



SANGHAVI LAW OFFICE

SANGHAVI LAW OFFICE, LLC

Investigation Report: External Investigation of Historical Abuse

Interlochen Center for the Arts

Sanghavi Law Office, LLC

July 27, 2026

I. Introduction

Interlochen Center for the Arts (“Interlochen”) is a non-profit educational institution in northwest Michigan dedicated to arts education. Founded in 1928 as a summer music camp, Interlochen has grown into a multidisciplinary arts organization that includes a boarding high school (grades 9 to 12, plus post-graduate students), known as Interlochen Arts Academy (the “Academy”), and a summer program for students in grades 3 to 12, known as Interlochen Arts Camp (the “Camp”).¹ The Academy opened in 1962, and currently has approximately 580 students. Through its Camp and Academy programs, students study music, theatre, dance, visual arts, creative writing, film and new media, and interdisciplinary arts, as well as traditional academic topics. Interlochen’s alumni body, from both the Academy and the Camp, includes more than 116,000 former students or campers.² Interlochen also hosts visiting artists, concerts, and performances, and its students perform as part of national tours.

In September 2024, Interlochen and the Interlochen Board of Trustees engaged Sanghavi Law Office, LLC (“Sanghavi Law Office”) to conduct an external, neutral, and independent investigation into historical reports³ of sexual abuse by faculty and staff at Interlochen.⁴ The purpose of the investigation was to gather information about alumni experiences at Interlochen to help acknowledge Interlochen’s past, affirm the voices of those who have been impacted, and incorporate lessons learned to ensure that current and future students thrive in a safe and supportive environment. This investigation reflects significant engagement by both Interlochen leadership and Interlochen alums⁵ over the course of nearly two years.

Interlochen initially asked the investigative team from Sanghavi Law Office (the “Investigative Team”) to investigate reports from the 1960s and 1970s involving Respondent 1, a longtime arts faculty member and division director at the Academy, after an alum from the 1970s came forward to report her experience to Interlochen.⁶ In June 2025, Interlochen asked the Investigative Team to expand the scope of the investigation to include reports about sexual misconduct at the Academy by any faculty, staff, or other adult affiliated with Interlochen in any decade.⁷ The Investigative Team received information from alums of both the Academy and the

¹ This report refers to any program or session that occurred at Interlochen in the summer as the “Camp.”

² This report generally uses the term “student” to refer to both campers and students interchangeably.

³ This report refers to “historical reports,” as reports of conduct involving alums, not current students, and typically reflects the passage of time since the reported conduct.

⁴ This report refers to the individuals who were reported to have engaged in sexual misconduct as “Respondents.”

⁵ This report refers to individuals who attended the Camp and/or the Academy, regardless of whether they graduated, as alums. Although the term alum may be perceived as more informal than alumna/alumnus, it is gender neutral and its use allowed for a more readable identifier than the formal Latin. In addition, the report generally uses the term alums and alumni interchangeably to reflect the plural.

⁶ Respondent 1 is deceased, passing away prior to the start of this investigation.

⁷ For simplicity, this report uses the term “adult affiliated with Interlochen” to refer to any administrator, faculty member, staff member, trustee, donor, visiting artist, or any other adult at or otherwise affiliated with Interlochen. It does not include parents or guardians.

Camp.⁸ During the course of the expanded investigation, Interlochen asked the Investigative Team to further expand the scope of to include specific outreach to individuals who Interlochen believed might have information regarding Jeffrey Epstein (“Epstein”), a former donor to Interlochen.

The Investigative Team had no prior relationship with Interlochen. Interlochen cooperated with the requests by the Investigative Team for information and connections to individuals who may have relevant information, including alums, individuals who were reported to have engaged in misconduct, and current and former employees. Although Interlochen asked the Investigative Team to prioritize reports of sexual misconduct involving physical conduct and to complete this report during the summer of 2026,⁹ Interlochen otherwise took care to respect the Investigative Team’s investigative autonomy. The Investigative Team gathered the information and reached the observations in this report independently. Interlochen was readily available to the Investigative Team, communicated routinely, and actively assisted in the gathering of relevant records and information.

