**Investigation Report**

**Name of Investigator:** {Name}

**Date of Report:** {Date}

**Case #:** {Number}

**Background:**

This report addresses the allegations of a violation of {University’s Policy Name}. {Investigator Name, Title} conducted the investigation into these allegations pursuant to the procedures in {University’s Policy Name}. This investigation focused on a fair and impartial collection of all available evidence including, but not limited to, witness accounts and documents. The Complainant and the Respondent were provided with opportunities to offer evidence for inspection and review by the Investigator. Prior to completion and submission of this report, both parties and their advisors were afforded an equal opportunity to inspect and review all evidence obtained as part of the investigation that is directly related to the allegations in the Formal Complaint.

The parties were given {at least ten days} to review the evidence and submit a written response for consideration by the Investigator prior to the completion of this final report. Their responses were considered by the Investigator and are included in Appendix {cite}.

The final report was provided to the parties on {date} and the parties were given until {date} to respond. {Any responses provided by the parties will be included in the investigative file that will be provided to the Title IX Coordinator/Director of Student Conduct and the Decision Maker(s).} This final report is a summary of all relevant evidence collected and reviewed as a part of the investigation.

The final report includes only relevant evidence. “Relevant” evidence is evidence that tends to make an allegation more or less likely to be true. “Relevant” evidence does not include the following types of evidence and questions, which are deemed “irrelevant” at all stages of any process initiated under {University’s Policy Name}:

1. Evidence about the Complainant’s sexual predisposition or prior sexual behavior unless:
   1. It is offered to prove that someone other than the Respondent committed the conduct alleged by the Complainant, or
   2. It concerns specific incidents of the Complainant’s prior sexual behavior with respect to the Respondent and are offered to prove Consent.
2. Evidence that constitutes information protected under a legally-recognized privilege including attorney-client privilege; or
3. Any party’s medical, psychological, and similar records unless the party has given voluntary, written consent.

**Identification of Parties and Witnesses:**

{Name} is identified as the Complainant. {Add additional information/details as necessary to help establish the nature of the Complainant/Respondent relationship} *{A Complainant is defined in {University’s Policy Name} as an individual who has reported being or is alleged to be subjected to conduct that could constitute covered sexual misconduct as defined under this Policy. According to {University’s Policy Name}, if a Complainant does not wish to make a Formal Complaint, the Title IX Coordinator may determine a Formal Complaint is necessary. In this matter, the Title IX Coordinator elected to sign a Formal Complaint, and the Investigator proceeded with the investigation. The University informed the Complainant of this decision in writing, and the Complainant did not participate in the process further; however, the Complainant will receive all notices issued under {University’s Policy Name}.}*

{Name} is identified as the Respondent. {Add additional information/details as necessary to help establish the nature of the Complainant/Respondent relationship}

{Name} is Witness 1. {Add additional information/details as necessary to help establish the nature of the relationship to case}

{Name} is Witness 2. {Add additional information/details as necessary to help establish the nature of the relationship to case}

. . .

**Summary of Allegation(s):**

On {Date}, Complainant filed a Formal Complainant with {Office} according to {University’s Policy Name} naming Respondent. Complainant alleges {summary of facts}.

*Provide the factual background of the alleged sexual misconduct.*

**Jurisdiction:**

Under {University’s Policy Name}, the University prohibits all Sexual Misconduct Violations, both Regulatory and Non-Regulatory, as defined in the Policy. The University promptly and equitably responds to all reports of sexual misconduct in order to eliminate the misconduct, prevent its recurrence, and redress its effects on any individual or the community.

For alleged violations of Regulatory Prohibited Conduct as defined in {University’s Policy Name}, the following elements will be determined in the reasonable determination of the Title IX Coordinator:

* 1. The conduct is alleged to have occurred in the United States;
  2. The conduct is alleged to have occurred in the University’s Education Program or Activity; and
  3. The alleged conduct, if true, would constitute covered Regulatory Prohibited Conduct, as defined in this Policy.

If all of the elements are met, the University will investigate the allegations under the processes set forth in this Policy. If any one of these elements is not met, the Title IX Coordinator will notify the parties the specific allegation contained in the Formal Complaint does not meet the required jurisdictional requirements under the Final Rule and is being dismissed. Any Party may appeal a dismissal using the process set forth in the Appeals section below. However, dismissal of any violations constituting Regulatory Prohibited Conduct will not affect the University’s ability to proceed with an investigation of charges categorized as Non-Regulatory or other charges under {University’s Policy Name} or any other University Policy.

