX.”).
157. See Yoffie, supra note 11.
158. Joyce, supra note 60. Universities have also been accused of overcorrecting “after decades of failing to take student sexual violence seriously enough.” Id. However, the criminal justice system is also notorious for failing to handle sexual violence cases adequately. See Michelle J. Anderson, Campus Sexual Assault Adjudication and Resistance to Reform, 125 YALE L.J. 1940, 1999 (2016).
handle the Title IX claims. Because universities now have wide discretion in how to address Title IX claims, adjudicators of Title IX violations vary by campus. Some universities use only a single-investigator, a method that bypasses the live hearing stage and results in a decision rendered by one individual. This model is widely employed by universities, although the American Bar Association’s task force recommended against its use:

[T]he single investigator model, which consists of having an investigator also serve as the decision-maker, carries inherent structural fairness risks especially as it relates to cases in which suspension or expulsion is a possibility. Should a school choose to use the investigatory model, the task force recommends that the investigator and the decision-maker be different persons and adopt additional procedural protections consist with these recommendations.

Other universities use the adjudicatory model, which includes a hearing at which both parties are entitled to be present; however, the specific form varies by university. Some campuses, such as Vassar College in Poughkeepsie, New York, have elected to hire retired judges to adjudicate claims.

159. See Yoffe, supra note 11.
160. Belkin, supra note 59.
162. TAMARA R. LAVE, AM. BAR ASS’N, CRIM. JUSTICE SECTION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN RESOLVING ALLEGATIONS OF CAMPUS SEXUAL MISCONDUCT (2017), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/criminaljustice/Due_Process_Task_Force_Recommendations.pdf. The ABA task force also recommended that the standard of proof be elevated if the investigatory model is used at a university. Id. Though it declined to categorize the standard of proof as “clear and convincing,” the task force articulated the standard by stating that in order to convict an accused student, the decision-maker should find that there is sufficient evidence that is relevant, probable, and persuasive to firmly convince him or her that the respondent engaged in the alleged misconduct, and that the evidence supporting a finding of responsibility significantly outweighs any evidence that the respondent is not responsible for the alleged misconduct.
Id. at 7–8.
163. Id. at 2.
as faculty-members expressed discomfort with filling the role.\textsuperscript{164} Other campuses have hired outside parties to conduct the investigations and hearings, such as lawyers or other trained professionals who are more versed in legal proceedings than campus officials.\textsuperscript{165} Problematically, many campuses choose to have internal officials conduct the hearings, which has been criticized as creating a conflict of interest for both the accuser and the accused.\textsuperscript{166}

In order to ensure that campus adjudications are as unbiased as possible and to protect the due process rights of all parties, it is crucial to have a panel of fact-finders who are both unconnected to the university and trained in tactics to address both perpetrators and survivors of trauma.\textsuperscript{167} As noted by various outlets, including university personnel themselves, “[s]tudent conduct administrators simply lack the investigative ability, impartiality, professional training, and legal knowledge required to reliably adjudicate sexual assault cases.”\textsuperscript{168} Sexual misconduct cases are difficult even for the criminal justice system, as they are often plagued by insufficient evidence, credibility issues, and conflicting testimony.\textsuperscript{169} Nevertheless, because Title IX violations remain in the domain of university adjudication for the present, all universities should employ neutral third parties—optimally, retired judges, as done by Vassar—to provide the most fair and unbiased proceedings possible.\textsuperscript{170} Specific training, ideally based in a trauma-informed approach, should be mandated for all decision makers of sexual misconduct claims in order to promote accuracy,
and ensure the fair consideration and comprehension of evidence. Through detailed and consistent training, universities will be able to provide a thorough and reliable approach to Title IX claims.

