

Loyola University of Chicago

**Comprehensive Policy
and Procedures**
for
**Addressing Discrimination,
Sexual Misconduct, and Retaliation**

Updated and Published 8/24/2022



Preparing people to lead extraordinary lives

**USE AND ADAPTATION OF THIS MODEL WITH CITATION TO ATIXA,
IS PERMITTED THROUGH A LIMITED LICENSE TO LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.
ALL OTHER RIGHTS RESERVED. ©2019. ATIXA**

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Article 1: Comprehensive Policy for Discrimination, Sexual Misconduct, and Retaliation at Loyola University of Chicago | 4 |
| I. Rationale for a Comprehensive Policy | 4 |
| II. Applicable Scope and Key Terminology | 4 |
| III. The Office for Equity & Compliance..... | 7 |
| A. Comprehensive Policy Administrators | 7 |
| IV. Title IX and the Comprehensive Policy | 7 |
| A. Title IX Coordinator and Deputy Coordinators..... | 7 |
| V. Illinois Preventing Sexual Violence in Higher Education Act..... | 9 |
| A. Nearest Medical Facilities | 9 |
| B. Local Law Enforcement Contact Information..... | 10 |
| C. Community-Based, State, and National Sexual Assault Crisis Centers and Resources | 10 |
| VI. University Nondiscrimination Policy..... | 10 |
| A. Information Specific to Disability Discrimination and Accommodations | 11 |
| 1. Accommodations for Students with Disabilities | 11 |
| 2. Accommodations for Faculty and Staff Employees with Disabilities | 12 |
| B. Information Specific to Pregnancy, Childbirth, and Related Conditions | 12 |
| 1. Information for Pregnant and Parenting Students..... | 12 |
| 2. Information for Pregnant and Parenting Employees | 12 |
| VII. Jurisdiction..... | 12 |
| VIII. Prohibited Conduct..... | 13 |
| A. Discrimination | 13 |
| 1. Abusive Conduct..... | 14 |
| 2. Discriminatory Harassment..... | 14 |
| 3. Domestic Violence..... | 14 |
| 4. Failure to Accommodate for Disability, or Pregnancy, Childbirth, and Related Conditions | 14 |
| 5. Hazing..... | 14 |
| 6. Other Discriminatory Misconduct | 15 |
| B. Sexual Misconduct..... | 15 |
| 1. Non-Consensual Sexual Penetration | 15 |
| 2. Non-Consensual Sexual Contact..... | 15 |
| 3. Sexual Harassment | 16 |
| 4. Sexual Exploitation..... | 17 |
| 5. Intimate Partner and/or Domestic Violence | 17 |
| 6. Stalking..... | 18 |
| 7. Information Regarding Consent, Force, Coercion, and Incapacitation | 18 |
| C. Retaliation | 19 |
| IX. Reports of Discrimination, Sexual Misconduct, or Other Related Offenses | 20 |
| A. Reporting Options | 20 |
| 1. Anonymous Reporting..... | 21 |
| 2. Responsible Campus Partner Reporting Obligation | 21 |
| B. Preliminary Review: The University’s Initial Response to Reports | 23 |
| 1. Outreach to Affected Parties..... | 23 |
| 2. Supportive Measures | 23 |
| 3. Responsive Interventions: Balancing Individual and Community Interests | 24 |
| C. Good Samaritan and Medical Amnesty Protocol (Students Only) | 26 |
| D. False Reports, Allegations, or Information | 26 |
| X. Formal Complaints..... | 26 |
| A. ERP Complaints..... | 27 |
| B. Grievance Process Complaints | 27 |
| XI. Alternative Resolution Options..... | 27 |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| A. | Mediation | 28 |
| B. | Restorative Justice Conferencing | 28 |
| C. | Directed Discussion | 29 |
| D. | No Contest Resolution..... | 29 |
| E. | Other Negotiated Resolution | 29 |
| XII. | Privacy and Recordkeeping..... | 30 |
| A. | Federal and State Statistical Reporting Obligations | 30 |
| B. | Federal Timely Warning Obligations | 31 |
| XIII. | Revision of the Comprehensive Policy..... | 31 |
| Article 2: Equitable Resolution Procedures | | 32 |
| I. | When the ERP is Applicable | 32 |
| A. | Prohibited Conduct Actionable Under the ERP | 32 |
| B. | Other Misconduct..... | 32 |
| II. | General ERP Information | 32 |
| A. | Evidentiary Standard | 32 |
| B. | Equitable Treatment of Complainants and Respondents | 32 |
| C. | Comprehensive Policy Administrators and the ERP | 33 |
| D. | Timely Resolution of the ERP | 33 |
| E. | ERP Advisors (for Students Only)..... | 34 |
| F. | Accommodation for Disabilities in the ERP | 34 |
| III. | Notice, Dismissal, and Consolidation of ERP Complaints | 34 |
| A. | Notice of Allegations upon Receipt of ERP Complaint | 34 |
| B. | Dismissal of ERP Complaints..... | 35 |
| C. | Consolidation of ERP Complaints | 35 |
| D. | Cross-Claims | 35 |
| IV. | ERP Investigations..... | 35 |
| A. | Assignment of Investigators | 36 |
| B. | Evidentiary Considerations..... | 36 |
| C. | Interviews and Exchanges with Primary Parties..... | 36 |
| D. | Presentation and Interviews of Relevant Witnesses | 37 |
| E. | Multiple-Party Cases | 37 |
| F. | Recording of Interviews..... | 37 |
| G. | Review of Relevant Evidence..... | 37 |
| H. | Acceptance of Responsibility..... | 38 |
| I. | Final Investigation Report and Notice of Findings..... | 38 |
| V. | Administrative Resolution | 38 |
| A. | General Considerations During Administrative Resolution | 38 |
| B. | Administrative Resolution Formats Based on Respondent Classification | 39 |
| 1. | When the Respondent is a Student..... | 39 |
| 2. | When the Respondent is a Staff Employee | 42 |
| 3. | When the Respondent is a Faculty Employee | 43 |
| VI. | Remedies under the ERP | 43 |
| VII. | Monitored Compliance with ERP Sanctions, Remedies, and Responsive Interventions | 44 |
| Article 3. Grievance Process for Title IX Sexual Harassment..... | | 45 |
| I. | When the Grievance Process is Applicable..... | 45 |
| A. | Title IX Sexual Harassment | 45 |
| 1. | Quid Pro Quo Sexual Harassment | 45 |
| 2. | Hostile Environment Sexual Harassment | 45 |
| 3. | Other Forms of Title IX Sexual Harassment..... | 45 |
| B. | Other Misconduct that is Not Title IX Sexual Harassment | 46 |
| II. | General Grievance Process Information | 47 |
| A. | Evidentiary Standard and Burden of Proof..... | 47 |
| B. | Equitable Treatment of Complainants and Respondents | 47 |

| | | |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| C. | Right of Nonparticipation | 47 |
| D. | Comprehensive Policy Administrators and the Grievance Process | 48 |
| E. | Timely Resolution of the Grievance Process | 48 |
| F. | Grievance Process Advisors | 48 |
| G. | Accommodation for Disabilities in the Grievance Process | 49 |
| III. | Notice, Dismissal, and Consolidation of Grievance Process Complaints | 49 |
| A. | Notice of Grievance Process Complaint | 49 |
| B. | Dismissal of Grievance Process Complaint | 50 |
| C. | Consolidation of Grievance Process Complaints | 50 |
| IV. | Availability of Alternative Resolution Options | 50 |
| V. | Investigation of a Grievance Process Complaint | 50 |
| A. | Assignment of Investigators | 51 |
| B. | Gathering of Relevant Evidence | 51 |
| C. | Interviews and Exchanges with Primary Parties | 51 |
| D. | Presentation and Interviews of Relevant Witnesses | 52 |
| E. | Recording of Interviews | 52 |
| F. | Preliminary Inspection and Review and Final Investigation Report | 52 |
| VI. | Grievance Process Hearings | 53 |
| A. | Hearing Format | 53 |
| B. | Cross-Examination by Advisors | 53 |
| C. | Excluded Questions | 54 |
| D. | Concluding the Hearing | 54 |
| E. | Recording of Hearing | 54 |
| VII. | Sanctioning Determination | 54 |
| A. | Sanctioning Student Respondents | 54 |
| B. | Sanctioning Staff Respondents | 55 |
| C. | Sanctioning Faculty Respondents | 55 |
| VIII. | Grievance Process Sanctions and Remedies | 55 |
| A. | Sanctions for Title IX Sexual Harassment | 55 |
| B. | Remedies | 56 |
| IX. | Written Determination | 56 |
| X. | Appeals of the Grievance Process Outcome | 56 |
| A. | Grounds for Appeal | 57 |
| B. | Requesting and Processing Appeals | 57 |
| 1. | Appeals When Respondent is a Student | 57 |
| 2. | Appeals When Respondent is a Non-Unionized Staff Employee | 57 |
| 3. | Appeals When Respondent is a Unionized Staff Employee | 57 |
| 4. | Appeals When Respondent is a Non-Unionized Faculty Employee | 58 |
| 5. | Appeals When Respondent is a Unionized Faculty Employee | 58 |
| C. | Appeal Decisions | 58 |
| XI. | Monitored Compliance with Grievance Process Sanctions, Remedies, and Responsive Interventions | 58 |
| XII. | Grievance Process Recordkeeping | 58 |

Article 1: Comprehensive Policy for Discrimination, Sexual Misconduct, and Retaliation at Loyola University of Chicago

I. Rationale for a Comprehensive Policy

Loyola University of Chicago (“Loyola” or the “University”) is committed to providing an educational and employment environment where the full richness of our diverse community can be explored and celebrated. To this end, the University maintains the highest standards for safety and inclusivity. Such standards are part of a larger ethical imperative rooted in our mission as “Chicago’s Jesuit, Catholic University – a diverse community seeking God in all things and working to expand knowledge in the service of humanity through learning, justice, and faith.”

In maintaining the *Comprehensive Policy and Procedures for Addressing Discrimination, Sexual Misconduct, and Retaliation* (the “Comprehensive Policy”), the University meets or exceeds the requirements of federal and state civil rights laws and regulations to provide for a prompt, fair, and equitable administrative process.

II. Applicable Scope and Key Terminology

The core purpose of the Comprehensive Policy is to consistently and effectively prohibit all forms of discrimination, sexual misconduct, and retaliation across all campuses and stakeholder groups at Loyola. For this reason, the standards contained in the Comprehensive Policy apply to all students, recognized student organizations, faculty and staff employees, guests, and visitors across all campuses and programs of the University within the United States and abroad. Except as otherwise provided herein, for the purposes of the Comprehensive Policy, staff includes all non-faculty employees of the University, including officers and student workers when acting in an employment capacity.

Discrimination, sexual misconduct, and retaliation can take place in many forms, and often occur in overlapping or intersecting ways. Additionally, some specific violations (such as domestic violence and stalking) may be more appropriately categorized as either discriminatory or sexual misconduct, depending on the specific circumstances of the particular alleged incident. For these reasons, the University has chosen to address all such violations under one consistent policy with procedural frameworks appropriate to the unique circumstances of each case.

The following are several key terms that are important to understanding and navigating the Comprehensive Policy:

Administrative resolution is a general term used to describe the various processes by which the University resolves a substantiated formal complaint under the Equitable Resolution Procedures (after a finding of responsibility has been made following investigation and/or admission). Administrative resolution processes may be governed by the [Community Standards](#), [Faculty Handbook](#), collective bargaining agreements, and/or [Employee Staff Handbook](#), depending on the applicable classification of the respondent. Allegations involving student-worker respondents or other respondents who hold dual classifications will be routed to the most appropriate administrative resolution format depending on the individual context of the alleged misconduct, at the discretion of the Executive Director for Equity & Compliance. An **administrative resolution officer** (“ARO”) is a general term to describe trained and qualified individuals who have a role in these processes.

An **affected party** is a member of the University community (student, faculty employee, or staff employee) who reports having experienced (or has been reported by another to have experienced) prohibited conduct under the Comprehensive Policy. Affected parties are eligible to request supportive measures and/or file a formal complaint under either the Equitable Resolution Procedures or Title IX Sexual Harassment Grievance Process (“Grievance Process”), as applicable.

A **complainant** is an affected party who has chosen to file a formal complaint against a respondent or otherwise chosen to participate in the Equitable Resolution Procedures or the Grievance Process.

Comprehensive Policy Administrator (“CPA”) describes an employee of the University with a professional role in the administration of the policies and procedures of the Comprehensive Policy.

Education program or activity includes locations, events, or circumstances over which the University exercises substantial control over both the conduct of a respondent and the context in which the conduct is alleged to have occurred. This also includes any building owned or controlled by a recognized student organization.

Equitable Resolution Procedures (“ERP”) refers to the steps by which the University resolves formal complaints of alleged misconduct under the Comprehensive Policy, excluding allegations that meet the specific definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment.

The **Executive Director for Equity & Compliance (“EDEC”)** is the director of the Office for Equity & Compliance and serves as the University’s Title IX Coordinator. Throughout the Comprehensive Policy, some responsibilities of the EDEC may be delegated to other University personnel as needed to ensure efficient and effective service for all stakeholders.

A **finding** is a determination made at the conclusion of an investigation (ERP) or hearing (Grievance Process) as to whether or not the alleged violation has been substantiated under a preponderance of the evidence standard. A finding of either “responsible” or “not responsible” is assigned to each alleged policy violation individually. In cases involving multiple complainants and/or multiple allegations of the same violation, a respondent may be found “responsible” for multiple violations of the same policy.

A **formal complaint** (or “complaint”) is a physical or electronic document submitted in writing by a complainant or by the EDEC, alleging one or more violations of the Comprehensive Policy by a respondent, and officially requesting that the University intervene and investigate and/or adjudicate the matter under either the ERP or the Grievance Process (or alternative resolution options, if applicable). *ERP complaints* and *Grievance Process complaints* are distinguished as follows:

- **ERP complaints** are formal complaints of any alleged discrimination, sexual misconduct, retaliation, or other related offenses under the Comprehensive Policy, except for allegations that meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment.
- **Grievance Process complaints** are formal complaints of alleged misconduct that meets the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment.

The **Grievance Process for Title IX Sexual Harassment (“Grievance Process”)** is the set of procedures used by the University to address alleged misconduct that meets the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment, as required under applicable Title IX regulations (34 CFR 106.45). The Grievance Process is explained in Article 3 of the Comprehensive Policy.

Heightened risk factors is a term used to describe elements that, if suggested in a report of alleged misconduct, may warrant the University initiating a formal complaint irrespective of the wishes and/or participation of the affected party. Heightened risk factors may include, without limitation, indications of predation, threatened or actual violence, weapons, minors, a pattern of alleged misconduct, and/or a potential threat to the safety of the University community.

Alternative resolution options include non-disciplinary processes such as conflict resolution (mediation, restorative justice), directed discussions, or other negotiated resolution, and constitute one set of procedural options that may be available for the resolution of some formal complaints.

A **preliminary review** is an initial review of a report conducted by the University to assess (a) whether the reported behavior may fall under the Comprehensive Policy, and (b) the level of threat that may be present to the University community.

A **preponderance of the evidence** is the evidentiary standard used at Loyola to determine whether a respondent is responsible for violating the Comprehensive Policy. This standard requires that the totality of the evidence, considered impartially, must indicate that it is more likely than not that the Comprehensive Policy was violated.

Pregnancy, childbirth, and related conditions includes pregnancy, childbirth, termination of pregnancy, lactation, medical conditions related to any of the above (such as gestational diabetes), and recovery from any of the above.

Protected classes are categories of individuals who share an identity such that they qualify for protections against discrimination under the law (and under the Comprehensive Policy). Protected classes at Loyola include race¹, color, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, national or ethnic origin, ancestry, disability, marital status, parental status, military/veteran status, and any other characteristic protected by applicable law.

Recognized student organization means a student organization recognized by the University according to applicable policy. The term “recognized student organization” includes both registered student organizations (“RSOs”) and sponsored student organizations (“SSOs”), as defined by applicable policies in the Division of Student Development.

A **report** is a disclosure or other communication to the Office for Equity & Compliance or to another University official with the authority to institute corrective measures on behalf of the University that directly notifies the University of an allegation of prohibited conduct under the Comprehensive Policy. A report may be made by any individual (including third parties) or may be anonymous, and is distinct from a formal complaint.

A **reporter** is an individual who informs the University of an alleged incident and/or violation of the Comprehensive Policy. The reporter may be the same as the affected party (the person who experienced the alleged misconduct) or may be a third party.

A **respondent** is an individual who has allegedly engaged in prohibited conduct that could constitute a violation of the Comprehensive Policy. For the purposes of reports and ERP complaints only (i.e., not applicable to Grievance Process complaints), a respondent may also be an organization, such as a recognized student organization or a department of the University.

A **responsive intervention** is an action undertaken by the University in response to a report or complaint that is intended to ensure or improve the safety and inclusivity of the University community. Responsive interventions range from referring a matter to be addressed by a supervisor to issuing an emergency removal directive, and are undertaken with balanced consideration for the needs of the individual parties, the broader University community, and the University as an institution.

Sanctions (also known as “assigned outcomes” under the Community Standards applicable to students) are individual consequences assigned to a respondent after a finding of responsibility under either the ERP or the Grievance Process, as applicable.

Student means any person in attendance (in person or online) at Loyola, including its Arrupe College. Students include undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and non-degree-seeking persons.

Title IX sexual harassment refers to sexual harassment or other offenses that meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements under Title IX.

¹ Race includes traits associated with race, including but not limited to hair texture and protective hairstyles such as braids, locs, and twists.

III. The Office for Equity & Compliance

In January 2019, the University created the Office for Equity & Compliance (“OEC”) to centralize and coordinate University-wide compliance with Title IX and other equity-based federal and state laws and regulations. The OEC staff includes the EDEC, who also serves as the Title IX Coordinator, and a team of Equity Investigators, who also serve as Deputy Title IX Coordinators.

Office for Equity & Compliance

Loyola University of Chicago
Granada Center, Suite 403
6439 N. Sheridan Rd.
Chicago, IL 60626
(773) 508-7766 (office)
equity@luc.edu
www.luc.edu/equity

The EDEC acts with independence and authority free from bias or conflicts of interest. The EDEC, with the assistance of the OEC staff, oversees the resolutions of reports and complaints arising under the Comprehensive Policy and ensures that all University representatives who assist with administration of the Comprehensive Policy act with objectivity and impartiality and are assessed with respect to conflicts of interest and/or potential bias.

The work of the OEC is also supported University-wide by several key partners, including the University’s Department of Campus Safety (“Campus Safety”), the Wellness Center, Human Resources, the Office of the Dean of Students (“DOS”), and the Office of the Provost. Notably, the DOS is a key resource for students involved in any matter covered by the Comprehensive Policy, from resourcing affected parties to supporting and advising respondents.

More information about the OEC and other critical campus partners may be found at the OEC website: www.luc.edu/equity.

A. Comprehensive Policy Administrators

The OEC also relies on a pool of trained and qualified Comprehensive Policy Administrators (“CPAs”) who assist with the University’s response to reports and the administration of the ERP and the Grievance Process. CPAs are otherwise employed by the University and serve in such a capacity based on their respective roles. CPAs perform various functions impartially and free from conflicts of interest and bias, at the coordination and direction of the EDEC.

CPAs are trained in compliance with applicable federal and state laws and regulations. This training is designed to ensure the consistent application of the Comprehensive Policy (including the ERP and the Grievance Process) and improve CPAs’ understanding of relevant processes and concepts.

