

UNIVERSITY LETTERHEAD

NOTE: [Bracketed language is required]

HEARING PANEL DECISION

COMPLAINANT:  
RESPONDENT:  
DATE OF HEARING:

On DATE, a Hearing was held in accordance with Section 600.030 of the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations on a Formal Complaint filed by Complainant [NAME] (hereafter "Complainant"). Complainant has alleged that Respondent [NAME] (hereafter "Respondent") engaged in conduct constituting sexual harassment in an education program or activity in violation of Section 600.020 Sexual Harassment under Title IX of the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations. After consideration of the testimony and evidence presented, the Hearing Panel, by majority vote, [CHOOSE ONE: (determined by a preponderance of the evidence)(was not able to determine by a preponderance of the evidence)] that Respondent violated Section 600.020

The following interviews were conducted with Parties and Witnesses  
[Add from Investigative Report.]

The following Site Visits were made:  
[Add from Investigative Report.]

The following Methods were Used to Gather Other Evidence:  
[Add from Investigative Report.]

The following Hearing(s) were Held:  
[Date of Hearing(s).]

#### SECTION IV

##### FINDINGS OF FACT

In support of the determination set forth above, the Hearing Panel makes the following findings of fact:

#### SECTION V

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF sd1 (U)ID 18 >>BDC T\* ( )Tj EMC /P <</M m T\* ( 52

[LIST REMEDIAL ACTION(S) IMPOSED if any.]

## SECTION VIII OPTION TO APPEAL

Either Party may appeal this decision within five (5) business days of the date of delivery of this Decision. You may submit an appeal based on one or more of the following grounds:

- a) A procedural irregularity that affected the outcome (e.g., material deviation from established procedures, etc.);
- b) To consider 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;
- c) The Title IX Coordinator, Investigator(s), or decision-maker(s) had a conflict of interest or bias for – or against – Complainants or Respondents generally, or the individual Complainant or Respondent.