3. Provide a Consistent, Workable Definition of Consent

Despite the fact that most schools provide publicly available sexual assault policies and consent definitions, they are varied at best and completely contradictory at worst. Because obtaining consent lies at the crux of most, if not all, sexual misconduct allegations, it is critical to have a consistent, workable standard for how to define and measure it. As universities adjust their policies to meet ever-changing guidelines, most define consent to some extent, though these definitions are often contradictory, vague, or counterintuitive. Some policies are contradictory within themselves; for example,

171. Nolan, supra note 167. Trauma-informed approaches assist fact-finders in comprehending evidence, including seemingly erratic or counterintuitive behaviors displayed by survivors. CREATING GUIDANCE FOR ADDRESSING SEXUAL ASSAULT TASK FORCE, AM. COLL. HEALTH ASS’N, ADDRESSING SEXUAL AND RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE: A TRAUMA-INFORMED APPROACH 32–33 (2018), https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/Addressing_Sexual_and_Relationship_Violence_A_Trauma_Informed_Approach.pdf (emphasizing the importance for law enforcement officials to have training in trauma-informed responses and interview techniques). With adjudicators more informed and better equipped to deal with specific sexual misconduct cases, hearings would ideally produce more thorough and accurate decisions. Id. at 51 (identifying the need to “[c]reate policies and procedures that . . . ensure due process for all students” as a key principle of the trauma-informed approach).

172. See generally id. at 5–9, 46–49 (describing how educating, training, and informing university staff provides a workable solution to handling Title IX claims).


175. Maria Lencki, University Offers Students Contradictory Instructions on Sexual Consent, C. Fix (Dec. 19, 2018), https://www.thecollegefix.com/university-offers-students-contradictory-instructions-on-sexual-consent/; see also Gersen & Suk, supra note 13, at 894 (noting that “the definition of
the University of Michigan defines consent as “a clear and unambiguous agreement, expressed outwardly through mutually understandable words or actions, to engage in a particular activity,”176 while elsewhere in the explanation of the policy, there is a sentence that warns students that consent cannot be assumed by actions.177 Other policies are consistent internally, but vary widely between campuses: some universities utilize the affirmative consent standard, requiring explicit verbal agreement,178 while others allow consent to be obtained via actions.179 Still others provide hypothetical scenarios in order for students to visualize consent and understand the probable punishment of violating the boundaries in each particular incident.180

Another crucial discrepancy lies in how campuses handle consent when one or both of the parties is under the influence of alcohol or another intoxicant.181 While some schools plainly assert that consent is unable to be given sexual assault turns entirely on the meaning of consent”).


180. See, e.g., Sexual Misconduct Scenarios, YALE U. (Sept. 9, 2013), https://provost.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/Sexual-Misconduct-Scenarios_Sept2013.pdf. For example, one hypothetical describes an encounter and its likely consequence:

Devin and Ansley are engaging in a consensual sexual encounter, which Devin begins to intensify. Ansley responds by pulling away slightly, moving Devin’s hands and saying “not so fast; I’m not sure.” Devin cooperates briefly but then intensifies the contact once more. Ansley inches backwards and then becomes still. Nonetheless, Devin has sex with Ansley.

While the initial sexual activity was consensual, that consent was not sustained. The UWC penalty would likely range from multi-semester suspension to expulsion.

Id. at 3.

181. Lori E. Shaw, Title IX, Sexual Assault, and the Issue of Effective Consent: Blurred Lines—When Should “Yes” Mean “No”?, 91 IND. L.J. 1363, 1368–69 (2016). Because of a “lack of a carefully crafted, uniform definition based on scientific evidence,” it is hard for schools to determine at what level intoxication becomes incapacitation—and therefore at what level consent is no longer viable. Id. at 1368. Although many schools accept the notion that a student who has experienced a “blackout” is completely incapable of conscious thought, science does not support that notion. Id. at 1370. The existence of a blackout does not necessarily establish how drunk a student is, and consequently does not speak to the individual ability to consent. Id. Put more simply, “[a] student can be severely intoxicated without suffering from a blackout, and a student can suffer from a blackout without being severely intoxicated.” Id.
while intoxicated to any degree, others attempt to define the degree of intoxication that constitutes incapacitation.\textsuperscript{182} As many universities conflate the word intoxication with incapacitation—concepts that once had very distinct meanings, but are now often used interchangeably—administrations ignore the realities of collegiate life and utilize “more ideology than logic” in policy creation.\textsuperscript{183} Consequently, policies are instituted that fundamentally misunderstand the individual’s capacity to consent and relegate some presumably voluntary behavior to sexual misconduct.\textsuperscript{184}