IV. Title IX and the Comprehensive Policy

Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 and its implementing regulations (34 CFR § 106) as administered by the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education (collectively referred to as “Title IX”) explicitly prohibits discrimination based on sex by any institution of higher education that receives federal funds (which includes Loyola). Under Title IX, certain types of sexual harassment, when occurring within the United States and within the University’s education programs and activities, constitute a form of prohibited sex discrimination.

Title IX requires a specific grievance process for formal complaints of Title IX sexual harassment, as distinct from other forms of Title IX sex discrimination and other forms of sexual harassment. To comply with this requirement, the Grievance Process, as well as the specific conditions for the application of the Grievance Process, are provided in Article 3.

A. Title IX Coordinator and Deputy Coordinators

Every educational institution receiving federal financial assistance must designate a “Title IX Coordinator” to carry out the institution’s obligations under Title IX. At Loyola, the EDEC is the Title IX Coordinator, and is assisted in this function by the Deputy Title IX Coordinators listed below.

Any person may report Title IX sex discrimination, including Title IX sexual harassment (whether or not the person reporting is the affected party), via the publicly available [online reporting form](#) (powered by Maxient™; additional information available at www.luc.edu/equity); in person, by mail, by telephone, or by email, using the contact information listed for the Title IX Coordinator (below); or by any other means that results in the Title IX Coordinator receiving the person's verbal or written report. Such a report may be made at any time (including during non-business hours) by using the telephone number or email address, or by mail to the office address, listed for the Title IX Coordinator.

Inquiries about Title IX as implemented at Loyola, or reports or formal complaints of any alleged Title IX violation may be directed internally to:

Title IX Coordinator

Timothy Love, Executive Director for Equity & Compliance
Office for Equity & Compliance
Granada Center 4th Floor, 6439 N. Sheridan Rd., Chicago, IL 60626
office (773) 508-7766
direct (773) 508-3733
tlove@luc.edu

Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Nika Arzoumanian, Equity Investigator
Office for Equity & Compliance
Granada Center 4th Floor, 6439 N. Sheridan Rd., Chicago, IL 60626
office (773) 508-7766
direct (773) 508-3784
narzoumanian@luc.edu

Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Brian Houze, Equity Investigator
Office for Equity & Compliance
Granada Center 4th Floor, 6439 N. Sheridan Rd., Chicago, IL 60626
office (773) 508-7766
direct (773) 508-8694
[bhousse@luc.edu](mailto:bhouze@luc.edu)

Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Jill Santos, Equity Investigator
Office for Equity & Compliance
Granada Center 4th Floor, 6439 N. Sheridan Rd., Chicago, IL 60626
office (773) 508-7766
direct (773) 508-3781
jsantos9@luc.edu

Deputy Title IX Coordinator

Samantha Maher Sheahan, Associate Dean of Students
Office of the Dean of Students
Damen Student Center 3rd Floor, 6511 N. Sheridan Rd., Chicago, IL 60626
office (773) 508-8840
direct (773) 508-3618
smaher1@luc.edu

Inquiries or reports may be made externally to:

Office for Civil Rights (OCR)
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20202-1100
(800) 421-3481

TDD (877) 521-2172

OCR@ed.gov

www.ed.gov/ocr

OCR Chicago Office

U.S. Department of Education

Citigroup Center

500 W. Madison St., Suite 1475, Chicago, IL 60661-4544

(312) 730-1560

OCR.Chicago@ed.gov

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)

Chicago District Office

JCK Federal Building, 230 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, IL 60604

(800) 669-4000

ASL Video Phone: (844) 234-5122

www.eeoc.gov

To raise any concern or conflict of interest regarding the EDEC, or to report any alleged misconduct or discrimination committed by the EDEC, contact the Vice President for Human Resources/Chief Human Resources Officer (“Chief Human Resources Officer”) at (312) 915-6175 or HR-WTC@luc.edu. To raise concerns regarding a potential conflict of interest with or allegation of misconduct by any other administrator involved in the administration of the Comprehensive Policy, please contact the EDEC.

V. Illinois Preventing Sexual Violence in Higher Education Act

As an institution in the state of Illinois, Loyola also complies with the Illinois Preventing Sexual Violence in Higher Education Act (“ILPSVHE Act,” 110 ILCS 155), which provides state-specific requirements responding to sexual misconduct against students at institutions of higher education in Illinois.

The Comprehensive Policy meets or exceeds all compliance requirements for a “comprehensive policy” created and implemented by the University to address student allegations of sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Under the ILPSVHE Act, the following information is also provided for students:

A. Nearest Medical Facilities

If an affected party wishes to report to law enforcement, it is important to preserve any physical evidence when possible. Pursuant to the Illinois Sexual Assault Survivors Emergency Treatment Act, an affected party may have a medical forensic examination and/or medical treatment related to the sexual assault completed in Illinois at no cost to the affected party.

Please note that although medical treatment is available regardless of the time since the incident, an evidence collection kit may be offered only within seven days of an assault, and certain specific medical support may only be available if administered within 72 hours of the incident. The following are medical facilities and/or agencies nearest to each campus where an affected party may ask for a “sexual assault advocate,” support, or other services upon check-in.

- Lake Shore Campus:
Methodist Hospital, 5025 N. Paulina St., Chicago, IL 60640, phone: (773) 271-9040
- Water Tower Campus:
Northwestern Memorial Hospital, 251 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611, phone: (312) 926-2000
- Health Sciences Campus:
West Suburban Medical Center, 3 Erie St., Oak Park, IL 60302, phone: (708) 383-6200
- John Felice Rome Center:
Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli, Largo Agostino Gemelli, 00136 Roma, Italia, phone: +39-06-30151

- Loyola University Retreat and Ecology Center (LUREC):
 - (advocacy) The CARE Center in Crystal Lake, 104 Minnie St. Crystal lake, IL 60014, phone: (815) 671-4004
 - (evidence collection) Emergency Room, 4201 Medical Center Dr. McHenry, IL 60050, phone: (815) 344-5000
- Cuneo Mansion and Gardens:
 - (advocacy) Zacharias Sexual Abuse Center, 4275 Old Grand Ave., Gurnee, IL 60031, phone: (847) 872-7799
 - (medical care) Advocate Condell Medical Center, 801 S Milwaukee Ave, Libertyville, IL 60048, phone: (847) 362-2900

B. Local Law Enforcement Contact Information

- Lake Shore Campus:
 - [Department of Campus Safety](#): 773-508-6039
 - Chicago Police (24th District): 312-744-5907 (6464 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60626)
- Water Tower Campus:
 - [Department of Campus Safety](#): 773-508-6039
 - Chicago Police (18th District): 312-742-5870 (1160 N. Larrabee St., Chicago, IL 60610)
- Health Sciences Campus:
 - Campus Security: 708-216-9077
 - Cook County Sheriff's Police: 708-865-4700 (1401 S. Maybrook Dr., Maywood, IL 60153)
- John Felice Rome Center:
 - Polizia (Police): 113
 - Carabinieri (Military Police): 112
 - Rome Center Emergency: 011.39.06.355881
 - <https://www.luc.edu/rome/resources/parentsandguardians/emergencycontacts/>
- Loyola University Retreat and Ecology Center (LUREC):
 - Woodstock Police Department 24-Hour Non-Emergency: 815-338-2131 (656 Lake Avenue, Woodstock, IL 60098)
- Cuneo Mansion and Gardens:
 - Vernon Hills Police Department Non-Emergency (847) 362-4449 (740 Lakeview Parkway, Vernon Hills, IL 60061)

C. Community-Based, State, and National Sexual Assault Crisis Centers and Resources

- [Greenlight Family Services](#) (confidential counseling): 773-750-7077
- [Resilience](#) (Chicago-based, confidential resource): 312-443-9603
- YWCA Chicago Rape Crisis Hotline:
 - 888-293-2080 in Chicago Metropolitan Area
 - 630-971-3927 in DuPage County
 - 708-748-5672 in the South Suburbs
- Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault (ICASA):
 - [Find a rape crisis center in Illinois](#)
- RAINN National Sexual Assault Hotline: 800-656-HOPE (4673)
 - [online.rainn.org](https://www.rainn.org)
 - [online.rainn.es](https://www.rainn.es) (Spanish language services)

VI. University Nondiscrimination Policy

Loyola adheres to all applicable federal and state civil rights laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination in private institutions of higher education. Loyola does not discriminate against any employee, applicant for employment, student, or applicant for admission on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation,

gender identity or expression, national or ethnic origin, ancestry, disability, marital status, parental status, military/veteran status, or any other characteristic protected by applicable law.²

This Nondiscrimination Policy prohibits discrimination in employment and in providing access to educational opportunities. Therefore, any member of the Loyola community who acts to deny, deprive, or limit the educational or employment benefits or opportunities of any student, employee, guest, or visitor on the basis of their actual or perceived membership in the protected classes listed above is in violation of the Nondiscrimination Policy.

This Nondiscrimination Policy also includes protections for those opposing discrimination or participating in any University resolution process or within the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or other human rights agencies.

If you have questions about this Nondiscrimination Policy, Title IX, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VI”), Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”), or Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (“Section 504”), or if you believe you have been discriminated against based on your membership in a protected class, please contact Tim Love, Executive Director for Equity & Compliance, or another member of the Office for Equity & Compliance, at (773) 508-7766 or equity@luc.edu, and/or submit a report online at www.luc.edu/equity.

A. Information Specific to Disability Discrimination and Accommodations

Loyola is committed to full compliance with applicable sections of the ADA and Section 504, which prohibit discrimination against qualified persons with disabilities, as well as other federal and state laws pertaining to individuals with disabilities. Under the ADA/Section 504 and its amendments, a person has a disability if they have a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities. ADA/Section 504 also protect individuals who have a history or record of a substantially limiting impairment, or who are perceived by others as having such an impairment.

If you have questions about disability discrimination or believe you have been discriminated against based on disability, please contact Tim Love, Executive Director for Equity & Compliance, or another member of the Office for Equity & Compliance, at (773) 508-7766 or equity@luc.edu, and/or you may submit a report online at www.luc.edu/equity.

If you are a student or faculty or staff employee seeking accommodations for a disability, please review the following information.

1. Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Loyola provides qualified students with disabilities the reasonable accommodations and support needed to ensure equal access to the academic programs and activities of the University. All accommodations are made on a case-by-case basis. A student requesting any accommodation should first contact the [Student Accessibility Center](#) (“SAC”), which coordinates services for students with disabilities. The SAC reviews documentation provided by a student and, in consultation with the student, determines which accommodations are appropriate to the student’s particular needs and programs. For information about faculty employees’ obligations to cooperate with the SAC regarding academic accommodations based on students’ disabilities, see the [Faculty Handbook](#).

If, after working with the SAC, a student feels that the University has failed to accommodate them appropriately, a report may be submitted to the OEC.

² It should be noted that while the [Faculty Handbook](#) uses a slightly different phrasing to describe the University Nondiscrimination Policy, the substance of these policies is consistent.

2. Accommodations for Faculty and Staff Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to the ADA, Loyola provides reasonable accommodation(s) to all qualified faculty and staff employees with known disabilities, where their disability affects the performance of their essential job functions, except where doing so would be unduly disruptive or would result in undue hardship.

Any faculty or staff employee with a disability is responsible for requesting an accommodation in writing to Human Resources and providing appropriate documentation. For more information about this process, see [Human Resources' online accommodation notice](#), [Faculty Handbook](#), or collective bargaining agreement, as applicable.

If, after working with Human Resources/the Provost's Office, a faculty or staff employee feels that the University has failed to accommodate them appropriately, a report may be submitted to the OEC.

B. Information Specific to Pregnancy, Childbirth, and Related Conditions

The University is firmly committed to creating a welcoming, accessible, and inclusive environment for pregnant and parenting students and faculty and staff employees. Discrimination against any student or faculty or staff employee based on pregnancy, childbirth, or related conditions is a form of sex discrimination and prohibited under Title IX. Additional information is available at www.luc.edu/equity.

1. Information for Pregnant and Parenting Students

Reasonable assistance for pregnancy, childbirth, and related conditions varies and is provided in response to a student's circumstances. Such assistance may include, but is not limited to: utilization of lactation spaces; breaks during class or work to attend to health, breastfeeding, or lactation needs; extension of time for coursework and rescheduling of tests and examinations; and changes in physical equipment or supplies. Students seeking to request assistance or additional information related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related conditions should submit the [Pregnant & Parenting Assistance Request Form](#), available at www.luc.edu/equity, or contact any staff in either the Office of the Dean of Students or Office for Equity & Compliance.

2. Information for Pregnant and Parenting Employees

Faculty or staff employees seeking to request assistance or additional information related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related conditions should contact Human Resources.

VII. Jurisdiction

The Comprehensive Policy applies to conduct by any current University student or employee (faculty and staff) that takes place on any of Loyola's campuses (in the United States or abroad), within the University's education programs or activities, and/or in any other circumstances (including off-campus and online) when the OEC determines that the conduct affects a University interest.

Regardless of where the conduct occurred and whether the affected party is a member of the University community, the University will review all allegations to determine whether the conduct occurred in the context of its employment or education programs or activities and/or has continued effects therein. University interests may include, but are not limited to:

1. Any action that constitutes a criminal offense as defined by law. This includes, but is not limited to, single or repeat violations of any local, state, or federal law;
2. Any situation where it appears that a respondent may present a danger or threat to the health or safety of oneself or others;
3. Any situation that significantly impinges on the rights, property, or achievements of oneself or others or significantly breaches the peace and/or causes social disorder; and/or

4. Any situation that is detrimental to the educational, professional, or operational interests of the University.

Loyola reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to impose limitations on respondents who are not current students or faculty or staff employees, but who are reported to have engaged in prohibited conduct as defined by the Comprehensive Policy or another University policy. Such a limitation may include but is not limited to barring an individual from all University property and/or events.

Respondents in this category may include, but are not limited to: guests and visitors to the University; individuals who are admitted and/or deposited to Loyola but are not yet in attendance; individuals who attend post-secondary educational institutions other than Loyola while residing in a Loyola residence facility; and former students and others who are not enrolled for a particular term but who have a continuing relationship with or educational interest in Loyola (e.g., students under suspension, on a leave of absence, or participating in an activity in preparation for attendance, such as orientation, Bridge to Loyola, Arrupe Summer Enrichment Program, and residence hall check-in).

If a respondent is unknown or is not a student or employee of the University, the OEC or DOS can still assist the affected party in accessing supportive measures and other resources on or off-campus, including (when applicable) assisting the affected party with reporting to local law enforcement and/or Campus Safety.

Reports from affected parties who are not current students or employees of the University community (including former students and faculty and staff employees) alleging prohibited conduct by a respondent who is a current student or employee will be reviewed by the University to assess whether University interests may still warrant responsive action.

VIII. Prohibited Conduct

The following behaviors conflict with the University's values and expectations for members of the University community (and in some cases, applicable laws), and are therefore prohibited at Loyola. The following policies may be applied to single incidents as well as patterns and/or climate, all of which may be investigated or otherwise addressed in accordance with the Comprehensive Policy. The University also reserves the right to address these behaviors through other University processes when they are of a general nature and/or do not appear to have been motivated by a person's status in a protected class. Except as otherwise required by applicable law, none of these policies are meant to restrict academic freedom as described in the [Faculty Handbook](#) or a collective bargaining agreement, as applicable.

Unless otherwise indicated, all definitions provided below are as applied for the purposes of the Comprehensive Policy, and may differ from definitions used by law enforcement and/or courts for criminal, civil, or other legal purposes, including reporting under the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Police and Campus Crime Statistics Act (see Article 1, subsection XII(A)). Illustrative examples and additional information may be found at www.luc.edu/equity.

A. Discrimination

Discrimination is defined as the adverse or preferential treatment of another wholly or partially because of the person's actual or perceived membership in a protected class (see Article 1, subsection (VI)). Discrimination may also include non-discriminatory behavior that has a disproportionate impact on others because of their membership in a protected class.

When brought to the attention of the University, discrimination will be appropriately addressed and remedied, whether through disciplinary action, other responsive interventions, or both. Sanctions for discrimination and discriminatory misconduct may range from warning through expulsion (for students) or termination of employment (for faculty and staff employees).

In addition to the definition of discrimination *per se* provided above, the following behaviors³ are also prohibited as forms of discrimination when the misconduct or its resulting harm is based on or related to the affected party's actual or perceived membership in a protected class:

1. *Abusive Conduct*

Abusive conduct is defined as any intentional conduct that inflicts or attempts to inflict bodily harm or severe emotional harm upon any person, any reckless action that could result in bodily harm, and/or any action that would reasonably cause another to be fearful that their health or safety is in immediate danger.

2. *Discriminatory Harassment*

Discriminatory harassment is defined as unwelcome and objectively offensive conduct that abuses, mocks, intimidates, bullies, diminishes, or disparages another person or persons because of their actual or perceived membership in a protected class, and that may contribute to a hostile education, work, or living environment. Discriminatory harassment may, but need not, include the use of slurs, epithets, or derogatory terms. Unwelcomeness and objective offensiveness are evaluated based on the totality of the circumstances from the perspective of a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances as the affected party.

A hostile environment is created when discriminatory harassment is:

- severe or persistent or pervasive; and
- objectively offensive, such that it
- unreasonably interferes with, denies, or limits an individual's or group's ability to participate in or benefit from the University's educational, employment, residential, or social program.

Loyola may remedy any form of discriminatory harassment when substantiated, whether or not the behavior rises to the level of creating a hostile environment.

3. *Domestic Violence*

Domestic violence is usually a form of gender-based misconduct, and is therefore primarily addressed in *Section VII.B. Sexual Misconduct*. However, in some circumstances, such violence may be based on some protected status other than sex, such as violence between two roommates that is motivated by racial or other discrimination.

4. *Failure to Accommodate for Disability, or Pregnancy, Childbirth, and Related Conditions*

Loyola is committed to making reasonable accommodations for qualified individuals with disabilities in compliance with applicable University policies and state and federal disability laws. Similarly, Loyola is committed to providing reasonable assistance for individuals related to pregnancy, childbirth, and related conditions in compliance with applicable University policies and state and federal laws.

Any individual who believes they have not been accommodated as required by University policies and/or by law may report the matter to the OEC for investigation.

5. *Hazing*

Hazing is defined as actions or activities often associated with initiation or group associations which inflict or attempt to cause mental or physical harm or anxieties; or which demean, degrade, or disgrace any person regardless of location, intent, or consent of participants.

³ For students, each of these policies is explained in further detail in the [Community Standards](#).

6. Other Discriminatory Misconduct

Violation of any other University policy may constitute other discriminatory misconduct when the violation is motivated by the affected party's actual or perceived membership in a protected class.

B. Sexual Misconduct

Consistent with Loyola's mission and identity, the University maintains the highest standards for respectful sexual interactions between consenting individuals. Although Illinois law defines various violent and/or non-consensual sexual acts as crimes⁴, for the purposes of the Comprehensive Policy, Loyola applies its own definitions and standards for the various ways in which sexual and/or gender-based misconduct are prohibited. When allegations of sexual misconduct meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment, the requirements for Grievance Process complaints and the Grievance Process will apply (see Article 1, subsection X(A) and Article 3).

Certain forms of sexual misconduct are among the most harmful violations that any individual can undertake against the safety and dignity of our University community; the University therefore reserves the right to impose any level of sanction, up to and including suspension or expulsion/termination, for any sexual violation based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case.

Acts of sexual misconduct may be committed by any person upon any other person, regardless of the sex, sexual orientation, and/or gender identity or expression of those involved. Specific violations include:

1. Non-Consensual Sexual Penetration

Non-consensual sexual penetration is defined as:

- any sexual penetration or attempted penetration,
- however slight,
- with any body part or object
- by a person upon another person
- that is without consent and/or by force.