**Policies Implicated and Relevant Definitions:**

The investigation addressed alleged violations of {University’s Policy Name OR *Student Code of Conduct*}. The following specific violations are alleged:

1. {Alleged Violation 1—Provision of Policy/Code}: *Definition*
   1. *Element 1 of Violation*
   2. *Element 2 of Violation*
2. {Alleged Violation 2—Provision of Policy/Code}: *Definition*
   1. *Element 1 of Violation*
   2. *Element 2 of Violation*
3. {Alleged Violation 3—Provision of Policy/Code}: *Definition*
   1. *Element 1 of Violation*
   2. *Element 2 of Violation*

Other Relevant Definition:

1. *Include other relevant definitions from Policy or Student Code of Conduct (i.e. consent, incapacitation)*

**Standard of Proof:**

{*If Respondent is a student:* Consistent with requirements set forth in the Pennsylvania Code pertaining to student disciplinary due process requirements,} (T)he University will use the preponderance of the evidence standard in investigations of formal complaints alleging sexual misconduct violations under {University’s Policy Name}. This means that the {Hearing Board/Decision Maker(s)} must determine whether it is more likely than not that a violation of the Policy occurred.

**Timeline of Investigative Steps:**

Complainant initially reported this incident to {Office} on {Date}. Complainant filed a Formal Complaint with the {Title IX Coordinator} on {Date}. On {Date}, the Title IX Coordinator selected {Name} as Investigator. On {Date}, the Investigator began the investigation. The following list shows dates relevant to the investigation:

* {Interviewed Complainant} {Date}
* {Interviewed Respondent} {Date}
* . . .

The investigation was completed on {Date}. The parties and their advisors were given until {Date} to inspect and review the report and provide written responses to the report. The report was finalized on {Date}.

**Evidence:**

*List all other evidence considered in the investigation. May include text messages, emails, social media posts, videos, etc. Evidence may corroborate or contradict witness interviews.*

**Interviews:**

Summaries of each interview are presented below. All relevant items of evidence collected for this report are included as attachments.

Interview with Complainant

*Provide summary of Complainant interview*

Interview with Respondent

*Provide summary of Respondent interview*

Interview with Witness 1

*Provide summary of Witness 1 interview*

Interview with Witness 2

*Provide summary of Witness 2 interview*

. . .

**Undisputed Relevant Facts:**

For the purposes of this report, undisputed facts are facts either that all parties and witnesses agree on or those that are so clear based on evidence that they cannot be seriously disputed.

*List the facts that are not in dispute. These are facts that either all parties and witnesses agree on or those that are so clear based on evidence that they cannot seriously be disputed.*

*Examples may be the date of an incident; location of an incident; who was present and/or involved in the incident; etc.*

**Disputed Relevant Facts:**

For the purposes of this report, disputed facts are facts that parties and witnesses may disagree on. The Decision Maker(s) will make determinations about disputed facts.

*List the facts that are in dispute. These are facts that parties and witnesses may disagree on.*

*Examples may be whether or not a Complainant consented; intoxication of the parties; identity of the Respondent; etc.*

**Analysis:**

*In this section, apply relevant facts to each element of each alleged violation. Do not make credibility determinations, recommended findings, or determinations in your analysis. Those determinations are the responsibility of the Decision Maker(s).*

1. {Alleged Violation 1—Provision of Policy/Code}: *Definition*
   1. *Element 1 of Violation*
      1. *Undisputed facts that support Element 1*
      2. *Undisputed facts that do not support Element 1*
      3. *Disputed facts about Element 1*
   2. *Element 2 of Violation*
      1. *Undisputed facts that support Element 2*
      2. *Undisputed facts that do not support Element 2*
      3. *Disputed facts about Element 2*
2. {Alleged Violation 2—Provision of Policy/Code}: *Definition*
   1. *Element 1 of Violation*
      1. *Undisputed facts that support Element 1*
      2. *Undisputed facts that do not support Element 1*
      3. *Disputed facts about Element 1*
   2. *Element 2 of Violation*
      1. *Undisputed facts that support Element 2*
      2. *Undisputed facts that do not support Element 2*
      3. *Disputed facts about Element 2*
3. {Alleged Violation 3—Provision of Policy/Code}: *Definition*
   1. *Element 1 of Violation*
      1. *Undisputed facts that support Element 1*
      2. *Undisputed facts that do not support Element 1*
      3. *Disputed facts about Element 1*
   2. *Element 2 of Violation*
      1. *Undisputed facts that support Element 2*
      2. *Undisputed facts that do not support Element 2*
      3. *Disputed facts about Element 2*

**Summary:**

The Decision Maker(s) should view the case in its entirety and weigh the presented evidence and any evidence presented at a future hearing to determine if a policy violation occurred by a preponderance of the evidence.