Moreover, affirmative consent laws, although written to clearly define situations in which valid consent can be given, actually further convolute the debate.\textsuperscript{185} Although the importance of finding a viable solution to fairly handle sexual assault cases is inarguably paramount, “the ‘yes means yes’ standard faces the same administrative hearsay problem as its outdated ‘no means no’ counterpart” by simply continuing the credibility debate on which party is being honest, while simultaneously broadening the definition of sexual assault.\textsuperscript{186} Although affirmative consent laws theoretically provide individuals with a more explicit framework to utilize when defining consent, these laws, as currently written, ignore the realities of human sexuality (such as relying on nonverbal behavior), while maintaining the same ambiguities as their predecessors.\textsuperscript{187}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{182} See Tyra Singleton, Conflicting Definitions of Sexual Assault and Consent: The Ramifications of the Title IX Male Gender Discrimination Claims Against College Campuses, 28 HASTINGS WOMEN’S L.J. 155, 163 (2017).
  \item \textsuperscript{183} Jed Rubenfeld, Mishandling Rape, N.Y. TIMES (Nov. 15, 2014), https://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/16/opinion/sunday/mishandling-rape.html [https://nyti.ms/119MFK7]. When discussing universities that issue a blanket ban on consent obtained while intoxicated, the author identifies problematic scenarios: “Now consider that one large survey showed that around 40 percent of undergraduates, both men and women, had sex while under the influence of alcohol. Are all these students rape victims? And what if both parties were under the influence?” Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{184} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{185} See supra Part III.C.
  \item \textsuperscript{186} Marciniak, supra note 137, at 71.
  \item \textsuperscript{187} Id. at 54, 56; see also Colleen Flaherty, Missing the Mark on Consent, INSIDE HIGHER ED (Aug. 14, 2017), https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/08/14/study-suggests-big-difference-between-how-college-men-describe-affirmative-consent. In this article, Flaherty described a study that examined how consent policies were being put into practice by college-aged men. Id. The study found that when asked to explain their most recent sexual encounters, the participants described relying predominantly on physical, nonsexual indicators of interest—notably, moaning and eye-contact. Id. According to the study’s writer, Nicole Bedera, often “men may believe they’re meeting the standard of consent set by their institutions but are actually falling short.” Id.
\end{itemize}
The affirmative consent standard has also proved unworkable in broader social settings outside of university campuses. In early 2018, Aziz Ansari, a well-known comedian and actor, was accused of sexual assault after an encounter with a woman using the pseudonym Grace. Via an internet post, Grace shared her story of her meeting with Ansari, which involved a dinner date and a sexual encounter that left her feeling uncomfortable and violated. Grace described the encounter, detailing a subsequent text exchange in which she asserted that Ansari “ignored clear nonverbal cues . . . [and] kept going with advances.” However, when she expressed these feelings to Ansari, he vehemently apologized, noting that he had not realized he had crossed her boundaries, and that he was under the impression that the encounter had been “completely consensual.”