Sexual penetration includes vaginal or anal penetration or oral copulation (genital to mouth contact) no matter how slight the penetration.

2. Non-Consensual Sexual Contact

Non-consensual sexual contact is defined as:

- any intentional sexual touching,
- however slight,
- with any body part or object
- by a person upon another person
- that is without consent and/or by force.

⁴ In Illinois, criminal sexual assault is defined as follows: "A person commits criminal sexual assault if that person commits an act of sexual penetration and (a) uses force or threat of force; (b) knows that the victim is unable to understand the nature of the act or is unable to give knowing consent; (c) is a family member of the victim, and the victim is under 18 years of age; or (d) is 17 years of age or over and holds a position of trust, authority, or supervision in relation to the victim, and the victim is at least 13 years of age but under 18 years of age" (720 ILCS 5/11-1.20). This definition is applicable to criminal prosecutions for criminal sexual assault in Illinois; however, this definition differs from the language used by Loyola to address violations of the Comprehensive Policy.

Sexual touching includes intentional contact with the breasts, groin, buttocks, or genitals; or touching another with any of these body parts; or making someone touch another or themselves with or on any of these body parts; or any other bodily contact made in a sexual manner.

3. Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is broadly defined⁵ as:

- unwelcome and objectively offensive,
- sexual,
- verbal, written, online, and/or physical conduct.⁶

Sexual harassment occurs without regard to the respondent's intent and is based on the totality of the circumstances. Loyola may remedy any form of sexual harassment when substantiated, whether or not the behavior constitutes *quid pro quo* or hostile environment sexual harassment.

a. Quid Pro Quo Sexual Harassment

Quid pro quo sexual harassment is defined as:

- unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature,
- by a person having power or authority over another,
- when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or academic status or participation in other University programs or activities, or
- when submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or academic decisions adversely affecting the individual.

b. Hostile Environment Sexual Harassment

A hostile environment is created when sexual harassment is

- severe or persistent or pervasive; and
- objectively offensive, such that it
- unreasonably interferes with, denies, or limits an individual's or group's ability to participate in or benefit from the University's educational, employment, residential, or social program.

Unwelcomeness and objective offensiveness are evaluated based on the totality of the circumstances from the perspective of a reasonable person in the same or similar circumstances. Other forms of sexual misconduct (as defined in Article 1, subsection VIII(B)), when substantiated, may be considered in determining whether the sexual misconduct also contributed to a hostile environment.

⁵ In addition to federal and state prohibitions, sexual harassment is also illegal in Chicago. Chicago Municipal Code 6-010-040 defines sexual harassment as "any (i) unwelcome sexual advances or unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature or (ii) requests for sexual favors or conduct of a sexual nature when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, or (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for any employment decision affecting the individual, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive working environment; or (iii) sexual misconduct, which means any behavior of a sexual nature which also involves coercion, abuse of authority, or misuse of an individual's employment position." All conduct falling under this definition is also prohibited by Loyola and covered under the Comprehensive Policy.

⁶ Harassment based on sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression are also prohibited as forms of discriminatory harassment, in compliance with Title VII (see Article 1, subsection VIII(A)(2)).

c. Title IX Sexual Harassment

In certain circumstances specifically defined under Title IX, some allegations of sexual harassment (including some instances of *quid pro quo* sexual harassment, hostile environment sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, as defined by law) may constitute Title IX sexual harassment.⁷

For the purpose of addressing formal complaints of Title IX sexual harassment, the University must comply with a specific, prescribed administrative process, which is provided for in the Comprehensive Policy as the Grievance Process (see Article 3). As described in Article 1, subsection X(B), the Grievance Process will be followed for all formal complaints of Title IX sexual harassment.

All other reports and formal complaints of “non-Title IX” sexual harassment may be addressed according to the ERP (see Article 2).

4. Sexual Exploitation

Sexual exploitation refers to behavior wherein a person takes non-consensual or harmful sexual advantage of another and the behavior does not otherwise fall within the definitions of non-consensual sexual penetration, non-consensual sexual contact, or sexual harassment. Examples of sexual exploitation include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Sexual voyeurism (such as watching a person undressing, using the bathroom, or engaging in sexual acts without the consent of all persons observed).
- Taking pictures or video or audio recording another in a sexual act or in other private activity without the consent of all involved, or exceeding the boundaries of consent (such as disseminating otherwise consensual sexual pictures without the photographed person’s consent).
- Prostitution of oneself or others.
- Engaging in sexual activity with another person while knowingly infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or a sexually transmitted disease or infection without first disclosing the infection.
- Administering alcohol or drugs (such as “date rape” drugs) to another person without the other person’s knowledge or consent and with the intent of taking sexual advantage of them.
- Exposing one’s genitals or breasts (“flashing”) in non-consensual circumstances.

5. Intimate Partner and/or Domestic Violence

Intimate partner and/or domestic violence (“IP/DV”) is defined as any act of violence or threatened act of violence against someone in a past or present intimate, familial, or household relationship, including violence that occurs between roommates. IP/DV may include, but is not limited to, physical violence, emotional abuse, economic abuse, property damage, and other forms of sexual violence. IP/DV may consist of one act of misconduct or an ongoing pattern of behavior.⁸

⁷ Source: 34 CFR Part 106.30(a).

⁸ In Illinois, a person commits domestic battery if the person knowingly and without justification “causes bodily harm to any family or household member [or] makes physical contact of an insulting or provoking nature with any family or household member.” (720 ILCS 5/11-1.70). This definition is applicable to criminal prosecutions and Clery reporting in Illinois; however, it differs from the language used by Loyola to address violations of the Comprehensive Policy.

6. Stalking

Stalking⁹ is defined as an unwanted course of conduct (two or more acts) directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear for their safety or the safety of others or to suffer substantial emotional distress. Though stalking is usually considered a gender-based offense, stalking is prohibited even when the affected party was targeted because of membership in a different protected class or was targeted for some other reason.

In instances where stalking is found not to have been motivated by an individual's membership in a protected class, the report may be referred elsewhere to be investigated and/or adjudicated under other University policies (such as the [Community Standards](#) for student respondents) as applicable.

7. Information Regarding Consent, Force, Coercion, and Incapacitation

The following concepts are integral to understanding the Comprehensive Policy.

a. Consent

Consent is freely given, mutually understandable permission to engage in a specific sexual activity.¹⁰ Since individuals may experience the same interaction in different ways, it is the responsibility of each party to make certain that the other has consented before engaging in the activity. For consent to be valid, there must be a clear expression in words or actions that the other individual consents to that specific sexual conduct. Neither silence nor the absence of resistance convey consent. Consent also cannot be gained by force or coercion, and an individual who is incapacitated cannot give consent.

Whether or not consent was communicated is based on the totality of the circumstances, including the context in which the sexual activity occurred and (if applicable), how the parties may have communicated consent in the past. However, past consent for sexual activity does not automatically convey current consent for sexual activity. Similarly, consent to some sexual activity (such as kissing or fondling) cannot be presumed to extend consent for other sexual activity (such as intercourse). The existence of a current or previous dating relationship also does not establish or convey consent.

Consent can be withdrawn at any time, and once the withdrawal of consent has been clearly communicated, the sexual activity must cease immediately.

b. Force

Force is the use or threat of physical violence and/or imposing on someone physically to gain sexual access. Sexual activity that is forced is by definition non-consensual.

⁹ In Illinois, "A person commits stalking when he or she knowingly engages in a course of conduct directed at a specific person, and he or she knows or should know that this course of conduct would cause a reasonable person to: (1) fear for his or her safety or the safety of a third person; or (2) suffer other emotional distress." (720 ILCS 12-7.3). This definition is applicable to criminal prosecutions and Clery reporting in Illinois; however, it differs from the language used by Loyola to address violations of the Comprehensive Policy.

¹⁰ In Illinois, consent is defined as follows: "a freely given agreement to the act of sexual penetration or sexual conduct in question. Lack of verbal or physical resistance or submission by the victim resulting from the use of force or threat of force by the accused shall not constitute consent. The manner of dress of the victim at the time of the offense shall not constitute consent." Additionally, a "person who initially consents to sexual penetration or sexual conduct is not deemed to have consented to any sexual penetration or sexual conduct that occurs after he or she withdraws consent during the course of that sexual penetration or sexual conduct" (720 ILCS 5/11-1.70). This definition is applicable to criminal prosecutions in Illinois; however, this definition differs from the language used by Loyola to address violations of the Comprehensive Policy.

c. Coercion

Coercion is the use of pressure, intimidation, or threats to gain sexual access. Coercive behavior differs from seductive or sexually inviting behavior or the negotiation of boundaries/desires. When a person communicates that they do not want sex, that they want to stop, or that they do not want to go past a certain point of sexual interaction, pressuring, intimidating, or threatening that person to overcome their resistance can constitute coercion.

d. Incapacitation

Incapacitation is defined as a state in which an individual cannot fully understand or comprehend the nature or context of their decisions and/or actions. An incapacitated person cannot, by definition, consent to sexual activity because they cannot understand or appreciate the “who, what, when, where, why, or how” of the sexual activity in question. Incapacitation may result from a person consuming a large amount of alcohol or other drugs, having a mental disability, being asleep or passed out, or being involuntarily physically restrained. Incapacitation is a state beyond intoxication.

A person cannot consent to sexual activity if they are incapacitated. An individual who engages in sexual activity when that individual knows or reasonably should know that the other person is physically or mentally incapacitated has violated the Comprehensive Policy. The intoxication of a respondent, such that the respondent may not have realized the incapacity of an affected party, does not excuse such a violation.

Under Illinois law¹¹, a minor (meaning a person under 17 years old) does not have the capacity to consent to sexual activity under any circumstances. This means that any sexual activity with a person under 17 is both a crime and a violation of the Comprehensive Policy, even if the minor wanted to engage in the activity.

C. Retaliation

Retaliation is defined as any adverse action taken against a person because of their participation in a protected activity, as defined below.

“Adverse action” includes but is not limited to: any action that would keep an individual from reporting discrimination, harassment or retaliation; shunning and avoiding an individual who reports discrimination, harassment or retaliation; express or implied threats or intimidation intended to prevent an individual from reporting discrimination, harassment or retaliation; and denying employment benefits because a faculty or staff employee reported discrimination, harassment or retaliation or participated in the reporting and investigation process described in the Comprehensive Policy.

Protected activities include submitting a report or filing a complaint under the Comprehensive Policy under one’s own or another’s behalf; participating in or providing information related to an internal or agency investigation of alleged discrimination, sexual misconduct, or retaliation; exercising one’s right to an accommodation for disability or pregnancy; opposing a practice believed reasonably and in good faith to be discriminatory or harassing; or otherwise exercising one’s rights under the Comprehensive Policy.

Retaliation is a serious violation¹²; acts of alleged retaliation should be reported immediately to the OEC and will be promptly addressed. Supportive measures may also be available to proactively protect individuals who fear that they may be subjected to retaliation for reporting, filing a formal complaint, or otherwise participating in an investigative process under the Comprehensive Policy.

¹¹ In Illinois, a person commits criminal sexual abuse (or other related crime) who, “*commits an act of sexual penetration or sexual conduct with a victim who was...under 17 years of age...*” (720 ILCS 5/11-1.50). This definition is applicable to criminal prosecutions in Illinois; however, this definition differs from the language used by Loyola to address violations of the Comprehensive Policy.

¹² Pursuant to Chicago Municipal Code 2-160-040, retaliation for reporting sexual harassment is illegal in Chicago.

Reports of retaliation that are not governed by the Comprehensive Policy (e.g., retaliation for reporting fraud or other employee misconduct) may be referred elsewhere to be addressed under other applicable University policies and procedures.

IX. Reports of Discrimination, Sexual Misconduct, or Other Related Offenses

Loyola encourages anyone who experiences misconduct under the Comprehensive Policy to report the incident to the University, so that the University may respond promptly and equitably. For the purposes of the Comprehensive Policy, **reports** are distinguished from **formal complaints**, which are addressed separately in Article 1, subsection X.

The University recognizes the privacy and sensitivity of reports, and only shares information internally on a need-to-know basis when necessary to respond effectively to a report. The University also understands that for various reasons an affected party may prefer to report anonymously or to share only limited information. To ensure that accurate information and resources are provided in a timely and consistent manner, the following policies apply University-wide.

A. Reporting Options

Any individual may report all forms of discrimination, sexual misconduct, and/or retaliation using any of the following methods. There is no time limitation on reporting allegations. However, if the respondent is no longer subject to the University's jurisdiction or if substantial time has passed since the underlying incident occurred, the University's ability to investigate, substantiate alleged violations, take disciplinary action, provide remedies, or otherwise respond to the allegations may be limited.

1. **(PREFERRED OPTION)** Report concerns directly to the OEC using the publicly available [online reporting form](#) (powered by Maxient™) available at www.luc.edu/equity. Online reporting is available year-round, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week (including University holidays).
2. Report to the OEC via email at equity@luc.edu or by emailing the Title IX Coordinator or any Deputy Title IX Coordinator at the contact information provided in Article 1, subsection III.
3. Report to the OEC via phone, in person, or by postal mail using the following directory information for the office, located at Loyola's Lake Shore Campus:
Loyola University of Chicago
Office for Equity & Compliance
Granada Center, Suite 403
Chicago, IL 60626
(773) 508-7766
The OEC office is open year-round, Monday through Friday, from 8:30 AM – 5:00 PM CST (except for University holidays).
4. *(For concerns about a student only)* Report online or in person to the [Center for Student Assistance and Advocacy](#), under the [Office of the Dean of Students](#). The Office of the Dean of Students will in turn notify the OEC.
5. *(For concerns about a faculty or staff employee only)* Report in person, by phone, or electronically to the [Department of Human Resources](#). Human Resources will in turn notify the OEC.

All reports are acted upon promptly, and every effort is made by the University to preserve the privacy of reports. For more information about privacy, see Article 1, subsection XII.

If the alleged misconduct is criminal in nature, any member of the community, including guests and visitors, may also contact Campus Safety and/or local police to make a report. Campus Safety will inform the OEC when a violation of the Comprehensive Policy is reported to them directly or from an outside source.

1. Anonymous Reporting

Any individual may report an incident anonymously using the [online reporting form](#) (powered by Maxient™) posted at www.luc.edu/equity. Depending on the nature of the anonymous report and the information provided, anonymous reports may still prompt the EDEC to file a formal complaint and investigate according to the ERP or the Grievance Process. However, it should be noted that the University's ability to offer and/or provide supportive measures, investigate the alleged incident(s), impose sanctions, provide appropriate remedies, and otherwise respond to a report is limited in cases where no affected party or complainant is identified.

2. Responsible Campus Partner Reporting Obligation

With very limited exceptions (see subsections (a), (b), and (c), below), **all Loyola faculty and staff employees must report any known, disclosed, alleged, or otherwise reported (formally or informally) incidents of sexual misconduct** that satisfy any of the following criteria:

- Sexual misconduct **against any individual who is currently a minor**¹³ by any individual
- Sexual misconduct **against any individual who is or was a student at the time of the incident**
- Sexual misconduct **by any individual who is or was a student or employee (faculty or staff) at the time of the incident**

Faculty and staff employees and others with such a duty are referred to as “responsible campus partners,” and are to report such incidents within 24 hours of becoming aware of the incident. Students (including student workers and graduate assistants) are excluded from the responsible campus partner reporting obligation at all times and regardless of whether the student is acting in an employment or student capacity.

In order not to betray the trust of any student or other affected party, responsible campus partners should be forthright and transparent about this obligation at all times. Additionally, responsible campus partners should maintain strict privacy with respect to student disclosures and reports; the OEC will notify individuals with a legitimate business need to know, as necessary.

Reporters and/or affected parties may therefore want to consider carefully whether they share personally identifiable details with responsible campus partners, as responsible campus partners must promptly share all details of such reports they receive – including the identities of all known parties – preferably via the [online reporting form](#) (powered by Maxient™) available at www.luc.edu/equity.

Failure of a responsible campus partner, as described in this section, to report an incident of sexual misconduct of which they are aware is a violation of the Comprehensive Policy and may subject the responsible campus partner to disciplinary action.

Note that this obligation is for reports and disclosures of sexual misconduct only, and except as applied to supervisors/managers (see “Obligation for Supervisors/Managers to Report Discrimination and Retaliation” below), does not apply to reports of discrimination or retaliation. However, all responsible campus partners are strongly encouraged to report such incidents as well, to ensure that appropriate resources and support may be provided to affected parties.

a. Exception for Select Designated Employees

At Loyola, students wishing to speak to a member of the University about an experience of sexual misconduct without initiating an OEC report should contact the Sexual Assault Advocates (“Advocates”) of the Wellness Center. Advocates are the only University employees who are designated as “confidential advisors” under the ILPSVHE Act (110 ILCS 155, Section 20), and as such, Advocates can help students access available supports and resources in the University and/or in the local community without triggering a duty to have the matter reported to

¹³ For purposes of the Comprehensive Policy, “minor” means any student under 18 years of age and any non-student guests or visitors under 18 years of age at any University-sponsored or affiliated program – including camps, community programs, and special events. All employees of Loyola are mandatory reporters of child abuse and neglect under Illinois’ Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act (325 ILCS 5, Section 4).

the OEC. Advocates can be contacted free of charge through the [Advocacy Services at the Wellness Center](#) or by calling the Advocacy Hotline at 773-494-3810 during the extended business hours posted online.

In addition, the following categories of employee are also exempt from the reporting obligations of responsible campus partners in certain situations, **only when the employee is acting in the professional capacity indicated**, and subject to the limitations below:

- Licensed professional counselors and staff
- Health service providers and staff
- Catholic priests (only when offering the Sacrament of Reconciliation/“confession”) and other pastoral counselors¹⁴

Students and employees seeking confidential services off-campus may also want to consult with local community resources, such as:

- Licensed professional counselors
- Local rape crisis counselors, such as [Resilience](#) (888-293-2080) in Chicagoland
- Some local or state assistance agencies
- [Perspectives, Loyola’s Employee Assistance Program](#) (for employees and some graduate students)

It should be noted that even the above-listed individuals may have an obligation to report matters to the University, law enforcement, or others, in cases where either (a) the failure to disclose would result in a clear, imminent risk of serious physical injury to or death of any person, (b) the matter involved the alleged abuse of a minor, or (c) disclosure is otherwise required by law. Additionally, these individuals may still be required to submit anonymous statistical information to the OEC for Clery Act purposes unless they believe it would be harmful to their client, patient, or parishioner.

b. Exception for Safe Haven Programs

Programming around sexual assault and harassment, intimate partner and/or domestic violence, and stalking is an important educational tool. At times, it may be appropriate or reasonable to expect that students would disclose personal experiences with these topics during these programs. “Safe Haven” events are events where, even if one or more responsible campus partners are present, a personal disclosure or allegation of sexual misconduct would not trigger an obligation to report the matter to the OEC. Safe Haven designation must be pre-approved by the EDEC, and several elements must be in place before the event will be designated a Safe Haven event. These requirements include:

- A trained Advocate must be present for the entirety of the program
- Advertisements must label the program as a Safe Haven event
- Information about how to report sexual misconduct to the OEC must be provided

When planning to host or facilitate a Safe Haven event (or any educational program about sexual misconduct), planners are encouraged to contact the Wellness Center or OEC to receive information about best practices. To request a trained Advocate to be present at a proposed event, please contact the [Advocacy Coordinator in the Wellness Center](#).

c. Exception for IRB-Approved Research

Loyola provides a narrow exemption to its responsible campus partner reporting obligation for research activities that have been approved by the Institutional Review Board (“IRB”). The University will exempt a faculty member who may otherwise be a responsible campus partner from the reporting obligation when acting in a researcher

¹⁴ “Pastoral counselor” here refers to a person who is associated with a religious order or denomination, is recognized by that religious order or denomination as someone who provides confidential counseling, and is functioning within the scope of that recognition as a pastoral counselor. For assistance identifying a pastoral counselor from a non-Catholic faith tradition, contact the [Department of Campus Ministry](#), at 773-508-2200.

role. This exemption reflects the fact that student participants in research studies would expect confidentiality, which is fundamental to conducting ethical research with human participants.