Trey Devey (“Devey”), President of Interlochen, and Interlochen’s Board of Trustees leadership jointly sent three community letters via email to the Academy community, including faculty, staff, current families, and Academy alums for whom the school had current contact information, to announce the external investigation and invite their participation in the investigation. The communications included an initial letter on June 13, 2025 (the “June 13 Letter”) informing alums of the investigation and that Sanghavi Law Office welcomed anyone with relevant information to come forward. Devey and Board Chair Barrett Rollins (“Rollins”) sent two additional updates on the investigation through community letters dated September 22, 2025 (the “September 22 Letter”) and January 5, 2026 (the “January 5 Letter”). The September 22 Letter reinforced that all alums, from any decade, were invited to participate and that the investigation was not limited to the 1960s and 1970s. In April 2026, at Interlochen’s request, the Investigative Team provided an update on the status of the investigation to the individuals who had participated in the investigation to date. Interlochen also created a dedicated webpage, [External Investigation into Historical Abuse](#), to ensure that information about the investigation was publicly available.¹⁰ In addition to these communications, there were multiple media accounts regarding this investigation, as well as Epstein’s former connection to Interlochen, in local and national media outlets, after which a number of alums directly contacted the Investigative Team to participate in the investigation.

Between September 2024 and July 2026, the Investigative Team engaged in a comprehensive process to seek and document reports of sexual abuse at Interlochen. A significant component of this investigation was receiving information through interviews with alums and other individuals

⁸ The term “alum” refers to individuals who were: 1) students at the Academy, including post-graduate students; 2) campers, including individuals who participated in the university division program; or 3) prospective students.

⁹ To the extent that there is additional information that emerges following the release of this report, or additional steps to complete based on information gathered to date, Interlochen has committed to having the Investigative Team continue additional work as needed.

¹⁰ Copies of the June 13 Letter, the September 22 Letter, and the January 5 Letter are available on Interlochen’s External Investigation into Historical Abuse webpage.

who reported experiencing or witnessing misconduct. The Investigative Team has chronicled the reports received in this report as they were reported to the Investigative Team. Importantly, the Investigative Team did not determine whether the conduct occurred as reported. Rather, the purpose of this investigation was to seek and document historical reports of abuse in a candid and comprehensive manner, to give voice to the experiences of alums, and to learn from those past experiences.

The Investigative Team conducted approximately 180 interviews by telephone, Zoom, or in person. In addition, some individuals provided detailed information in writing, either in addition to or in lieu of participating in an interview. Individuals who participated in interviews with the Investigative Team or who otherwise provided detailed information reported conduct of a sexual nature that the individuals themselves were subjected to, that they observed, or that they otherwise had knowledge of at the Academy or the Camp. The Investigative Team understands that there may be additional individuals who experienced harm who have not participated in the investigation to date. The Investigative Team's work will continue should additional individuals seek to participate.

The Investigative Team also conducted interviews with individuals who were reported to have engaged in misconduct, as well as with current and former employees to understand whether Interlochen had received notice of any of the reported incidents, and if so, how Interlochen responded. Although the Investigative Team chronicled the available information about institutional knowledge and response, it did not make findings as to the sufficiency, timeliness, or appropriateness of the response.

The Investigative Team also gathered information about current policies, procedures, and practices. This information is summarized in Section IX.

The reported conduct spanned from the 1950s through the 2010s. The majority of reports received referenced sexual misconduct occurring prior to 2000. Alums reported a range of behavior by adults affiliated with Interlochen, some of which included grooming, flirting, comments of a sexual nature, touching of a sexual nature, vaginal intercourse, anal intercourse, oral intercourse, and engaging in long-term "relationships."¹¹ Alums reported that this conduct occurred in a variety of locations on and off campus including, for example, in faculty houses (both when other students were present and when a student was alone with a faculty member), in on-campus buildings, in cars, while traveling for school-related trips, while traveling for non-school related trips, on a lake close to Interlochen, in on-campus bathrooms, and in residence hall rooms. Further, alums reported conduct by adults in various roles at Interlochen, including arts faculty members and academic teachers (including visiting instructors), residence life staff members, donors, trustees, and visitors who were present on Interlochen's campus. Many alums detailed the impact that this conduct had on them. Some shared that the impacts were significant and lasted well after they graduated from or otherwise left Interlochen. This impact is discussed in Section VII.