The story was troubling to many because under affirmative consent standards, Ansari would be a rapist—simply for being unable to read Grace’s mind. Similar to other critics of affirmative consent, New York Times writer Bari Weiss expressed concern that such stories “transform[] what ought to be a movement for women’s empowerment into an emblem for female helplessness” by suggesting that a woman has no agency in sexual encounters. Despite purportedly acting “aggressive and selfish and obnoxious,” Ansari appears to have simply been unable to ascertain that Grace was uncomfortable at first, but ultimately respected her refusal once it was expressed. This example, like many others both on university campuses and in the broader

190. Id.
191. Id.
192. Megan Thomas, Aziz Ansari Responds to Sexual Assault Allegation: ‘I Was Surprised and Concerned’, CNN (last updated Jan. 16, 2018, 9:46 AM), https://www.cnn.com/2018/01/15/entertainment/aziz-ansari-responds/index.html (reporting Ansari’s response to the accusation, in which he stated, “The next day, I got a text from her saying that although ‘it may have seemed okay,’ upon further reflection, she felt uncomfortable. It was true that everything did seem okay to me, so when I heard that it was not the case for her, I was surprised and concerned.”).
193. Weiss, supra note 188.
194. Id.
195. Id. (explaining that when Grace said “no” for the first time, Mr. Ansari responded, “How about we just chill, but this time with our clothes on?”).
social sphere, evidences the reality that affirmative consent—at least as currently articulated—does not provide a legally workable standard that protects victims of sexual assault while also accurately reflecting consensual encounters.¹⁹⁶

Additionally, as currently written, affirmative consent laws, such as California’s Senate Bill 967, seemingly require the accused student to prove consent was obtained rather than the complainant to prove that it was not.¹⁹⁷ Some scholars have suggested that affirmative consent be used as an affirmative defense, rather than a conceptual definition,¹⁹⁸ while others have completely negated the feasibility of the concept in collegiate interactions.¹⁹⁹ In a study conducted by The Washington Post and the Kaiser Family Foundation, eighty-three percent of students acknowledged familiarity with affirmative consent standards, but differed wildly in their comprehension of its application.²⁰⁰ Actions such as getting a condom and undressing oneself were interpreted by some students as constituting consent, while others maintained that those actions were insufficient.²⁰¹ The study revealed that even on campuses with affirmative consent standards that purport to rid any ambiguity from the definition, students are still unsure what actions establish voluntary agreement for further sexual activity.²⁰² Because of the interpretation issues and resistance

¹⁹⁶. See FIRE Statement, supra note 117; Weiss, supra note 188.
¹⁹⁷. See Garshfield, supra note 115.
¹⁹⁸. Noah Hilgert, Note, The Burden of Consent: Due Process and the Emerging Adoption of the Affirmative Consent Standard in Sexual Assault Laws, 58 ARIZ. L. REV. 867, 898 (2016) (“If one of the goals of the affirmative consent standard is to redirect criminal scrutiny from the alleged victim to what the defendant did or did not do, the statutory language needs to reflect that value. . . . The defendant . . . could nonetheless prove that he or she had obtained consent by a preponderance of the evidence, thus reserving consent as an affirmative defense.”).
¹⁹⁹. See Marciniak, supra note 137, at 52.
²⁰¹. Id. at 13–14 (finding that 47% of both men and women answered that taking off your own clothes establishes consent, with 49% saying no, 3% saying it depends, and 1% having no opinion; 40% of both men and women answered that getting a condom establishes consent, with 54% saying no, 4% saying it depends, and 1% having no opinion).
²⁰². Nick Anderson & Peyton M. Craighill, College Students Remain Deeply Divided Over What Consent Actually Means, Wash. Post (June 14, 2015, 7:02 PM), http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/americas-students-are-deeply-divided-on-the-meaning-of-consent-during-sex/2015/06/11/bbd303e0-04ba-11e5-a428-c984eb077d4e_story.html. See generally Shaw, supra note 181, at 1412 (maintaining that an affirmative consent standard is inappropriate on college campuses until the criminal justice system develops it more fully).
plaguing affirmative consent laws, they must unambiguously be worded to preserve the presumption of innocence of the accused and ensure that the burden of proof—as in all cases—rests solely with the prosecutor.203