Student participants in research studies will be informed that relevant disclosures in IRB-approved research will not be shared with the University and do not constitute notice to the University of an allegation or report of sexual misconduct. Applicable disclosures made to researchers in all other settings (e.g., during office hours, academic advising, classroom discussions, informal discussions, or classroom assignments) must still be reported to the OEC. For further information about the limitations of this exemption, see the IRB website: <https://www.luc.edu/irb/>.

d. Obligation for Supervisors/Managers to Report Discrimination and Retaliation

To the extent required by law, faculty and staff employees who hold supervisory or managerial responsibilities have an obligation to report any known, disclosed, alleged or otherwise reported (formally or informally) incidents of discrimination or retaliation against or by a current Loyola student or faculty or staff employee.

B. Preliminary Review: The University's Initial Response to Reports

The OEC conducts a timely and impartial preliminary review upon receipt of all incoming reports. The purpose of the preliminary review is three-fold: (a) to assess the potential applicability of the Comprehensive Policy or other University policies to the reported incident; (b) to ensure that any affected party receives timely and accurate information about their rights and options; and (c) to determine how to most appropriately and efficiently respond to a reported incident.

1. Outreach to Affected Parties

Immediately upon electronic submission of a report by any individual (whether reported by the affected party or a third party reporter) using the [online reporting form](#) (powered by Maxient™), the reporter is automatically directed to concise information, written in plain language, concerning the rights and resources available to affected parties.¹⁵ These resources are also publicly available on the OEC website, at www.luc.edu/equity.

Unless a report is anonymous, upon receiving the report, a representative of the OEC (or DOS for students) will contact the affected party and/or third party reporter to communicate the availability of supportive measures and describe the available rights and processes that may be applicable to the reported circumstances. The affected party will be invited to meet with a representative of the OEC (and/or DOS, for students) to consider the affected party's wishes with respect to supportive measures, responsive interventions, and any formal complaint, and to answer any questions concerning the University's applicable policies or procedures. Affected parties will be informed that supportive measures are available regardless of whether or not they choose to file a formal complaint.

2. Supportive Measures

When applicable, Loyola will offer and/or implement appropriate and reasonably available supportive measures for reporters, affected parties, complainants, respondents, and/or witnesses in response to a report or complaint of alleged discrimination, sexual misconduct, or other related offenses.

Supportive measures are non-disciplinary, and are designed to restore or preserve equal access to the University's education program or activity without unreasonably burdening other parties, including measures designed to protect the safety of all parties or the University's educational environment, or deter prohibited conduct. The University treats supportive measures as private, provided that privacy does not impair the University's ability to implement the supportive measures. Supportive measures are available independently of whether a formal complaint is filed by the affected party or the EDEC, and are provided at no cost to parties.

Supportive measures may include, but are not limited to:

¹⁵ Consistent with the University's obligations under the ILPSVHE Act to provide such information to students within 12 hours of receiving an electronic report of sexual misconduct.

- Referral to counseling, medical, advocacy, and/or other health services
- Referral to the Employee Assistance Program (for faculty and staff employees)
- Mutual restrictions on contact between parties (see No Contact Directives, below)
- Advocating to faculty for adjustments to academic deadlines, course schedules, etc.
- Student financial aid counseling
- Education to the community or community subgroup
- Altering campus housing situation
- Altering work locations or arrangements for faculty or staff employees or student workers
- Safety planning
- Providing transportation/parking assistance
- Referral for academic support
- Referral for visa or immigration assistance

a. No Contact Directives

Upon receipt of a report or complaint of alleged violation of the Comprehensive Policy, the EDEC may implement mutually applicable restrictions preventing contact of any kind between two or more parties. Such a measure, referred to as a No Contact Directive (“NCD”) is non-disciplinary in nature and does not suggest any presumption of responsibility for the alleged violation(s). NCDs may be implemented at the initiative of the EDEC or at the request of a complainant, respondent, or other relevant individual, when warranted. In all cases in which a NCD is implemented, the relevant parties will be promptly informed in writing of the conditions, duration, and applicable parameters of the restriction.

Allegations that an individual has violated the terms of a NCD will be reviewed based on the totality of the circumstances. Alleged violations by students may be referred to the OSCCR for expedited adjudication under the Community Standards as a Category B “Failure to Comply” violation (201(8)). Alleged violations by faculty or staff employees may be referred to Human Resources or the Office of the Provost.

If the alleged violation is substantiated, the violating party may be subject to a range of outcomes, including additional restrictions, disciplinary action, or other responsive interventions.

3. Responsive Interventions: Balancing Individual and Community Interests

As part of a preliminary review or at the conclusion of an administrative resolution process, and independent of any findings and/or sanctions (if applicable), the OEC may recommend or mandate non-disciplinary responsive interventions to preserve the safety and inclusivity of the University community. Responsive interventions are undertaken with balanced consideration for the needs of the individual parties, the broader University community, and the University as an institution.

In determining how to respond most appropriately and effectively to a report or complaint, the OEC may consider a broad range of information, including but not limited to the information provided in the report, other relevant documentation or evidence (such as law enforcement or arrest records), the presence or absence of heightened risk factors (as defined in Article 1, subsection II), and the availability of various resources and services throughout the University (such as conflict resolution services or other adjudicative processes).

Responsive interventions may apply to the parties or other individuals specifically and/or the campus community broadly. Examples of responsive interventions may include, but are not limited to:

- Referral of a matter to a supervising authority or other University resource (such as the Office of the Dean of Students, Human Resources, or the Office of the Provost)
- Implementation or extension of non-disciplinary, mutually applicable contact limitations (No Contact Directives) between parties
- Implementation or extension of temporary limitations on University activities and/or access (see below)
- Mandated individual, group, or community training or education
- Administration of climate surveys or other assessments
- Review and/or revision of other University policies or procedures
- Emergency removal (see below)

The University will maintain the privacy of any responsive interventions, provided privacy does not impair the University's ability to implement the interventions.

If a reporting or affected party does not respond to the University's outreach, declines University assistance or intervention, wishes to receive information or supportive measures only, or otherwise declines to file a formal complaint, then the OEC may pursue an appropriate responsive intervention on its own or may close the matter without further action.

If the EDEC determines that the alleged behavior falls outside the scope of the Comprehensive Policy or would otherwise more appropriately be addressed by another University department (such as Human Resources or the Office of Student Conduct & Conflict Resolution), the report may be referred to the other department to be addressed.

a. Limitations on University Activities and/or Access ("LUAA")

The University may place interim limits or restrictions on a student, recognized student organization, or faculty or staff employee when, in the judgment of the EDEC and considering the totality of the circumstances, such a measure will help de-escalate a conflict and/or preserve the safety and inclusivity of the University community. Such interim limits or restrictions are communicated to parties through an instrument known as a Limitation on University Activities or Access ("LUAA").

As a condition of a LUAA, a student, student organization, or faculty or staff employee may have limited or no access to University facilities or activities, including but not limited to the following: University housing; University campuses (or parts of campuses); specific facilities or information systems of the University; and/or University academic offerings, social activities, programs, or events. The University will determine the parameters of a LUAA on an individualized, case-by-case basis.

Violation of a LUAA issued under the Comprehensive Policy may be grounds for additional informal or formal intervention, including disciplinary action.

Additionally, the University reserves the right to place interim limits or restrictions on a faculty or staff employee, or place a faculty or staff employee on paid or unpaid administrative leave.

b. Emergency Removals

The University may remove a student from the University on an emergency basis when, in the judgment of the EDEC and following an individualized safety and risk analysis, an immediate threat to the physical health or safety of any student or other individual arises from allegations of misconduct under the Comprehensive Policy.

Students who are removed on an emergency basis may not access any University facility or education program or activity, may not attend class or participate in coursework, and must obtain approval before visiting campus to attend to any University business.

When an emergency removal directive is issued, the restricted student will be promptly notified and provided the opportunity to request an administrative review of the decision. When requested by an undergraduate student, the review will be conducted by the Vice President for Student Development (or designee); when requested by a graduate student, the review will be conducted by the Vice Provost for Graduate Education (or designee). A review of an emergency removal is not a hearing or investigation regarding the merits of any underlying allegation(s); rather it is an administrative review of the emergency removal decision alone, to determine whether the removal is appropriate under the circumstances. The University may re-evaluate an emergency removal decision at any time to consider its continued necessity.

Violation of an emergency removal directive issued under the Comprehensive Policy may be grounds for additional informal or formal intervention, including disciplinary action.

C. Good Samaritan and Medical Amnesty Protocol (Students Only)

Loyola encourages students to report all incidents of discrimination, sexual misconduct, and retaliation. Sometimes, students in particular may be hesitant to report such matters to University officials or participate in resolution processes because they fear that they themselves may become subject to disciplinary action for their own misconduct, such as an underage student who was drinking alcohol when they were sexually assaulted. To encourage reporting and alleviate such barriers, Loyola maintains the *Good Samaritan and Medical Amnesty Protocol*, which offers protections against some disciplinary action for certain students who come forward to report or otherwise assist with crises involving sexual misconduct and other specific circumstances. More information about the Good Samaritan and Medical Amnesty Protocol can be found in the [Community Standards](#).

D. False Reports, Allegations, or Information

Deliberately submitting a false report, filing a false complaint, or intentionally providing materially false information in bad faith by any affected party, complainant, witness, or respondent in relation to the policies and procedures of the Comprehensive Policy are serious offenses and may subject the offender to disciplinary action. Such offenses are distinct from erroneous and/or inaccurate allegations or information made or provided in good faith.

Disciplining an individual under any applicable University policy (such as the Community Standards, for students) for making a materially false statement in bad faith in the course of a proceeding under the Comprehensive Policy does not constitute retaliation by the University. However, a determination of responsibility, alone, is not sufficient to conclude that any party made a materially false statement in bad faith.

X. Formal Complaints

Affected parties may be satisfied with receiving resources and supportive measures provided upon the University's response to a report, and may not intend or desire to pursue further intervention facilitated by the University. However, in cases where an affected party intends to initiate the University's intervention to investigate, adjudicate, or otherwise resolve an incident of alleged misconduct, the affected party must file a formal complaint, and is thereafter referred to as a "complainant." A formal complaint may be initiated for any alleged conduct that, if supported by evidence, would constitute a violation of the Comprehensive Policy.

Formal complaints allege misconduct by one or more specifically identified respondents (i.e., an individual student, a faculty or staff employee, or a specific student organization). Allegations of misconduct by unknown or unidentified individuals, or by a University department or office will also be addressed, but the process may depart from specific procedural steps otherwise followed for formal complaints against specifically identified respondents.

The EDEC may also initiate a formal complaint irrespective of the wishes and/or participation of the affected party when deemed necessary by the EDEC to demonstrate appropriate responsiveness to a report. The decision of whether or not to initiate a formal complaint under such circumstances is at the discretion of the EDEC, and will be undertaken with care and in balanced consideration of the interests of the individuals involved (affected party/complainant and respondent), the interests of the larger University community (e.g., when heightened risk factors, as defined in Article 1, subsection II, are alleged), and the interests of the institution in responding in a manner that meets its legal requirements.

When the University proceeds with a formal complaint irrespective of the wishes and/or participation of the affected party, all parties will be informed, and any affected party (i.e., potential complainant) may individually elect at any time prior to the resolution of the matter to participate as a complainant in the applicable resolution process. Formal complaints of alleged Title IX sexual harassment and formal complaints of other misconduct are distinguished as follows, in accordance with Title IX:

A. ERP Complaints

ERP complaints are formal complaints of any alleged discrimination, sexual misconduct, retaliation, or other related offenses under the Comprehensive Policy, except for allegations that meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment under the law. ERP complaints must be filed by either (a) the affected party, who becomes a “complainant” upon filing,¹⁶ or (b) by the EDEC.

Any individual who is an affected party/complainant can file an ERP complaint alleging misconduct under the Comprehensive Policy. The EDEC may also file an ERP complaint in response to a report when determined necessary. When an ERP complaint is filed by the EDEC, the identity of the affected party (i.e., the potential complainant) may be withheld from the respondent when necessary to protect the safety of the affected party.

An ERP complaint may be filed with the EDEC using the [online ERP complaint form](#) (powered by Maxient™, the preferred method) or in person, by mail, or by email, by using the contact information for the OEC found in Article 1, subsection III. An ERP complaint filed by a complainant must contain the complainant’s physical or digital signature, or otherwise indicate that the complainant (or legal guardian) is the person filing the ERP complaint. Where the EDEC files an ERP complaint, the EDEC does not become a complainant or otherwise a party to the case.

ERP complaints may be addressed via alternative resolution options described in Article 1, subsection XI, or according to the ERP as described in Article 2.

B. Grievance Process Complaints

Grievance Process complaints are formal complaints of alleged misconduct that meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment under the law. According to Title IX, Grievance Process complaints must be addressed according to specific procedural requirements. Grievance Process complaints must be filed by either (a) the affected party, who becomes a “complainant” upon filing,¹⁷ or (b) by the EDEC.

At the time of filing a Grievance Process complaint, the complainant must be participating in or attempting to participate in a University education program or activity, and must allege Title IX sexual harassment by an individual respondent (or individual respondents) that occurred in the United States.

A Grievance Process complaint may be filed with the EDEC using the [online Grievance Process complaint form](#) (powered by Maxient™, the preferred method) or in person, by mail, or by email, by using the contact information found in Article 1, subsection III. A Grievance Process complaint filed by a complainant must contain the complainant’s physical or digital signature, or otherwise indicate that the complainant (or legal guardian) is the person filing the formal complaint. Where the EDEC files a Grievance Process complaint, the EDEC does not become a complainant or otherwise a party to the case.

Grievance Process complaints may be addressed via alternative resolution options described in Article 1, subsection XI, or according to the Grievance Process as described in Article 3.

XI. Alternative Resolution Options

Alternative resolution options may be available in certain circumstances prior to reaching a determination regarding the respondent’s responsibility, when both parties agree and when the EDEC determines that the matter is appropriate for alternative resolution.

Before initiating any alternative resolution process (including mediation, restorative justice, directed discussions, no contest resolutions, and other negotiated resolutions), the University must provide to all parties a written notice disclosing the allegations, the requirements of the alternative resolution process, and any consequences

¹⁶ In cases of an affected party/complainant who is a minor (under the age of 18), an ERP complaint may also be filed by a parent or legal guardian on behalf of the complainant.

¹⁷ In cases of an affected party/complainant who is a minor (under the age of 18), a Grievance Process complaint may also be filed by a parent or legal guardian on behalf of the complainant.

resulting from participating in the alternative resolution process (including the records that will be maintained or could be shared).

General information about the availability of alternative resolution options may be included in the University's responsive communications to reports and/or formal complaints, but alternative resolution may only be requested by a party upon or after the filing of a formal complaint.

Additionally, both/all parties must provide voluntary, written consent to alternative resolution for the University to proceed with facilitating alternative resolution; the University may not require or compel any party to participate in an alternative resolution process; and alternative resolution is never available to resolve allegations that a faculty or staff employee engaged in Title IX sexual harassment towards a student.

At any point prior to resolving a matter through alternative resolution, any party may withdraw from the alternative resolution process and resume the ERP or the Grievance Process (as applicable) with respect to the formal complaint. However, once a matter has been resolved through alternative resolution, it may not be raised again.

Alternative resolution may be facilitated internally by a trained and qualified University employee or externally by an outside organization, such as the [Center for Conflict Resolution](#), with logistical support provided by the OEC. Parties interested in exploring the possibility of alternative resolution should discuss these options with the EDEC or assigned investigator.

A. Mediation

Mediation¹⁸ is a voluntary, confidential, participant-focused, and structured dialogue facilitated by a neutral and impartial mediator, where parties' needs and interests are explored without judgement to reach a mutually agreeable resolution.

The EDEC determines if mediation is appropriate based on the interest/willingness of the parties, the nature of the conduct at issue, and the amenableness of the conduct to such a process. Disciplinary sanctions are not assigned as a result of mediation, although if all parties agree to any remedy or other course of action, the resolution agreement will be documented and become binding upon the parties. The OEC only maintains records of any final agreement that is reached, and has a limited role in implementing and enforcing agreed upon resolutions.

Mediation may not be used to address reports of violent conduct of any kind or where a respondent appears to present an ongoing threat to the University community. However, mediation may be made available after the resolution of a formal complaint, if the parties and the EDEC believe it could help repair harm. Mediation is never used in cases of sexual assault (as defined in Article 3, subsection I(A)(3)(a)).

B. Restorative Justice Conferencing

Restorative justice ("RJ") is an alternative framework for promoting justice that – in circumstances where the respondent accepts responsibility for causing harm – focuses on the harm rather than the guilt or responsibility of the respondent. A restorative justice conference (or "RJ conference") is one restorative practice where the party who experienced harm, the party who caused harm, and a representative of the University community (represented by a University employee), come together to discuss the perspectives, feelings, needs, and expectations of each party. The intent of RJ conferencing is to acknowledge and understand the harm caused and to work collaboratively to identify ways to repair that harm and restore community.

The EDEC determines if RJ is appropriate based on the interest/willingness of the parties, the nature of the conduct at issue, and the amenableness of the conduct to such a process. Disciplinary sanctions are not assigned as a result of RJ, although if all parties agree to any remedy or other course of action, the resolution agreement will be

¹⁸ Mediation as referenced in the Comprehensive Policy is distinct from mediation as provided for under some collective bargaining agreements, the latter of which is not governed by the Comprehensive Policy.

documented and become binding upon the parties. The OEC only maintains records of any final agreement that is reached and has a limited role in implementing and enforcing agreed upon resolutions.

RJ may not be used to address reports of violent conduct of any kind or where a respondent appears to present an ongoing threat to the University community. However, RJ may be made available after the resolution of a formal complaint, if the parties and the EDEC believe it could help repair harm. RJ is never used in cases of sexual assault (as defined in Article 3, subsection I(A)(3)(a)).

C. Directed Discussion

At times, a party may request that the University take only a very limited role in addressing alleged misconduct. For example, a complainant who does not want to subject a respondent to the possibility of discipline may request assistance in notifying the respondent how the alleged behavior affected the complainant and/or request a change in the respondent's future behavior.

When appropriate, the EDEC may approve a directed discussion as a way to communicate the perspective of an affected party to a respondent without engaging the ERP or the Grievance Process. To this end, the EDEC may, after notifying the respondent that a formal complaint has been filed, request a meeting with the respondent to discuss the complainant's perspective and requested change in behavior or other responsive action from the respondent. The respondent is thereby made aware that the University has received a formal complaint involving them, although they will not be subject to disciplinary action. In this manner, a complainant may communicate their perspective; the respondent may be made aware of the allegation(s); and the University may satisfy its obligation to address every formal complaint equitably and appropriately to the circumstances at hand.

Directed discussions are non-disciplinary in nature, and do not result in sanctions or other corrective action. However, because a non-disciplinary record is still generated and maintained by the OEC as a result of a directed discussion, the respondent may elect to respond in writing for the record if desired. The response may be shared with the affected party, depending on the wishes of the parties.

