

[REDACTED]

## Summary and Decision

### I. Date of Hearing

[REDACTED]

### II. Hearing Participants

#### Parties and Advisors

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- Mark Satawa, Respondent Advisor – Attorney

#### Hearing Decision Maker

- [REDACTED]

#### Hearing Coordinator

- [REDACTED]

### III. Allegations of Prohibited Conduct

This hearing was held to determine whether:

Respondent engaged in conduct that violated [REDACTED] Title IX Policy's prohibition against sex harassment or the [REDACTED] Equal Opportunity/Non-Discrimination Policy's prohibition against sex harassment.

[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

d. Conclusion

The evidence was insufficient to demonstrate a violation of sexual harassment under the Equal Opportunity/Non-Discrimination Policy definition. Because the definition of sexual harassment under the Equal Opportunity/Non-Discrimination Policy was not met, the definition of sexual harassment under the Title IX Policy (a higher standard) would also not be met, and further analysis is unnecessary.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]