4. Facilitate Interaction Between Campuses and Law Enforcement

From officers who are skeptical of victims to prosecutors that can choose not to file charges against the alleged perpetrator, the criminal justice system has been widely criticized for its failure to effectively adjudicate sexual violence cases.204 This belief that the criminal justice system fails sexual assault victims is one of the main rationales for adjudicating these types of claims in university tribunals.205 However, universities are also condemned for mishandling sexual misconduct claims, prompting an influx of litigation from accused students who claim that unqualified school administrators bungled their adjudication proceedings.206 To make matters worse, universities in certain states face state and federal laws that differ on which officials are required to report sexual assault claims, which creates confusion among university administrators and leads to a lack of communication between campuses and law enforcement.207

Title IX and the criminal justice system have very different purposes in terms of adjudicating sexual violence claims; while Title IX addresses com-
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203. See Garshfield, supra note 115. But see Hilgert, supra note 198, at 883 (arguing that there is no right to a presumption of innocence in university tribunal hearings, as that protection rests solely with criminal defendants).


205. Bernstein, supra note 8.

206. See Yoffe, supra note 11; cases cited supra note 89. However, while accused students are up in arms regarding the lack of constitutional rights afforded to them in campus proceedings, victims have continued to lament the lax treatment of perpetrators. See Jackson, supra note 67. In several cases, Yale University found sufficient evidence of nonconsensual sexual encounters; however, the perpetrators simply received “written reprimands” and were not expelled or suspended from school. OFFICE OF THE PROVOST, YALE UNIV., REPORT OF COMPLAINTS OF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT 3, 4, 7 (2013), https://provost.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/July2013Report.pdf. This type of minimal punishment for students found guilty of sexual assault is unfortunately common on university campuses across the country. See Jackson, supra note 67.

plaints through the lens of equal access to education, the criminal justice system exists to punish wrong-doing. Proponents of removing sexual assault allegations from Title IX jurisdiction maintain that instead of moving these types of cases to unqualified universities, “the focus should be on developing procedures and evidentiary rules within the criminal justice system that provide a more open and non-biased review of the facts in cases of criminal sexual assault, generally.” Although it is beyond the scope of this Note to discuss in depth the many difficulties that plague sexual assault investigations and convictions (especially within the criminal justice system), it is helpful to consider how universities and law enforcement can work together to protect both victims and the accused.

Susan Riseling, the chief of police and associate vice chancellor at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, offered several suggestions as to how the two entities could create a symbiotic relationship, including having the “Title IX investigator . . . watch the police’s interview through a television feed, and prompt the detective to ask any additional questions.” In encouraging police involvement in Title IX adjudication, universities would permit oversight of their adjudication processes while simultaneously utilizing available resources to ensure a full and fair investigation. Because many due process complaints by accused students stem from a lack of procedural protections afforded by university administration, input from law enforcement would imbue Title IX determinations with specific experience from trained professionals who have familiarity in handling such serious allegations.

Additionally, police involvement would aid in criminally prosecuting cases, which “can only be done if the cases are being investigated fully by trained police officers, not just Title IX investigators, who have to meet a much lower standard of evidence than a prosecutor would.” In this way,

208. See Rubenfeld, supra note 183.
210. See New, supra note 207 (discussing suggestions to help facilitate the intersection of campus police investigations and college disciplinary investigations for sexual assault cases).
211. Id.
212. Id.
213. Id. As mentioned previously, universities have notoriously been criticized for failing to treat victims properly during sexual assault investigations. See Rubenfeld, supra note 183. Cooperation with law enforcement would also assist universities in communicating appropriately with victims of sexual violence, as police are trained in interviewing trauma survivors. See New, supra note 207.
214. New, supra note 207; see also Saul, supra note 12 (likening sexual assault claims to “murder, arson, and kidnapping” to argue that universities alone are unequipped to handle rape allegations on
intervention by law enforcement facilitates the pursuit of justice while protecting all parties involved: victims are able to see their attackers formally prosecuted, while accused students are shielded from false convictions by the higher standard of proof required by the criminal justice system. Overall, a symbiotic relationship between universities and law enforcement—regardless of whether the allegations are ever formally filed in the criminal justice system—would benefit all parties by working to ensure a fair, adequate process and a full investigation of claims.