D. No Contest Resolution

Where the facts alleged in a formal complaint are not contested, where the respondent has admitted or wishes to admit responsibility, or where both parties want to resolve the case without a completed investigation or adjudication, the case may be eligible for No Contest Resolution. The EDEC determines if No Contest Resolution is appropriate based on the interest/willingness of the parties, the nature of the conduct at issue, and the amenableness of the conduct to such a process. No Contest Resolution must be agreed upon, voluntarily and in writing, by both parties and approved by the EDEC.

Under the No Contest Resolution process, the available evidence is documented in a report and both parties are afforded the opportunity to meet separately with a designated decision-maker (from the pool of CPAs) prior to the determination of sanctions. The decision-maker determines appropriate sanctions based on the uncontested formal complaint, the respondent's disciplinary history within the institution (if any), and the discussions (if applicable) with each party. The decision-maker's determination of sanctions (only) is subject to appeal, following the procedure that would have been applicable had the formal complaint been resolved through the ERP or the Grievance Process.

E. Other Negotiated Resolution

The EDEC, with the written consent of both parties, may negotiate and implement an agreement to resolve the allegations that satisfies all parties and the University. Such resolution is highly case-specific and depends on the individual circumstances of the report. In all cases, however, the general requirements for all alternative resolution options will apply.

XII. Privacy and Recordkeeping

All reports, formal complaints, and proceedings that arise under the Comprehensive Policy are understood to be sensitive and private. All persons participating in or administering those proceedings are expected to maintain the privacy of the proceedings.

The University reserves the right to designate which University officials have a need to know about incidents that fall within the Comprehensive Policy, in compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”) and other applicable laws.¹⁹ Also in accordance with FERPA, the University reserves the right to notify parents/guardians of students regarding any health or safety risk, change in student status, or conduct situation, when such notifications are permitted by law, such as when a significant and articulable health and/or safety emergency is present.

Parties should exercise caution and care if they choose to discuss their experience outside of the processes referenced under the Comprehensive Policy, as spreading inaccurate information intentionally or maliciously may constitute harassment, retaliation, or other violations. Additionally, parties may not share, discuss, or publicize (e.g., via traditional or social media) evidence, documentation, or records pertaining to an investigation or other proceeding. Violating this prohibition may impact the outcome of a pending case, to include dismissal of a report or complaint; additionally, students and faculty or staff employees may be subject to disciplinary action. The University also reserves the right to redact or limit information shared with parties or other individuals (including withholding a Preliminary or Final Investigation Report) to protect privacy or safety interests.

The University retains records of allegations, investigations, proceedings, and training materials for a minimum of seven years. Some records, such as expulsions or employee records, may be retained longer. Records related to reports or formal complaints of Title IX sexual harassment are subject to additional recordkeeping policies, which are described in Article 3, subsection XII.

A. Federal and State Statistical Reporting Obligations

Certain campus officials – those deemed “Campus Security Authorities” under the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Police and Campus Crime Statistics Act (the “Clery Act”) – have a duty to report the following for federal statistical reporting purposes:

- All “primary crimes,” which include all criminal homicide, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft, and arson;
- Hate crimes, which include any bias motivated primary crime as well as any bias motivated larceny or theft, simple assault, intimidation, or destruction/damage/vandalism of property;
- VAWA-based crimes²⁰, which include sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking; and
- Arrests and referrals for disciplinary action for weapons-related law violations, liquor related law violations, and drug abuse-related law violations.

All personally identifiable information is withheld, but statistical information must be passed along to Campus Safety regarding certain types of incidents and their general location (on- or off-campus, in residential housing, in the surrounding area, etc., but with no addresses provided) for publication in the Annual Security Report and daily campus crime log. Similar information must also be shared annually with the Illinois Office of the Attorney General under the ILPSVHE Act.

¹⁹ Any party utilizing a University employee/official as their advisor (when applicable) must grant explicit permission for the employee to serve in the advisor role. Serving as a party’s advisor does not grant a faculty or staff employee a “need to know” as otherwise described in this section. Likewise, a faculty or staff employee with a designated need to know about incidents reported is not, by extension, granted permission to be present during investigatory or adjudicatory proceedings.

²⁰ VAWA is the Violence Against Women Act, first enacted in 1994 and codified in part at 42 U.S.C. 13701-14040.

The information to be shared under the Clery Act includes the date, the location of the incident (using Clery Act location categories), and the Clery Act crime category. The information to be shared under state law also includes what actions were taken by the University in response to the report. All such reporting is conducted in a manner that protects the identities of all parties. These reports help to provide the community with a clear picture of the extent and nature of campus crime, to ensure greater community safety.

B. Federal Timely Warning Obligations

Parties reporting misconduct under the Comprehensive Policy should be aware that under the Clery Act, Campus Safety administrators must issue timely warnings for incidents reported to the University that pose a substantial threat of bodily harm or danger to members of the campus community. In such cases, the University ensures that an affected party's name and other personally identifying information are not disclosed, while still providing enough information for community members to make safety decisions in light of the potential danger.

XIII. Revision of the Comprehensive Policy

The University reserves the right to revise, update, or otherwise change this Comprehensive Policy at any time as necessary, and once the changes are published online at www.luc.edu/equity, they are in effect.

If government laws, regulations, or court decisions change the University's legal requirements in a way that affects the Comprehensive Policy, the Comprehensive Policy will be construed to comply with the most recent government regulations. This document does not create legally enforceable protections beyond the protection of Illinois state and federal laws.

Article 2: Equitable Resolution Procedures

The ERP is intentionally broad in its scope and application, informed by the University's mission and values and in compliance with applicable laws. As described in Article 1, the University's response to reports is oriented towards informing the affected party of available supportive measures and the *option* to file a formal complaint, while ensuring that the University takes appropriate action when necessary.

Upon filing of an ERP complaint, whereby an affected party (referred to as a "complainant" following the filing of a complaint) or the EDEC has formally requested that the University take action to investigate and adjudicate a respondent who is a student, faculty, or staff member, the University employs the ERP to thoroughly, fairly, and impartially assess the available evidence and implement an appropriate response.²¹

I. When the ERP is Applicable

A. Prohibited Conduct Actionable Under the ERP

The ERP may be applied upon the filing of an ERP complaint by a complainant or by the EDEC that alleges misconduct under the Comprehensive Policy, except for allegations that meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment (see Article 3, subsection I). The ERP may also be applied to resolve allegations of prohibited conduct that have been dismissed by the EDEC for not satisfying the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment.

B. Other Misconduct

The ERP may also be used to address other misconduct as prohibited by other University policies, such as the [Community Standards](#) (for students) or the [Faculty Handbook](#), collecting bargaining agreements, or [Employee Staff Handbook](#), as applicable, when the allegations arise from the same facts and circumstances as alleged misconduct under the Comprehensive Policy. However, allegations of other misconduct that are unrelated to any alleged violation of the Comprehensive Policy are instead referred elsewhere to be addressed under other University processes, as applicable.

II. General ERP Information

The following information applies to the ERP following receipt by the OEC of an ERP complaint.

A. Evidentiary Standard

A preponderance of the evidence is the evidentiary standard used at Loyola to determine whether a respondent is responsible for violating the Comprehensive Policy. This standard requires that the totality of the evidence, considered impartially, must indicate that it is more likely than not that the Comprehensive Policy was violated.

Determinations of responsibility are not made until the end of the ERP, when the investigator has made a finding as documented in the Final Investigation Report.

Unless and until a respondent is determined to be responsible by a preponderance of the evidence for a policy violation at the conclusion of the ERP, the University operates with the presumption that the respondent is not responsible for violating the Comprehensive Policy.

B. Equitable Treatment of Complainants and Respondents

Complainants and respondents are treated equitably under the ERP. This means:

²¹ Complaints alleging Title IX sexual harassment, however, are addressed according to the procedures set forth in Article 3.

- All relevant evidence is evaluated objectively, including evidence that suggests responsibility and evidence that suggests no responsibility.
- Both complainants and respondents are expected to speak and write on their own behalf throughout the ERP, unless assistance is needed under an approved disability accommodation.
- Credibility determinations are not to be based on a person's status as a complainant, respondent, or witness.
- Both complainants and respondents may request appropriate and reasonably available supportive measures, ranging from referrals for counseling to facilitated academic/housing/transportation/workplace modifications. For a full description of available supportive measures, see Article 1, subsection IX(B)(2).
- Both parties whose participation is invited or expected are provided written notice of the date, time, location, participants, and purpose of all investigative interviews or other meetings with sufficient time for the party to prepare to participate.
- Complainants are provided appropriate remedies where a respondent is found responsible for an alleged violation.
- Respondents are provided a fair and impartial process under the ERP before the imposition of any sanctions or other responsive interventions that are not supportive measures.

C. Comprehensive Policy Administrators and the ERP

All CPAs who are involved in the facilitation and resolution of the ERP, including the EDEC, deputy coordinators, investigators, administrative resolution officers, appeal administrators, and alternative resolution facilitators, may not have a conflict of interest or bias for or against complainants or respondents generally or for or against an individual complainant or respondent.

Parties may raise a concern to the EDEC regarding bias or a conflict of interest at any time, at which point the EDEC will determine whether a bias or conflict of interest exists. If so, the biased or conflicted individual will be removed from involvement with the case and the impact of the bias or conflict, if any, will be remedied. A CPA's actual or perceived membership in a protected class (e.g., race, sex/gender, national origin, etc.) is not itself grounds for establishing bias.

Such individuals receive training in compliance with the requirements of state and federal laws. For more information about CPAs, see Article 1, subsection III(A).

D. Timely Resolution of the ERP

The University strives to resolve all ERP complaints in a prompt and timely manner; however, the precise timeline for an ERP case may vary based on the circumstances at hand.

The ERP may be delayed and/or individual time frames may be extended to a limited extent for good cause and with written notice to the parties of the delay or extension and the reasons therefor. Good cause may include various considerations, including but not limited to, the absence of a party, or a witness; extraordinary complexity or scope of the case; concurrent law enforcement activity²²; the need for language/translation assistance; or accommodations for disabilities or health conditions.

Throughout any delay or extension, the University may implement supportive measures as deemed appropriate, and parties are periodically updated on the status of their case.

²² It should be noted that the ERP is entirely distinct from civil or criminal proceedings; accordingly, the ERP is not typically delayed or precluded due to pending civil or criminal charges or the dismissal or reduction of such charges. However, the University seeks to cooperate with law enforcement personnel to ensure that University processes do not interfere with law enforcement activity.

E. ERP Advisors (for Students Only)

An ERP advisor for students only (referred to in this subsection only as “advisor”) is a person who may accompany a student or recognized student organization who is an affected party, complainant, or respondent during any meeting or proceeding related to a report or ERP complaint. Advisors are strictly optional, and the choice of whether or not to utilize an advisor is up to each party.

Student complainants and respondents involved in the ERP may be accompanied by one advisor of their choice, provided that the selection of the advisor does not cause an undue delay of the ERP.²³ It is the responsibility of each party to coordinate scheduling with their advisor for any meetings. The University will not delay meetings or proceedings to accommodate an advisor’s availability.

An advisor may not speak, write, or otherwise communicate on behalf of a party. Advisors may not engage in behavior or communications that harass, abuse, or intimidate any party, witness, or other individual involved in the matter. Advisors who do not abide by these guidelines may be removed from any meeting and excluded from serving in an advisor role, and the process may continue without an advisor present.

An advisor may be any person of the party’s choosing, including an attorney. When an advisor is also an attorney, this must be disclosed to the University, and the advisor is still limited to the supportive and non-representative role described above. An attorney of the University’s choosing may also attend any proceeding whenever an attorney serving as an advisor is present.

Any student party may request assistance from the OEC in identifying an available advisor (this is not available to parties who are faculty or staff employees). However, the University cannot ensure or guarantee the quality or availability of any University-provided advisor.

Advisors are expected to maintain the privacy of any records shared with them. Such records may not be shared with third parties, disclosed publicly, or used for purposes not explicitly authorized by the University, unless required by law. Advisors will not be compelled to participate as a witness in any investigation. The University may restrict the role of any advisor who does not respect the sensitive nature of the ERP or who fails to abide by the University’s privacy expectations.

F. Accommodation for Disabilities in the ERP

Loyola is committed to providing reasonable accommodations and support to qualified students, faculty and staff employees, or others with disabilities to ensure equal access to the ERP. Anyone needing such accommodations or support should inform the EDEC, who may connect the individual with the SAC (for students) or Human Resources (for employees) to evaluate any requests and, in consultation with the person requesting the accommodation and the EDEC, determine what accommodations are appropriate and necessary for full participation in the process.

III. Notice, Dismissal, and Consolidation of ERP Complaints

A. Notice of Allegations upon Receipt of ERP Complaint

Before any investigator initiates contact with the parties, the EDEC provides a written Notice of Allegations (“NOA”) to each party. NOAs include a summary of the allegations, including (if known) the identity of the parties involved, the nature of the alleged misconduct, the date and location of the alleged incident(s) (if known), the specific policies implicated, a description of the applicable University procedures, a reminder that retaliation is prohibited, and a statement of the potential sanctions that could result.

²³ Faculty and staff employee complainants and respondents may also be accompanied by an ERP advisor when provided for by other University policies or procedures or required by law. For example, for employees who are members of a union, a union representative may serve as an ERP advisor where applicable; and nothing in this section will limit or abridge rights otherwise afforded under a collective bargaining agreement.

NOAs also identify the assigned investigator and provide parties the opportunity to raise any concerns regarding a conflict of interest before the parties are contacted by the investigator. The EDEC, investigator, or other designee may inform parties of additional allegations or other material changes to the scope of the investigation by providing an updated or modified NOA.

NOAs are provided in writing and are typically delivered by email to the parties' University-issued email accounts, but may also be delivered in person or mailed to the local or permanent addresses of the parties on file with the University. Once emailed, mailed, and/or received in-person, notice is presumptively delivered.

When the respondent is a faculty or staff employee, the employee's department chair, dean, director, supervisor, Human Resources manager, or other necessary party may also be notified that an ERP complaint has been filed. Such information will be treated as private, but is necessary to ensure that supervisory employees are informed and prepared for any potential operational disruption.

B. Dismissal of ERP Complaints

If, during the preliminary review or at any point during an ERP investigation, the investigator determines that the alleged behavior, even if substantiated, would not constitute a violation of the Comprehensive Policy, the University may end the process immediately, dismiss the complaint, and notify the parties simultaneously and in writing.

Upon such a notification, either party may request that the EDEC review the dismissal and/or re-open the investigation. The EDEC will review the decision and consider the case for reopening/resuming the investigation. The EDEC's decision is final and not subject to appeal.

C. Consolidation of ERP Complaints

The University may, but is not required to, consolidate formal complaints as to allegations of prohibited conduct under the Comprehensive Policy against more than one respondent, or by more than one complainant against one or more respondents, or by one party against the other party (including "cross-claims" brought by a respondent against a complainant), where the consolidated allegations arise out of the same facts or circumstances.

Investigators and hearing administrators are trained to impartially review distinct sets of facts to negate any prejudicial impact of knowing about multiple, related allegations. In all instances, separate determinations of responsibility will be made for each distinct alleged policy violation against each respondent.

Where the ERP involves more than one complainant or more than one respondent, references in Article 2 to the singular "party," "complainant," or "respondent" include the plural, as applicable.

D. Cross-Claims

The University permits a respondent to submit a cross-claim (a report alleging that the complainant violated the Comprehensive Policy instead of or in addition to the original respondent), but may conduct a preliminary review, as described in Article 1, subsection IX(B)(1), to assess whether the cross-claim was made in good faith. The University is obligated to ensure that the resolution process is not abused for retaliatory purposes.

Cross-claims determined to have been made in good faith may be processed using the ERP. Investigation of such claims may take place after resolution of the underlying allegation, in which case a delay may occur. Cross-claims may also be resolved through the same investigation as the underlying allegation, at the discretion of the EDEC. When cross-claims are not made in good faith, they will be considered retaliatory, and may constitute a separate violation of the Comprehensive Policy.

IV. ERP Investigations

ERP investigations include the thorough and impartial collection, review, and analysis of all available evidence by one or more impartial investigators, and conclude with the investigator making a finding of either "responsible" or

“not responsible” for each alleged violation based on the application of the Comprehensive Policy to the evidenced facts. In preparation for an investigation of an ERP complaint, an investigator is assigned as described below.

If an investigation results in no finding of responsibility, then the complaint is resolved (and may be subject to appeal). If the investigation results in one or more findings of responsibility, then the case is promptly referred for administrative resolution to an appropriate administrative resolution officer (“ARO”), based on the classification of the respondent (i.e., student, faculty employee, or staff employee). The ARO determines appropriate sanctions for the respondent based on the severity of the violation and other factors.

Investigations are thorough, reliable, impartial, prompt, and fair to both parties, and may involve interviews with relevant parties and witnesses; obtaining and reviewing available, relevant evidence; identifying sources of expert information; and other investigative steps, as needed.

A. Assignment of Investigators

Upon receipt of an ERP complaint, the EDEC typically appoints one or more investigators from among the OEC staff to conduct an investigation overseen by the OEC staff. Notwithstanding the foregoing, certain instances (such as conflicts of interest, logistical, or other concerns) may cause the University to utilize an outside consultant or expert to facilitate the investigation. In such instances, all policies, procedures, and standards in the Comprehensive Policy will apply.

B. Evidentiary Considerations

Though investigations vary in nature based on the context of the underlying allegations, parties have a full and fair opportunity to present evidence and to review and respond to all relevant evidence that will be relied on by any investigator or other ERP administrator in making a decision.

Formal rules of evidence do not apply. Any evidence that the investigator believes is relevant and credible may be considered, with the following exceptions: (1) other incidents not directly related to the possible violation, unless they evidence a pattern or cumulative impact on a protected class in the aggregate; (2) the sexual history of an individual (though a limited exception may be made regarding sexual history between parties when related to past practices of communicating consent); or (3) the general character of an individual (as distinct from evidence that goes towards credibility, which may always be considered).

The investigator is responsible for addressing any evidentiary concerns prior to and/or during the investigation, and the investigator may exclude irrelevant or immaterial evidence and/or disregard evidence lacking in credibility or that is improperly prejudicial. The investigator will consult with the EDEC on all questions of procedure and evidence.

C. Interviews and Exchanges with Primary Parties

One of the most critical investigative steps is meeting with and interviewing the primary parties in a case (complainant and respondent). The purpose of these interviews includes collecting as much information as possible about the relevant details of the allegation(s); asking probing and clarifying questions; soliciting suggested witnesses or other individuals with whom the investigator may wish to follow up to corroborate information; reviewing and exploring available relevant documentation or other physical evidence (including video footage, digital communications, photographs, etc.); and assessing the credibility of the parties.

Investigative interviews may be conducted in-person or remotely/virtually, using available audiovisual technology such as Zoom™. Parties are interviewed separately, as the University maintains that the ERP is an administrative, non-adversarial process, separate and distinct from any criminal or civil court process.

To afford both parties the opportunity to present questions of one another, the investigator invites parties to propose questions that they believe should be asked of other parties or witnesses. Such questions must be submitted in writing to the investigator before the conclusion of the investigation phase. Upon receipt of requested/proposed questions, the investigator either (a) presents the question (re-worded as needed) to the intended party/witness, or (b) indicates to the requesting party the reasons why the question will not be asked.

The investigator has absolute discretion to determine which questions are relevant to the investigation and may decline to pose or permit certain questions. Responses to questions – including a refusal to answer a given question – are noted and included in the final investigation report.

D. Presentation and Interviews of Relevant Witnesses

Both parties have an equal opportunity to present relevant witnesses and recommended questions for the witnesses to be considered by the investigator. Upon the presentation of relevant witnesses, parties are asked to explain what relevance the witness has to the allegation(s) under investigation. Investigators are not compelled to interview all presented witnesses, but if an investigator declines to interview a witness for lack of relevance, the investigator must provide a rationale for determining that the witness was not relevant.

Witnesses (as distinguished from the parties) who are students or faculty or staff employees are expected to cooperate with and participate in the University's investigation and administration resolution processes. Failure of such witnesses to cooperate with and/or participate in good faith in an investigation – absent good cause such as a superseding safety interest – may warrant discipline.

Investigative interviews may be conducted in-person or remotely/virtually, using available audiovisual technology such as Zoom™. Witnesses are interviewed separately. In some cases, witnesses may also provide written statements in lieu of interviews, but written statements may be afforded limited weight as an investigator may not be able to assess credibility without interviewing a witness.

E. Multiple-Party Cases

In allegations involving more than one respondent or where multiple complainants have alleged substantially similar misconduct by the same respondent, the University reserves the right either to investigate and resolve the allegations jointly, or to investigate and resolve them separately.

In such circumstances, co-complainants or co-respondents may obtain access to sensitive information about other co-complainants or co-respondents, and all parties are expected to maintain privacy to ensure the reliability of the investigative process.

Investigators and administrative resolution officers are trained specifically to impartially review distinct sets of facts to negate any prejudicial impact of knowing about multiple, related allegations. In all instances, separate determinations of responsibility will be made for each allegation against each respondent.

F. Recording of Interviews

No audio or video recording of any kind is permitted by anyone other than the investigator, during any meetings or interviews associated with the ERP. If the investigator elects to audio and/or video record interviews, all parties present are first made aware of and must consent to the recording. If a party does not consent to recording an interview, the interview may be facilitated through the exchange of written questions and answers. Transcriptions of recorded interviews are included as part of the Preliminary Investigation Report and Final Investigation Report, and may be accessed by the parties, hearing administrator(s), or appeal administrator(s) during any hearing or appellate review.

Interview recordings remain a part of the case file through the final resolution of the matter (including any applicable appeal), and may be accessed as needed by any ERP administrator who takes part in the process (including appellate officers), upon request.

G. Review of Relevant Evidence

Prior to the conclusion of the investigation, investigators will provide parties a reasonable opportunity to respond to relevant evidence that has been collected. Investigators may draft a preliminary investigation report ("PIR") that includes or summarizes the relevant evidence that will be relied on in making a decision.

When a PIR is drafted, parties are invited (though not required) to review the PIR and provide a written response to the report within five business days. Upon receiving responses from either party, the investigator may share information in the response with the other party to solicit additional information, or may otherwise conduct further inquiry as needed. Investigators then add any additional relevant information to the PIR and finalize the investigation by converting the PIR to a final investigation report (see Article 2, subsection IV(I)). The University also reserves the right to redact or limit information shared with parties or other individuals (including withholding a PIR), to protect privacy or safety interests.

H. Acceptance of Responsibility

The respondent may accept responsibility for all or some of the alleged policy violations at any point during an investigation or resolution of a complaint. If a respondent accepts responsibility for all of the alleged misconduct, such an acceptance is noted in the final investigation report (as described in Article 2, subsection IV(I)), a finding of responsibility is entered, and the matter is promptly referred to an appropriate ARO, who determines sanctions.

If the respondent only accepts responsibility for some of the alleged policy violations, then the investigator notes the acceptance of responsibility and focuses the remainder of the investigation on the remaining, contested, allegations. Any such acceptance is noted in the final investigation report as distinct from an investigator's findings regarding contested allegations.

I. Final Investigation Report and Notice of Findings

Upon the conclusion of the investigation, the investigator drafts a comprehensive final investigation report ("FIR"), which includes a credibility assessment (when applicable) and a balanced, impartial analysis of the facts as supported by available evidence. Credibility determinations may not be based in any way on an individual's mere status as a complainant, respondent, or witness.

The FIR concludes with the investigator's findings, based on the investigator's professional expertise and understanding of the Comprehensive Policy as applied to the relevant facts under a preponderance of the evidence standard. The FIR clearly indicates whether the respondent is found to be **RESPONSIBLE** or **NOT RESPONSIBLE** for each allegation, and these findings are accompanied by an analysis and rationale.

Once the FIR has been finalized, the investigator, EDEC, or other designee, sends the parties a written notice of findings ("NOF"), providing access to review the FIR, informing the parties of the outcome of the investigation, and either referring the matter for administrative resolution and/or informing the parties of their rights to appeal (if applicable). The University reserves the right to redact or limit information shared with the parties or other individuals to protect privacy or safety interests.

V. Administrative Resolution

"Administrative resolution" is a general term used to describe the various processes by which the University resolves a formal complaint, after a finding of responsibility has been made under the ERP. Administrative resolution processes may be governed by the [Community Standards, Faculty Handbook](#), a collective bargaining agreement, or [Employee Staff Handbook](#), as applicable, depending on the circumstances of the alleged behavior and the classification of the respondent as a student, faculty employee, or staff employee. An administrative resolution officer ("ARO") is a general term to describe trained and qualified individuals who have a role in these processes. For cases involving allegations against faculty or staff employees, nothing in this subsection provides additional recourse beyond the processes outlined in the [Faculty Handbook](#), the collective bargaining agreements, or [Employee Staff Handbook](#).

At the conclusion of an ERP investigation, parties are informed of the name and contact information for any ARO to whom the case is being referred. The EDEC may also, at their own discretion, provide the ARO with non-binding recommendations or other information to assist with the administrative resolution.

A. General Considerations During Administrative Resolution

In each of the formats indicated in Article 2, subsection V(B), the following principles apply:

- An investigative finding of responsibility may not be modified at the administrative resolution phase.
- The purpose of administrative resolution is to identify appropriate and proportional sanctions and/or other responsive interventions upon a finding of responsibility that are reasonably designed to stop the substantiated misconduct, prevent its reoccurrence, and remedy its effects.
- Any evidence that the ARO believes is relevant and credible may be considered, including respondent's prior conduct/employment history and any evidence indicating a pattern of misconduct. Previous disciplinary action of any kind involving the respondent may be considered in determining the appropriate sanction(s).
- AROs may consult with the investigator, EDEC, relevant supervisors, Human Resources personnel, or others to ensure that the administrative resolution aligns with the University's values and behavioral expectations.

B. Administrative Resolution Formats Based on Respondent Classification

Each administrative resolution format is referenced briefly here, but parties should also consult with the respective source of authority for additional information and details. Allegations involving student-worker respondents or other respondents who hold dual classifications will be routed to the most appropriate administrative resolution format depending on the individual context of the alleged misconduct, at the discretion of the EDEC.

1. *When the Respondent is a Student*

Upon a finding by the investigator that a **student respondent**²⁴ is responsible for one or more policy violations, the matter is referred to the director of the Office of Student Conduct & Conflict Resolution ("OSCCR"), who serves as the ARO or delegates the matter to an alternative ARO, typically assigned from among the staff of the OSCCR. The administrative resolution phase for students substantially follows the principles for sanctions codified within the [Community Standards](#), and includes a thorough review of the investigative documentation and findings, including the FIR and all associated evidence on which the investigative decision relied.

When the respondent is a student, parties may object to any assigned ARO for cause (e.g., conflict of interest or bias) in writing to the EDEC as soon as possible. An ARO may be replaced or removed if the EDEC concludes that a bias or conflict of interest exists. Similarly, any ARO who cannot make an objective determination must recuse themselves from the process. If an ARO is unsure of whether a bias or conflict of interest exists, they must raise the concern to the EDEC as soon as possible.

Additional information regarding the administrative resolution process for complaints against students is as follows:

a. **Sanctions for Students**

Factors that may be considered by the ARO when determining sanctions for students may include, but are not limited to:

- The nature, severity of, and circumstances surrounding the violation
- The respondent's student conduct/disciplinary history
- Previous allegations or allegations involving similar conduct
- The need for the University's intervention to stop, prevent, and remedy the effects of the discrimination, sexual misconduct, and/or retaliation
- The impact on the parties
- Any other information deemed relevant by the ARO

Sanctions for a student respondent who is responsible for discrimination, sexual misconduct, and/or retaliation may include the following (for further information about these and other sanctions for students, please consult the

²⁴ The administrative resolution format for students is also utilized when addressing allegations against recognized student organizations.

Community Standards):

- University Warning
- University Probation
- University Suspension
- University Expulsion
- Residence Hall Probation
- Residence Hall Suspension
- Residence Hall Expulsion
- Withholding of Transcript or Degree
- Revocation of Admission or Degree
- Loss of University Privileges
- Educational Experience or Project
- Extension of Supportive Measures (No Contact Directive, Limitation on University Activities and Access, etc.)
- Recognized Student Organization Outcomes (suspension, loss of recognition, loss of some or all privileges for a specified period of time, etc.)
- Other Actions (in addition to or in place of those listed above, the University may assign any other sanctions as deemed appropriate)

The sanctions described here are not exclusive of, and may be in addition to, other actions undertaken by the University or imposed by outside authorities.

Sanctions for a student respondent are implemented as soon as feasible following the final resolution of the case (i.e., upon the conclusion of the appeal window or the resolution of any appeal, if one is requested). Additionally, parties' activities and/or access (e.g. graduation, study abroad, internships/externships/assistantships, access to workplace, residence halls, or facilities, etc.) may be postponed or restricted on an interim basis pending the resolution of a pending appeal.

b. Notice of Administrative Resolution for Student Respondents

The ARO issues a Notice of Administrative Resolution, which is communicated by the EDEC to all respondents and complainants simultaneously and in writing notifying them of the administrative resolution decision. The information provided to respondents and complainants may not be identical, as the exact details of some actions undertaken may be withheld to protect the privacy of the parties. Notices of Administrative Resolution in cases of student respondents include a restatement of the findings, a summary of and rationale for sanctions (of which some details may be withheld for privacy reasons), and relevant information necessary for the parties to assess their safety moving forward. Notices of Administrative Resolution may also include information about eligibility for appeal where applicable.

Notices of Administrative Resolution may be delivered by one or more of the following methods: in person, mailed to the local or permanent address of the parties as indicated in official University records, or emailed to the parties' University-issued email account. Once mailed, emailed, and/or received in-person, notice is presumptively delivered.

The University reserves the right to redact or withhold information from Notices of Administrative Resolution to protect privacy or safety interests.

c. Withdrawal of Student Respondent with Allegations Pending

Should any student respondent decline to participate in the ERP at any point, the ERP may proceed to a finding and administrative resolution or other reasonable resolution absent the student's participation. A student respondent who withdraws or leaves with unresolved allegations pending may not return to the University until and unless they complete any sanctions or other requirements to the satisfaction of the University, as applicable. Additionally, the University may still address and remedy any systemic issues or factors that contributed to the alleged violation(s) and any ongoing effects of the alleged misconduct. Meanwhile a hold may be placed on the respondent's student account, preventing them from being readmitted.

d. Appeals When Respondent is a Student

When the respondent is a student, either party (complainant or respondent) may appeal the investigative findings (whether “responsible” or “not responsible”), the administrative resolution decision, or both, on the following limited grounds:

- A **substantial procedural error or bias** that significantly impacted the investigative findings or administrative resolution.
- The discovery of **substantial new evidence**, not reasonably available during the investigation, that could substantially impact the original finding or administrative resolution.
- The **sanction or sanctions are disproportionate** to the violation(s).

A concise written appeal request must be submitted by the appealing party to the OEC as directed in the decision letter within five business days following delivery of the decision letter. Notice of and access to appeal requests will be delivered to the non-appealing party, after which the non-appealing party may respond in writing to the appeal request. Written responses must be submitted within five business days following delivery of the notice of appeal request. Appealing parties will receive notice of and access to any responses received. Appeal requests and responses must be submitted by 11:59 PM CST on the respective deadline date.

All appeal requests are reviewed by the EDEC to ensure basic eligibility requirements are met (i.e., timely submission, applicable grounds articulated). If an appeal request does not meet the basic eligibility requirements, the appealing party will be informed (and if still within the eligible time frame, the appealing party may resubmit a modified request). If no eligible appeal request has been submitted by the end of the appeals window, the original finding(s) and sanction(s) stand and become final.

Eligible appeal requests (and responses, if applicable) are reviewed by one or more assigned appeal administrator(s) from among eligible CPAs to determine the merits of the appeal. If any appeal grounds are substantiated by the appeal administrator(s), the appeal will be granted. Otherwise the appeal will be denied, the matter will be closed, and the original finding(s) and sanction(s) will stand and become final. Appeal administrators will notify both parties in writing of the outcome of the appeal.

If the appeal is granted:

- due to a substantial procedural error or bias, the matter will be remanded to the appropriate investigator or ARO (or, as in a case of bias, to a new investigator and/or ARO) for reconsideration to remedy the error;
- due to the discovery of new evidence not reasonably available at the time of the initial investigation/resolution, the matter will be remanded to the appropriate investigator or ARO for reconsideration in light of the new evidence;
- due to a sanction that is deemed disproportionate to the violation, the sanction may be administratively modified by the appeal administrator(s) or remanded to the appropriate ARO for reconsideration.

When a matter is remanded for reconsideration, written instructions will be provided to the receiving investigator and/or ARO to ensure that any error is remedied. The resulting outcome following any remand is final and not subject to further appeal.

Decisions by appeal administrators are deferential to the original decision, which may be modified or overturned only when there is clear error and a compelling justification. An appeal is not an opportunity for an appeal administrator to substitute their judgment for that of the original investigator or ARO merely because they disagree with the finding or administrative resolution decision. Appeal administrators may consult with the investigator, ARO, or EDEC at any time and for any reason, if needed.

For students, sanctions imposed as part of an administrative resolution decision that is under appeal will not be fully implemented until the final resolution of the case. However, students’ activities and/or access (e.g., graduation, study abroad, internships/externships/assistantships, access to workplace/residence halls/facilities, etc.) may be postponed or restricted on an interim basis pending the resolution of a pending appeal.

In cases where the appeal results in reinstatement to the University or resumption of privileges, all reasonable attempts will be made to restore the respondent to their prior status, recognizing that some lost opportunities may be irreparable.

2. When the Respondent is a Staff Employee

Upon a finding by the investigator that a **staff employee respondent** is responsible for one or more violations of the Comprehensive Policy, the matter is referred to the respondent's supervising director or other designee and the respective Human Resources manager responsible for the respondent's business unit, to be resolved in accordance with the [Employee Staff Handbook](#) and/or the respondent's collective bargaining agreement, if applicable. For the purposes of the Comprehensive Policy, the respondent's supervising director and Human Resources manager (or other Human Resources designee) are considered the AROs assigned to the case.

When the respondent is a staff employee, additional information regarding the administrative resolution process is as follows:

a. Sanctions for Staff Employee Respondents

Factors that may be considered by the ARO when determining sanctions for staff employees may include, but are not limited to:

- The nature, severity of, and circumstances surrounding the violation
- The respondent's employment records
- Previous allegations or allegations involving similar conduct
- The need for the University intervention to stop, prevent, and remedy the effects of the discrimination, sexual misconduct, and/or retaliation
- The impact on the parties
- Any other information deemed relevant by the ARO(s)

Sanctions for a **staff employee** respondent who is responsible for discrimination, sexual misconduct, and/or retaliation may include the following (for further information about these and other disciplinary measures for staff employees, please consult the [Employee Staff Handbook](#) or collective bargaining agreement, as applicable):

- Warning – Verbal
- Warning – Written
- Performance Improvement/Management Process
- Required Counseling
- Required Training or Education
- Probation
- Loss of Future Pay Increase
- Loss of Oversight or Supervisory Responsibility
- Demotion
- Suspension with Pay
- Suspension without Pay
- Termination
- Other Actions (in addition to or in place of those listed above, the University may assign any other sanctions as deemed appropriate)

The sanctions described here are not exclusive of, and may be in addition to, other actions undertaken by the University or imposed by outside authorities.

For staff employees, sanctions are implemented as soon as feasible following the final resolution of the case. Additionally, parties' activities and/or access may be restricted on an interim basis pending the resolution of a pending appeal.

b. Notice of Administrative Resolution for Staff Employee Respondents

The ARO issues a Notice of Administrative Resolution, which is communicated by the EDEC to all respondents and complainants simultaneously and in writing notifying them of the administrative resolution decision. The information provided to respondents and complainants may not be identical, as the exact details of some actions undertaken may be withheld to protect the privacy of the parties. Notices of Administrative Resolution in cases of staff respondents include a restatement of the findings, a summary of and rationale for sanctions (of which some details may be withheld for privacy reasons), and relevant information necessary for the parties to assess their safety moving forward. Notices of Administrative Resolution may also include information about eligibility for appeal where applicable.

Notices of Administrative Resolution may be delivered by one or more of the following methods: in person, mailed to the local or permanent address of the parties as indicated in official University records, or emailed to the parties' University-issued email account. Once mailed, emailed, and/or received in-person, notice will be presumptively delivered.

The University reserves the right to redact or withhold information from Notices of Administrative Resolution to protect privacy or safety interests.

c. Withdrawal of Staff Respondent with Allegations Pending

Should any staff employee decide to not participate in the ERP at any point, the ERP may proceed to a finding and administrative resolution or other reasonable resolution absent their participation. Should a staff respondent resign from the University, no sanction will be assigned, as the University will no longer have disciplinary jurisdiction over the resigned staff employee. However, the University may still address and remedy any systemic issues or factors that contributed to the alleged violation(s) and any ongoing effects of the alleged misconduct. A staff employee who resigns with unresolved allegations pending is not eligible for rehire with the University, and the records retained by the OEC and/or Human Resources will reflect that status. Additionally, any University responses to future inquiries regarding employment references for that individual may include that the former employee resigned during a pending disciplinary matter.

d. Appeals When Respondent is a Staff Employee

When the respondent is a staff employee, appeals may be governed exclusively by the [Employee Staff Handbook](#) and/or a collective bargaining agreement, if applicable, and may only be initiated by the respondent.

In cases where the staff respondent is a non-unionized staff employee, an appealing respondent must submit a written request for appeal to the Chief Human Resources Officer, as directed in the decision letter. The Chief Human Resources Officer either serves as the appeal administrator or assigns the matter to the Employee Complaint Appeals Committee, when applicable under the [Employee Staff Handbook](#).

In cases where the respondent is a unionized staff employee, please consult the applicable collective bargaining agreement.

3. When the Respondent is a Faculty Employee

For procedural information about faculty conduct, discipline, and appeals, please refer to the [Faculty Handbook](#) and/or any applicable collective bargaining agreement.

VI. Remedies under the ERP

Following the conclusion of an ERP complaint that has resulted in a finding of responsibility by the respondent, the EDEC may also provide remedies to and in consultation with the complainant, designed to restore or preserve the complainant's equal access to the University's education program or activity.

Remedies may range from supportive measures to any other responsive action requested by the complainant and deemed appropriate by the University to repair harm caused by substantiated misconduct, and need not avoid

burdening a respondent. The University will maintain the privacy of any remedies, provided privacy does not impair the University's ability to implement the remedies.

VII. Monitored Compliance with ERP Sanctions, Remedies, and Responsive Interventions

All individuals and other involved organizations and/or departments are expected to comply fully with any sanctions, remedies, and/or other responsive interventions within the timeframe specified. The implementation and monitoring of such outcomes are primarily the responsibility of the ARO who assigned them; however, assistance and coordination is provided by the OEC to ensure overall University compliance.