V. CONCLUSION

Even though the exact statistics are impossible to determine, sexual assault is undeniably a pervasive problem on university campuses nationwide that has increasingly garnered attention from both governmental entities and the media. Because of this, universities’ obligations extend far beyond those owed to the government under Title IX and other reporting regulations. They must create sexual violence policies that protect victims while
simultaneously providing constitutional protections to accused students—a presumption of innocence, adequate access to evidence, and the right to present a full and meaningful defense. They must carefully balance the interests of both parties to guarantee that their adjudication processes provide full and fair investigations. And, they must do so while facing vague definitions of the crimes, contradictory guidelines regarding proceedings, and vehement media scrutiny.

The responsibility falls to the government—specifically, the Department of Education—to create clear and equitable policies to handle the rampant sexual violence that occurs on university campuses every day, beginning by implementing bright line regulations such as requiring the “clear and convincing” evidence standard, the employment of independent adjudicators, and a uniform definition of consent across campuses. Additionally, in conjunction, both universities and students can work to dismantle the rape culture that encompasses university campuses. Societal attitudes towards rape must be...

Oct. 3, 2019). Beyond just Title IX, there are several other federal regulations that universities must comply with regarding sexual assault policies and reporting. The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act requires universities to publicly disclose crime statistics for certain categories of crimes, such as homicide, murder, sex offenses, and robbery.

See supra Part IV; see also Howard, supra note 7 (describing the “revamping” of universities’ sexual assault policies in a way that is more beneficial to both parties).

See Yoffe, supra note 11.

See Grinberg & Simko-Bednarski, supra note 217; see also Christine Hauser, Brock Turner Loses Appeal to Overturn Sexual Assault Conviction, N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 9, 2018), https://www.ny-times.com/2018/08/09/us/brock-turner-appeal.html [https://nyti.ms/2OqlbZH]. In 2016, Stanford student Brock Turner was convicted of sexually assaulting an intoxicated student, a case that drew national attention to sexual violence on college campuses. See Hauser, supra. Turner received a notoriously lax sentence from the criminal justice system, but was also expelled from Stanford and banned from stepping foot on campus, which was described as “the harshest sanction that a university can impose on a student” by Stanford. Id.; Statement from Stanford University Regarding Brock Turner Case (June 6, 2016), https://news.stanford.edu/2016/06/06/stanford-university-statement-regarding-brock-turner-case/ [hereinafter Stanford Statement]. Stanford received massive public backlash for its role in the investigation, but insisted that “Stanford University, its students, its police and its staff members did everything they could.” See Stanford Statement, supra.

See Green, supra note 27 (describing current proposals for sexual misconduct policies on campuses); see also supra Part IV.

See Andrea Durbach & Damian Powell, Sexual Assault at Universities: The Same Degrading Attitudes Permeate Society, GUARDIAN (Aug. 2, 2017, 2:00 PM), https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/aug/03/sexual-assault-at-universities-the-same-degrading-attitudes-permeate-society; see also Charlene Senn, Rape at Universities: One Program Is Proven to Reduce It,
revamped, as students must develop a respect for bodily autonomy and a thorough understanding of what constitutes consent—or more importantly, lack thereof.\textsuperscript{225} Additionally, in order to create a safer educational atmosphere for all students, schools must work to dispel the stigma around reporting sexual violence and engender an environment that protects the rights to an education for all students.\textsuperscript{226} Most importantly, both the government and the universities cannot forget that these evolutions must occur under the protection of the Constitution; as the Supreme Court so eloquently declared in 1969, students do not “shed their constitutional rights . . . at the schoolhouse gate.”\textsuperscript{227}

Rachael A. Goldman*