Failure to comply with sanctions/remedies/responsive interventions, whether by refusal, neglect, or any other reason, may result in additional disciplinary action, which may result in additional or increased sanctions, remedies, or other responsive interventions, up to and including suspension, expulsion, and/or termination from the University, and which may be noted in an individual's disciplinary or employment record.

A suspension will only be lifted when compliance with all sanctions is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the EDEC or designee, and may warrant informing complainants who have a continuing educational interest at Loyola of the respondent's status change as needed.

Article 3. Grievance Process for Title IX Sexual Harassment

The Grievance Process, as distinct from the ERP, is narrow in its scope, and is only applied to allegations of misconduct that meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment.

Upon the filing of a Grievance Process complaint, whereby an affected party (referred to as a “complainant” following the filing of a complaint) or the EDEC has formally requested that the University take action to investigate and adjudicate an individual respondent, the University employs the Grievance Process to thoroughly, fairly, and impartially assess the available evidence and implement an appropriate response.

I. When the Grievance Process is Applicable

Loyola must address all formal complaints of Title IX sexual harassment according to the Grievance Process (which reflects the prescribed procedures under the law) when (a) the alleged conduct, if proven, would constitute Title IX sexual harassment as defined in Article 3, subsection I(A); (b) the alleged Title IX sexual harassment occurred in the United States; (c) the alleged Title IX sexual harassment occurred within the University’s education program or activity; and (d) at the time the formal complaint of Title IX sexual harassment was filed, the complainant was participating or attempting to participate in the University’s education program or activity.

Title IX sexual harassment is specifically defined as follows:

A. Title IX Sexual Harassment

The term “Title IX sexual harassment” means conduct on the basis of sex (including sexual orientation or gender identity) that satisfies one or more of the following:

1. *Quid Pro Quo Sexual Harassment*

Quid pro quo sexual harassment occurs when an employee (faculty or staff) conditions the provision of an aid, benefit, or service of the University on the complainant’s participation in unwelcome sexual conduct.

2. *Hostile Environment Sexual Harassment*

Hostile environment sexual harassment occurs when unwelcome conduct is directed towards a complainant that is determined by a reasonable person in the complainant’s position to be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively denies the complainant equal access to the University’s education program or activity. Hostile environment sexual harassment occurs without regard to the respondent’s intent to cause harm, and is based on the totality of the circumstances in which the conduct occurs.

3. *Other Forms of Title IX Sexual Harassment*

Other forms of Title IX sexual harassment include sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, as defined by applicable laws.²⁵ These definitions, which are provided below, are distinct from Loyola’s own definitions for prohibited conduct described in Article I, subsection VIII.

a. Sexual Assault

Sexual assault is defined as an offense classified as a forcible or nonforcible sex offense under the Uniform Crime Reporting System of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.²⁶ A sex offense is any sexual act directed against another

²⁵ “Sexual assault” is as defined in 20 U.S.C. 1092(f)(6)(A)(v), “dating violence” is as defined in 34 U.S.C. 12291(a)(10), “domestic violence” is as defined in 34 U.S.C. 12291(a)(8), and “stalking” is as defined in 34 U.S.C. 12291(a)(30).

²⁶ The definitions for sexual assault listed here (including rape, fondling, incest, and statutory rape) encompass all behaviors that may constitute forcible and nonforcible sexual offenses under the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS).

person, without the consent of the complainant, including instances where the complainant is incapable of giving consent. Sex offenses are further defined and categorized as follows:

i. Rape

Rape is the penetration, no matter how slight, of 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 complainant, including instances where the complainant is unable to give consent because of the complainant's age or because of the complainant's temporary or permanent mental or physical incapacity.²⁷

ii. Fondling

Fondling is the touching of the private body parts of another person for the purpose of sexual gratification, without the consent of the complainant, including instances where the complainant is incapable of giving consent because of the complainant's age or because of the complainant's temporary or permanent mental or physical incapacity.

iii. Incest

Incest is nonforcible sexual intercourse between persons who are related to each other within the degrees wherein marriage is prohibited by law.²⁸

iv. Statutory Rape

Statutory rape is nonforcible sexual intercourse with a person who is under the statutory age of consent (which in Illinois is 17).

b. Dating Violence

Dating violence is defined as violence committed by a respondent (a) who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the complainant; and (b) where the existence of such a relationship shall be determined based on a consideration of the following factors: (i) the length of the relationship, (ii) the type of relationship, (iii) the frequency of interaction between the persons involved in the relationship.

c. Domestic Violence

Domestic violence is defined as felony or misdemeanor crimes of violence committed by a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the complainant, by a respondent with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a respondent who is cohabitating with or has cohabitated with the complainant as a spouse or intimate partner, by a respondent similarly situated to a spouse of the complainant under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction, or by any other respondent against an adult or youth complainant who is protected from that respondent's acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction.

d. Stalking

The term "stalking" means engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to (a) fear for the person's safety or the safety of others; or (b) suffer substantial emotional distress.

B. Other Misconduct that is Not Title IX Sexual Harassment

Loyola is fully compliant with Title IX and related regulations, but considers them to be a minimum standard for ensuring a safe and inclusive University environment. Accordingly, alleged sexual harassment that does not fall within the narrow definition of Title IX sexual harassment (either due to location of the incident, nature of the

²⁷ As used here, the term "rape" is inclusive of "rape", "sodomy", and "sexual assault with an object" as defined under NIBRS.

²⁸ In Illinois this includes as between (a) an ancestor and a descendent or between siblings, whether by half or whole blood or by adoption; (b) an uncle/aunt and nephew/niece, whether by half or whole blood; (c) between cousins of the first degree, with limited exceptions. (See 750 ILCS 5/212.)

misconduct, or both) may still be addressed under the ERP described in Article 2 or under other applicable University policies or procedures.²⁹ Where the alleged misconduct arises from the same facts and circumstances as an allegation of Title IX sexual harassment, the allegation may be addressed under the ERP or the Grievance Process (see Article 3, subsection III(C)). In either case, the EDEC will inform the parties of this decision and applicable next steps simultaneously and in writing.

II. General Grievance Process Information

A. Evidentiary Standard and Burden of Proof

A preponderance of the evidence is the evidentiary standard used at Loyola to determine whether a respondent is responsible for violating the Comprehensive Policy. This standard requires that the totality of the evidence, considered impartially, must indicate that it is more likely than not that the Comprehensive Policy was violated. This standard is required by Illinois law in cases of alleged student violations, and is applied to all cases under the Comprehensive Policy.

Determinations of responsibility are not made until the end of the Grievance Process, following a hearing. The burden of proof and the burden of gathering evidence sufficient to reach an informed determination regarding responsibility rest with the University and not with the parties.

Unless and until a respondent is determined to be responsible by a preponderance of the evidence for a policy violation at the conclusion of the Grievance Process, the University operates with the presumption that the respondent is not responsible for violating the Comprehensive Policy.

B. Equitable Treatment of Complainants and Respondents

Complainants and respondents are treated equitably under the Grievance Process. This means:

- All relevant evidence is evaluated objectively, including evidence that suggests responsibility and evidence that suggests no responsibility.
- Credibility determinations are not to be based on a person's status as a complainant, respondent, or witness.
- Both complainants and respondents may request appropriate and reasonably available supportive measures, ranging from referrals for counseling to facilitated academic/housing/transportation/workplace modifications. For a full description of available supportive measures, see Article 1, subsection IX(B)(2).
- Neither party is restricted from discussing the allegations under investigation or from gathering and presenting relevant evidence.³⁰
- Both parties whose participation is invited or expected are provided written notice of the date, time, location, participants, and purpose of all hearings, investigative interviews, or other meetings, with sufficient time for the party to prepare to participate.
- Complainants are provided appropriate remedies where a respondent is found responsible for Title IX sexual harassment.
- Respondents are provided a fair and impartial process under the Grievance Process before the imposition of any sanctions or other responsive interventions that are not supportive measures.

C. Right of Nonparticipation

Any party has the right not to participate in the Grievance Process. Where a party chooses not to participate, the University may still proceed with the Grievance Process. In such circumstances, the University will continue to send

²⁹ It should be noted that Loyola also has other obligations under Title VII and other equity laws to address other forms of sexual misconduct that do not constitute Title IX sexual harassment.

³⁰ Subject to prohibitions on retaliation as described in Article 1, subsection VIII(C).

to the nonparticipating party notices required under the Comprehensive Policy (for example, a written notice of the date, time, and location of a hearing). However, no party will be retaliated against, nor will any inferences as to a respondent's responsibility be made based on any party's choice not to participate in the Grievance Process.

D. Comprehensive Policy Administrators and the Grievance Process

All CPAs who are involved in the facilitation and resolution of the Grievance Process, including the Title IX Coordinator, deputy coordinators, investigators, hearing administrators, appeal administrators, and alternative resolution facilitators, may not have a conflict of interest or bias for or against complainants or respondents generally or for or against an individual complainant or respondent.

Parties may raise a concern to the EDEC regarding bias or a conflict of interest at any time, at which point the EDEC will determine whether a bias or conflict of interest exists. If so, the biased or conflicted individual will be removed from involvement with the case and the impact of the bias or conflict, if any, will be remedied. A CPA's actual or perceived membership in a protected class (e.g., race, sex/gender, national origin, etc.) is not itself grounds for establishing bias.

CPAs involved in administering the Grievance Process receive training to comply with the requirements of Title IX and other applicable laws. For more information about CPAs, see Article 1, subsection III(A).

E. Timely Resolution of the Grievance Process

The University strives to resolve all Grievance Process complaints in a prompt and timely manner, within six months from the receipt of a Grievance Process complaint through the delivery of the written determination. Grievance Process appeals, if applicable, may take up to an additional two months.

All time frames referenced in the Comprehensive Policy may be extended to a limited extent for good cause and with written notice to the parties of the delay or extension and the reasons therefor. Good cause may include various considerations, including but not limited to, the absence or unavailability of a party, or a witness; extraordinary complexity or scope of the case; concurrent law enforcement activity;³¹ the need for language/translation assistance; or the need for accommodations for disabilities or health conditions.

Throughout any delay or extension, the University may implement supportive measures as deemed appropriate, and parties are periodically updated on the status of their case.

F. Grievance Process Advisors

A Grievance Process advisor (referred to in this subsection only as "advisor") is a person who may accompany an individual who is an affected party, complainant, or respondent during any meeting or proceeding related to a report or Grievance Process complaint. Advisors are strictly optional, with the exception of being required to present the advisee's proposed questions during a hearing, and the choice of whether or not to utilize an advisor throughout the rest of the Grievance Process is up to each party.

All complainants and respondents involved in the Grievance Process may be accompanied by one advisor of their choice, provided that the selection of the advisor does not cause an undue delay of the Grievance Process.³² It is the responsibility of each party to coordinate scheduling with their advisor for any meetings. The University will not delay meetings or proceedings to accommodate an advisor's availability.

³¹ It should be noted that the Grievance Process is entirely distinct from civil or criminal proceedings; accordingly, the Grievance Process is not typically altered or precluded due to pending civil or criminal charges or the dismissal or reduction of such charges. However, the University seeks to cooperate with law enforcement personnel to ensure that University processes do not interfere with law enforcement activity.

³² For employees who are members of a union, a union representative may serve as the employee's advisor where applicable; and nothing in this section will limit or abridge rights otherwise afforded under a collective bargaining agreement.

An advisor may not speak, write, or otherwise communicate on behalf of a party, with the limited exception of presenting the advisee's proposed questions to other parties or witnesses during the hearing according to the procedures described in Article 3, subsection VI(B). Advisors may not engage in behavior or communications that harass, abuse, or intimidate any party, witness, or other individual involved in the matter. Advisors who do not abide by these guidelines may be removed from any meeting and excluded from serving in an advisor role, to be replaced with another advisor of choice or, if needed, an advisor assigned by the University.

An advisor may be any person of the party's choosing, including an attorney or union representative for employees who are members of a union, as described in the applicable collective bargaining agreement. When an advisor is also an attorney, this must be disclosed to the University, and the advisor is still limited to the supportive and non-representative role described above. An attorney of the University's choosing may also attend any proceeding whenever an attorney serving as an advisor is present.

Any complainant or respondent may request assistance from the OEC in identifying an available advisor, and an advisor will be provided who is aligned with the party's interests. However, the University cannot ensure or guarantee the quality of any University-provided advisor.

Advisors are expected to maintain the privacy of any records shared with them. Such records may not be shared with third parties, disclosed publicly, or used for purposes not explicitly authorized by the University, unless required by law. Advisors will not be compelled to participate as a witness in any investigation or hearing. The University may restrict the role of any advisor who does not respect the sensitive nature of the Grievance Process or who fails to abide by the University's privacy expectations.

G. Accommodation for Disabilities in the Grievance Process

Loyola is committed to providing reasonable accommodations and support to qualified students, faculty or staff employees, or others with disabilities to ensure equal access to the Grievance Process. Anyone needing such accommodations or support should inform the EDEC, who may connect the individual with the SAC (for students) or Human Resources (for faculty or staff employees) to evaluate any requests and, in consultation with the person requesting the accommodation and the EDEC, determine what accommodations are appropriate and necessary for full participation in the process.

III. Notice, Dismissal, and Consolidation of Grievance Process Complaints

A. Notice of Grievance Process Complaint

Upon receipt of a Grievance Process complaint, the OEC must provide written notice to the parties who are known, informing the parties of the Comprehensive Policy and the applicability of the Grievance Process to the allegations. This notice includes the allegations that may constitute Title IX sexual harassment as defined under the Comprehensive Policy, as well as sufficient details for the respondent to prepare a response before any initial interview. Sufficient details include the identities of the parties involved in the incident, if known, the conduct allegedly constituting Title IX sexual harassment, and the date and location of the alleged incident, if known.

The written notice also informs the parties of their rights under the Grievance Process (such as the right to an advisor and right to inspect and review evidence) and that knowingly making false statements or knowingly submitting false information during the grievance process is prohibited.

If, in the course of an investigation, the University decides to investigate allegations about the complainant or respondent that are not included in the original written notice, the University will provide notice of the additional allegations to the parties whose identities are known.

B. Dismissal of Grievance Process Complaint

The University must investigate the allegations in a Grievance Process complaint. However, if the alleged conduct would not, if proven, meet the definitional or jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment, the University must dismiss the complaint with regard to that conduct for purposes of Title IX.

The University may also dismiss the complaint or any allegations therein, if at any time during the investigation or hearing: (a) a complainant notifies the EDEC in writing that the complainant would like to withdraw the formal complaint or any allegations therein; (b) the respondent is no longer enrolled in or employed by the University; or (c) specific circumstances prevent the University from gathering evidence sufficient to reach a determination as to the complaint or allegations therein.

Complaints and/or allegations that are dismissed for Title IX purposes may be addressed instead under the ERP or may be consolidated with other allegations of Title IX sexual harassment to the extent that they arise under the same facts and circumstances. Such decisions are at the discretion of the EDEC. Upon a required or permitted dismissal under this subsection, the University will promptly send written notice of the dismissal and the reasons for the dismissal simultaneously to both parties.

If either party objects to a dismissal decision by the EDEC, the party may appeal that decision according to the appeal grounds and process described in Article 3, subsection X.

C. Consolidation of Grievance Process Complaints

The University may, but is not required to, consolidate formal complaints as to allegations of Title IX sexual harassment against more than one respondent, or by more than one complainant against one or more respondents, or by one party against the other party (including “cross-claims” of Title IX sexual harassment brought by a respondent against a complainant), where the allegations of Title IX sexual harassment arise out of the same facts or circumstances. Such determinations are at the discretion of the EDEC.

The University may also, at the discretion of the EDEC, consolidate allegations that do not meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements of Title IX sexual harassment with allegations of Title IX sexual harassment (and address both under the same Grievance Process) when both allegations arise from the same set of facts and circumstances.

Investigators and hearing administrators are trained to impartially review distinct sets of facts to negate any prejudicial impact of knowing about multiple, related allegations. In all instances, separate determinations of responsibility will be made for each distinct alleged policy violation against each respondent.

Where the Grievance Process involves more than one complainant or more than one respondent, references in this Article 3 to the singular “party,” “complainant,” or “respondent” include the plural, as applicable.

IV. Availability of Alternative Resolution Options

Upon filing of a Grievance Process complaint, alternative resolution options may be available prior to reaching a determination regarding the respondent’s responsibility, when both parties agree and when the EDEC determines that the matter is appropriate for alternative resolution, subject to the parameters set forth in Article 1, subsection XI.

In cases of alleged Title IX sexual harassment, the University strives to conclude alternative resolution within two months of the initiation of the alternative resolution option, subject to reasonable delay or extension for good cause as described in Article 3, subsection II(E).

V. Investigation of a Grievance Process Complaint

Investigations pursuant to a Grievance Process complaint include the thorough and impartial collection of all available evidence by one or more impartial investigators, and concludes with the investigator producing and presenting a Final Investigation Report to the parties for their review and preparation before a hearing.

Investigations are prompt, thorough, reliable, impartial, and fair to both parties, and may involve interviews with relevant parties and witnesses; gathering and presenting available, relevant evidence; and other investigative steps, as described below.

A. Assignment of Investigators

Upon receipt of a Grievance Process complaint, the EDEC typically appoints one or more investigators from among the OEC staff to conduct an investigation overseen by the OEC staff. Notwithstanding the foregoing, certain instances (such as conflicts of interest, logistical, or other concerns) may cause the University to utilize an outside consultant or expert to facilitate the investigation. In such instances, all policies, procedures, and standards in the Comprehensive Policy will apply.

B. Gathering of Relevant Evidence

Though investigations vary based on the context of the underlying allegations, parties have a full and fair opportunity to present relevant evidence and to review and respond to all related evidence collected by the investigator, whether or not the evidence is considered relevant and/or will be relied upon by the hearing administrator(s) in making a decision.

Formal rules of evidence as used in a court of law do not apply. The investigator may seek and consider any evidence that is directly related to the allegation(s) at issue, with the following exceptions:

(1) The University may not access, consider, disclose, or otherwise use a party's records that are made or maintained by a physician, psychiatrist, psychologist, or other recognized professional or paraprofessional acting in the professional's or paraprofessional's capacity, or assisting in that capacity, and which are made and maintained in connection with the provision of treatment to the party, unless the University obtains that party's voluntary, written consent to do so for the purposes of the Grievance Process.³³

(2) The Grievance Process may not require, allow, rely upon, or otherwise use questions or evidence that constitute, or seek disclosure of, information protected under a legally recognized privilege, unless the person holding such privilege has waived the privilege.

The investigator consults with the EDEC on all questions of procedure and evidence.

C. Interviews and Exchanges with Primary Parties

One of the most critical investigative steps is meeting with and interviewing the primary parties in a case (complainant and respondent). The purpose of these interviews includes collecting relevant information about the details of the allegation(s); asking probing and clarifying questions; providing the opportunity for parties to present inculpatory or exculpatory evidence and/or relevant witnesses, including fact or expert witnesses, to be interviewed by the investigator; and reviewing and exploring available documentation or other relevant physical evidence (including video footage, digital communications, photographs, etc.).

Parties should present all relevant evidence and witnesses during the investigation, or else such evidence and/or witnesses may not be presented at the hearing.³⁴ This ensures that both parties have an equal opportunity to be aware of evidence that may be referenced at the hearing.

³³ If a student is under 18 years old, then the University must obtain the voluntary, written consent of a parent or legal guardian.

³⁴ If a compelling need arises to consider testimony or other evidence that was not previously collected and documented during the investigation process, the hearing administrators may, at their sole discretion, temporarily adjourn the hearing to permit further investigation and exchange of information before reconvening and proceeding with the hearing. Alternatively, the hearing administrators may permit the limited introduction of new evidence that was not reasonably available before the Final Investigation Report was distributed to the parties, as

Investigative interviews may be conducted in-person or remotely/virtually, using available audiovisual technology such as Zoom™.

D. Presentation and Interviews of Relevant Witnesses

Both parties have an equal opportunity to present relevant witnesses (including fact and expert witnesses) and recommended questions for the witnesses to be considered by the investigator. Upon the presentation of relevant witnesses, parties are asked to explain what relevance the witness has to the allegation(s) under investigation. Investigators are not compelled to interview all presented witnesses, but if an investigator declines to interview a witness for lack of relevance, the investigator must provide a rationale for determining that the witness was not relevant. Witnesses cannot be compelled to participate in any investigation or proceeding under the Grievance Process.

Investigative interviews may be conducted in-person or remotely/virtually, using available audiovisual technology such as Zoom™. Witnesses are interviewed separately. In some cases, witnesses may also provide written statements in lieu of interviews.

E. Recording of Interviews

No audio or video recording of any kind is permitted by anyone other than the investigator, during any meetings or interviews associated with the Grievance Process. If the investigator elects to audio and/or video record interviews, all parties present are first made aware of and must consent to the recording. If a party does not consent to recording an interview, the interview may be facilitated through the exchange of written questions and answers. Transcriptions of recorded interviews are included as part of the preliminary inspection and review of evidence prior to the conclusion of the investigation, and may be accessed by the parties, hearing administrator(s), or appeal administrator(s) during any hearing or appellate review.

Interview recordings are maintained pursuant to the recordkeeping policy described in Article 3, subsection XII, and may be made available to parties, hearing administrator(s), or appeal administrator(s) upon request.

F. Preliminary Inspection and Review and Final Investigation Report

Prior to the conclusion of the investigation, the investigator provides both parties an equal opportunity to inspect and review any evidence obtained as part of the investigation that is directly related to the allegations – including evidence upon which the University does not intend to rely in reaching a determination regarding responsibility and inculpatory or exculpatory evidence whether obtained from a party or other source – so that each party can meaningfully respond to the evidence prior to the conclusion of the investigation.

This opportunity to conduct a preliminary inspection and review of all directly related evidence is facilitated by the investigator, who makes the applicable evidence available for review by each party and their advisor (if applicable). The parties then have at least 10 business days to complete the preliminary inspection and review and submit a written response, if desired, which the investigator will consider prior to concluding the investigation. The evidence subject to preliminary inspection and review is also available to both parties at any hearing, such that both parties have an equal opportunity to refer to such evidence during the hearing, including for purposes of cross-examination as described in Article 3, subsection XII.

After reviewing and considering any written responses submitted by the parties following the preliminary inspection and review, the investigator creates a FIR that fairly summarizes relevant evidence and, at least 10 business days prior to a hearing, is made available for review by each party and their advisor (if applicable) for their review and preparation of any written response (which may be submitted by parties in advance of the hearing, if desired).

long as both parties are provided a reasonable opportunity to review and respond to the evidence. If such evidence is permitted to be considered during the hearing, it may not be presented later under “new evidence” grounds for appeal.

VI. Grievance Process Hearings

As required by Title IX, the Grievance Process provides for a mandatory live hearing. Live hearings may be conducted with all parties physically present in the same geographic location, but may also, at the University's discretion, be facilitated virtually such that any or all parties, witnesses, and other participants may appear at the live hearing virtually, with technology enabling all participants simultaneously to see and hear each other.

A. Hearing Format

Hearings are facilitated by one or more hearing administrators who are trained and qualified CPAs tasked with reviewing and examining all relevant evidence, presenting questions to parties and witnesses as needed to make findings of responsibility, and, where applicable, facilitating the determination of sanctions appropriate to the policy violation at issue. A Grievance Process hearing is an administrative process, and formal rules of evidence (such as those applied to courtroom hearings) do not apply.

One hearing administrator serves as the hearing chairperson, who is responsible for ensuring order and decorum, and for directing the hearing procedures. Other individuals who may be present for a hearing include other hearing administrator(s), EDEC, investigator, parties and their advisors, and witnesses (who are admitted to the hearing when called upon by the hearing chairperson). When any party is accompanied by an advisor who is also an attorney, the University also reserves the right to have an attorney present to represent the University.

Hearings begin with introductions of all individuals present and a brief introduction of the case by the hearing chairperson. Opening statements by the parties may be permitted at the discretion of the hearing chairperson. After the introduction and any opening statements, the hearing administrators call upon the parties to respond to questions, usually in the following order: complainant, respondent, witnesses. Following the direct questioning of each individual by the hearing administrators, both parties are afforded the opportunity to present questions of their own – through their advisor – to the individual who was just questioned (i.e., cross-examination). Following the direct questioning of a party, that party's own advisor is not permitted to cross-examine their own advisee/party.

B. Cross-Examination by Advisors

During the hearing, the parties' advisors will have the opportunity to cross-examine other participating parties and witnesses (if any). Such cross-examination must be conducted directly, orally, and in real time by the party's advisor and never by a party personally.

The role of the advisor at a live hearing is not to represent a party, but only to relay the party's cross-examination questions that the party wishes to have asked of the other party and witnesses. If a party does not have an advisor present at the live hearing, the University will provide – without fee or charge to the party – an advisor of the University's choice, to perform the limited function of presenting the advisee's questions to the other party and/or witnesses.

Each party must prepare their questions, including any follow-up questions, for the other party and witnesses, and provide them to their advisor. The advisor will ask the questions as the party has provided them, and may not ask questions that the advisor has developed without their party. Each party's advisor may pose relevant and permissible questions to the opposing party and witnesses, subject to the limitations set forth in Article 3, subsection VI(C), including those challenging credibility.

The protocol for presenting questions by an advisor is as follows. Each question will first be proposed by the advisor to the hearing chairperson (or a designee), who will assess whether the question is relevant. If the question is relevant, the hearing chairperson will "affirm" the question and direct the questioned individual to respond. If the question is not relevant or is otherwise prohibited, the hearing chairperson will "exclude" the question, direct the questioned individual not to answer the question, and immediately and succinctly explain the reasoning for exclusion. Parties and their advisors may not object to proposed questions; the hearing chairperson has sole discretion in affirming or excluding questions.

If a party or witness does not participate in the live hearing, does not submit to cross-examination, or refuses to answer permissible questions from the hearing administrators or advisors, the hearing administrators may, at their discretion and based on the totality of the circumstances, assign limited or no weight to statements or information provided by that party or witness in reaching a determination regarding responsibility.³⁵ The hearing administrators may not make any inferences regarding responsibility based solely on a party's or witness's absence from the live hearing or refusal to answer cross-examination or other questions.

C. Excluded Questions

Questions and evidence about the complainant's sexual predisposition or prior sexual behavior are not relevant, unless (a) such questions and evidence about the complainant's prior sexual behavior are offered to prove that someone other than the respondent committed the conduct alleged by the complainant, or (b) if the questions and evidence concern specific incidents of the complainant's prior sexual behavior with respect to the respondent and are offered to prove consent.

The University does not permit questions by hearing administrators or by other parties through their advisors that seek disclosure of information protected under a legally recognized privilege, unless the person holding such privilege has waived the privilege.

Additionally, the University does not permit questions that are unduly repetitive or that are presented in a rude, hostile, or abusive manner. If an otherwise permissible question is presented in an impermissible manner, the hearing chairperson may instruct the advisor to rephrase the question. Advisors who do not abide by these guidelines may be removed from any meeting and excluded from serving in an advisor role, to be replaced with another advisor of choice or, if needed, an advisor assigned by the University.

D. Concluding the Hearing

Before concluding the hearing, each complainant may present an optional closing statement. Thereafter, each respondent will have the same opportunity. Following the respondent's closing statement, the hearing adjourns. The hearing administrator(s) deliberate in private following the conclusion of the hearing before making a finding as to responsibility for each alleged policy violation.

E. Recording of Hearing

The University creates an audio or audiovisual recording of all hearings, which are made available to the parties for inspection and review upon request and are maintained pursuant to the recordkeeping policy described in Article 3, subsection XII.

VII. Sanctioning Determination

If a hearing results in one or more findings of responsibility for a respondent having violated the Comprehensive Policy, the matter will proceed to sanctioning determination. Sanctions are determined differently depending on whether the respondent is a student, faculty employee, or staff employee. Allegations involving student-worker respondents or other respondents who hold dual classifications will be routed to the most appropriate sanctioning administrator depending on the individual context of the alleged misconduct, at the discretion of the EDEC.

A. Sanctioning Student Respondents

For student respondents, sanctions are determined by the hearing administrator(s) and incorporated into the written determination as described in Article 3, subsection IX.

³⁵ Where a party does not propose (through their advisor) any questions for the other party and/or witness, but the other party and/or witness has appeared/participated in the hearing, the other party/witness will be considered to have submitted to cross-examination; the hearing administrators may therefore still rely on the statements of the other party/witness.

B. Sanctioning Staff Respondents

For staff respondents, upon a decision of responsibility by the hearing administrator(s), sanctions are determined by a designated representative of Human Resources, according to the following staff disciplinary process.

The hearing chairperson delivers a hearing report to the designated representative of Human Resources. The Human Resources representative may consult with the appropriate supervisory authority under whom the respondent reports, decides the sanction(s) to be assigned to the staff respondent, and provides the sanctioning decision and rationale to the hearing chairperson, who incorporates the decision into the written determination as described in Article 3, subsection IX.

During the staff disciplinary process, any documents provided to either party will be provided to the other, and both parties will have an equal opportunity to respond to any inquiries made by the designated representative of Human Resources, if applicable.

C. Sanctioning Faculty Respondents

For faculty respondents, upon a decision of responsibility by the hearing administrator(s), sanctions are determined by the Senior Academic Officer (as defined in the [Faculty Handbook](#)) in accordance with the disciplinary process set forth in the [Faculty Handbook](#).

At the conclusion of the disciplinary process, the Senior Academic Officer decides the sanction(s) to be assigned to the faculty respondent, and provides the sanctioning decision and rationale to the hearing chairperson, who incorporates the decision into the written determination as described in Article 3, subsection IX.

During the faculty disciplinary process, any documents provided to either party will be provided to the other; and both parties will have an equal opportunity to respond to any discipline recommendations.

VIII. Grievance Process Sanctions and Remedies

A. Sanctions for Title IX Sexual Harassment

Factors that may be considered by the hearing and/or sanctioning administrator(s) when determining sanctions for Title IX sexual harassment may include, but are not limited to:

- The nature, severity of, and circumstances surrounding the violation;
- The respondent's student and/or employee conduct/disciplinary history (or absence thereof), whether or not the previous discipline was related to the current violation;
- The existence or circumstances of previous reports or formal complaints alleging similar conduct (or absence thereof);
- The University's obligation to stop, prevent, and remedy the effects of the misconduct; and
- The impact of the violation on the parties

Sanctions for Title IX sexual harassment may range from intensive educational sanctions (e.g., extended mandated training or professional coaching) to disciplinary sanctions such as temporary or permanent separation from the University (e.g., suspension or expulsion for students, or unpaid leave of absence or termination for employees). The range of sanctions described here is not exclusive of, and may be in addition to, other responsive interventions or other actions undertaken by the University or imposed by outside authorities.

Sanctions are implemented as soon as feasible following the final resolution of the case (i.e., upon the conclusion of the appeal window or the resolution of any appeal, if one is requested). Additionally, parties' activities and/or access (e.g. graduation, study abroad, internships/externships, access to workplace, residence halls, or facilities, etc.) may be postponed or restricted on an interim basis pending the resolution of a pending appeal.

B. Remedies

Following the conclusion of the Grievance Process that has resulted in a finding of responsibility by the respondent, the EDEC may also provide remedies to and in consultation with the complainant, designed to restore or preserve the complainant's equal access to the University's education program or activity.

Remedies may range from actions that previously constituted "supportive measures" to any other responsive action requested by the complainant and deemed appropriate by the University to make the complainant whole, and need not avoid burdening the respondent. The University will maintain the privacy of any remedies, provided privacy does not impair the University's ability to implement the remedies.

IX. Written Determination

Following the conclusion of the hearing and after any sanctions are determined (if applicable), the hearing chairperson issues a written determination, which is communicated by the EDEC to both parties simultaneously and in writing (and presumptively received upon delivery). The written determination:

- Identifies the allegations that may constitute Title IX sexual harassment and any other prohibited conduct addressed in the hearing, if applicable;
- Describes the procedural steps taken from the receipt of the formal complaint through the determination, including any notifications to the parties, interviews with parties and witnesses, site visits, methods used to gather other evidence, and hearings held;
- Presents findings of fact supporting the determination;
- Presents conclusions regarding the application of the Comprehensive Policy to the facts;
- Provides a statement of, and rationale for, the result as to each allegation, including a determination regarding responsibility, any sanctions the University imposes on the respondent, and whether remedies will be provided to the complainant; and
- Describes the University's procedures and permissible bases for the complainant and respondent to appeal.

X. Appeals of the Grievance Process Outcome

Both parties have the equal right to appeal the findings and/or sanctions resulting from the Grievance Process. Appeal requests must be submitted within 10 business days. Following the conclusion of the appeal window, if a timely appeal request is received from any party, all other parties (complainants and respondents) are provided notice of and access to the appeal request(s) and any supporting documentation provided. Any non-appealing party then has 10 business days to respond in writing, if desired. Following the end of the appeal response window, any written responses received are shared with the appealing party, but no further response (i.e., "response to a response") is permitted. Appeal requests and responses must be submitted by 11:59 PM CST on the respective deadline date; requests and responses received thereafter will not be accepted or considered.

Appeals are reviewed by one or more appeal administrators who are trained and qualified to serve in that role (i.e., free from any conflict of interest or bias; was/were not the original investigator, hearing administrator, or Title IX Coordinator). Appeal administrators may consult with the investigator, hearing administrator(s), sanctioning administrator(s), and/or EDEC at any time and for any reason, if needed.

An appeal administrator's responsibility is strictly limited to determining if, based on the applicable appeal grounds, there is cause for the original decision to be modified, overturned, or remanded. Decisions by appeal administrators are deferential to the original decision, which may be modified or overturned only when there is clear error and a compelling justification. An appeal is not an opportunity for an appeal administrator to substitute their judgment for that of a hearing or sanctioning administrator merely because the appeal administrator disagrees with the finding(s) or sanction(s) assigned.

During the appeal process, any opportunity provided to either party to review or respond to appeal documents, meet with the appeal administrator, or otherwise participate in the process will be provided equally to the other party.

At the end of the appeal window, if no timely appeal request has been received, the original outcome stands and becomes final within the University.

A. Grounds for Appeal

Appeals may be requested by any party on the following grounds:

- A **procedural irregularity** that affected the outcome of the matter;
- **New evidence** that was not reasonably available at the time the determination regarding responsibility or dismissal was made, that could affect the outcome of the matter; and/or
- The EDEC, investigator(s), or hearing administrator(s) had a **conflict of interest or bias** for or against complainants or respondents generally or the individual complainant or respondent that affected the outcome of the matter.

In cases involving student respondents (only), both parties may also appeal on the grounds that the sanction or sanctions are disproportionate to the violation(s).

In cases involving non-unionized faculty respondents (only), both parties may also appeal on any applicable grounds as described in the [Faculty Handbook](#).

In cases involving unionized faculty respondents (only), both parties may appeal on any applicable grounds as described above.

In cases involving unionized staff respondents (only), both parties may also appeal on any applicable grounds as described in the applicable collective bargaining agreement.

B. Requesting and Processing Appeals

The procedures for requesting an appeal, like the procedures for determining sanctions, differ depending on whether the respondent is a student, faculty employee, or staff employee. Allegations involving student-worker respondents or other respondents who hold dual classifications will be routed to the most appropriate appeal administrator depending on the individual context of the alleged misconduct, at the discretion of the EDEC.

1. Appeals When Respondent is a Student

In cases where the respondent is a student, an appealing party must submit a written request for appeal to the EDEC, as directed in the written determination letter. The EDEC facilitates the exchange of appeal request(s) and responses, if applicable, and assigns the matter to one or more appeal administrators from among the pool of qualified CPAs.

2. Appeals When Respondent is a Non-Unionized Staff Employee

In cases where the respondent is a non-unionized staff employee, an appealing party must submit a written request for appeal to the Vice President for Human Resources, as directed in the written determination letter. The Vice President for Human Resources or a designee facilitates the exchange of appeal request(s) and responses, if applicable, and the Vice President for Human Resources either serves as the appeal administrator or assigns the matter to the Employee Complaint Appeals Committee, when applicable under the [Employee Staff Handbook](#).

3. Appeals When Respondent is a Unionized Staff Employee

In cases where the respondent is a unionized staff employee, please consult the applicable collective bargaining agreement.

4. Appeals When Respondent is a Non-Unionized Faculty Employee

In cases where the respondent is a faculty employee, an appealing party must submit a written request for appeal to the University President, as directed in the written determination letter. The President or a designee facilitates the exchange of appeal request(s) and responses, if applicable, and the President (or a designee) reviews the appeal in accordance with the procedures set forth in the [Faculty Handbook](#), as applicable.

5. Appeals When Respondent is a Unionized Faculty Employee

In cases where the respondent is a unionized faculty employee, an appealing party must submit a written request for appeal to the University President, as directed in the written determination letter. The President or a designee facilitates the exchange of appeal request(s) and responses, if applicable, and the President (or a designee) reviews the appeal in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Comprehensive Policy.

C. Appeal Decisions

Upon rendering an appeal decision, the appeal administrator notifies all parties simultaneously and in writing of the decision, and any sanction(s) are implemented as soon as feasible. In cases where the appeal results in reinstatement to the University or resumption of privileges, all reasonable attempts will be made to restore the respondent to their prior status, recognizing that some lost opportunities may be irreparable in the short term.

XI. Monitored Compliance with Grievance Process Sanctions, Remedies, and Responsive Interventions

All individuals and other involved organizations and/or departments are expected to comply fully with any sanctions, remedies, and/or other responsive interventions within the timeframe specified. The implementation and monitoring of such outcomes are primarily the responsibility of the OEC; however, assistance and coordination may be provided by other CPAs to ensure overall University compliance.

Failure to comply with sanctions/remedies/responsive interventions, whether by refusal, neglect, or any other reason, may result in additional disciplinary action, which may result in additional or increased sanctions, remedies, or other responsive interventions, up to and including suspension, expulsion, and/or termination from the University, and which may be noted in an individual's disciplinary or employment record.

A suspension will only be lifted when compliance with all sanctions is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the EDEC or designee, and may warrant informing complainants who have a continuing educational interest at Loyola of the respondent's status change as needed.

XII. Grievance Process Recordkeeping

As required by Title IX, the University will maintain for a period of seven years, records and accompanying rationale for any actions, including supportive measures, taken in response to a report or formal complaint of Title IX sexual harassment.

The University will also maintain for seven years: records of each investigation conducted in response to a formal complaint of Title IX sexual harassment (including any audio or audiovisual recording or transcript generated as part of the Grievance Process); any determination regarding responsibility; any sanctions imposed on the respondent; any remedies provided to the complainant; any appeal and the results therefrom; any alternative resolution and the results therefrom; and all training materials applicable to Title IX and/or the Grievance Process used to train the EDEC, deputy coordinators, investigators, hearing administrators, and any person who facilitates an alternative resolution process.

Training materials applicable to Title IX and/or the Grievance Process are also publicly available on the OEC website, at www.luc.edu/equity.

Approved and published on August 24, 2022.