¹¹ Given the age differential between high school students and adult faculty or staff, the Investigative Team recognizes that conduct between a student and adult, even if described by an alum as consensual or as a relationship, is not appropriate in the educational context.

This report includes the following sections:

Section II:	Investigative Process
Section III:	Firsthand Accounts of Conduct by Respondent 1
Section IV:	Firsthand Accounts of Physical Conduct of a Sexual Nature by Other Adults Affiliated with Interlochen
Section V:	Firsthand Accounts of Conduct by Epstein
Section VI:	Firsthand Accounts of Non-Physical Conduct of a Sexual Nature by Adults Affiliated with Interlochen
Section VII:	Impacts of Reported Conduct
Section VIII:	Themes and Observations Related to Reported Conduct of a Sexual Nature
Section IX:	Current Protocols and Practices
Section X:	Conclusion, Including Thoughts by Alums Regarding What They Hope Will Come from Investigation

The information gathered during this investigation is, simply, devastating. Despite the deep and positive connections that many individuals expressed to the Investigative Team regarding Interlochen, some of these same individuals detailed the significant negative impact of the conduct that they reported. The Investigative Team acknowledges the emotional effort and toll it took for individuals to speak and write about this conduct. Without this engagement by so many individuals, this report and the lessons that Interlochen can learn from the information gathered would not be possible.

The Investigative Team acknowledges that given the content of this report, readers may find it emotionally taxing or otherwise difficult to process.

II. Investigative Process

The investigative process involved multiple steps including: the receipt of reports of sexual misconduct by adults affiliated with Interlochen; outreach to invite alums and their relatives, as appropriate to participate in interviews; gathering of information from interviews and written accounts shared with the Investigative Team; review of information from available student and personnel files; outreach to and interviews with individuals reported to have engaged in sexual misconduct; and outreach to and interviews with current or former Interlochen employees to gather available information about institutional knowledge and/or response.

A. Receipt of Reports of Sexual Misconduct by Adults Affiliated with Interlochen

The Investigative Team learned of reports of sexual misconduct by adults at Interlochen in various ways: 1) from Interlochen, if an individual reported directly to the school or if Interlochen otherwise became aware of reported conduct; 2) from individuals who reached out to the Investigative Team directly by email or telephone to report their own experience of sexual misconduct or share knowledge that an adult at Interlochen engaged in misconduct with others; 3) from individuals who Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted based on information provided by other individuals interviewed during this investigation; and 4) from existing

documentation, including personnel files, student files, and other information provided by Interlochen.

The Investigative Team received reports of sexual misconduct by adults affiliated with Interlochen from a variety of sources, including former students, former prospective students, current and former employees, family members of former students, and other individuals with information regarding sexual misconduct at Interlochen. Some concerns were raised anonymously.

B. Outreach

Some individuals contacted the Investigative Team directly by email or by telephone to report sexual misconduct by adults affiliated with Interlochen or to indicate that they wanted to speak with the Investigative Team. The Investigative Team responded to each outreach, inviting the individual to schedule an interview. In addition, the Investigative Team requested that Interlochen attempt to contact: 1) individuals who the Investigative Team learned were reported to have experienced sexual misconduct by adults affiliated with Interlochen;¹² 2) current or former employees who might have been aware of such conduct; and 3) adults who were reported to have engaged in such conduct. Interlochen sought to locate current contact information, either through its own records or through publicly accessible databases. For those the Investigative Team sought to interview, Devey contacted the alum, the current or former employee, or the Respondent to invite their participation.¹³ The Investigative Team then sent a follow-up email to the individual requesting to meet, unless the individual indicated to Interlochen that they did not wish to speak with the Investigative Team. If an individual did not respond to an initial request for an interview by Interlochen and the Investigative Team, the Investigative Team typically reached out a second time.

As noted above, Interlochen requested that the Investigative Team complete a written report by the summer of 2026, based on information gathered to date, to support Interlochen's stated goal to respond to concerns raised by alums in a timely manner. The Investigative Team has identified additional follow-up outreach and interviews to be conducted after completion of this report.

¹² This report references some alums who, based on information from interviews or file reviews, may have experienced abuse by adults at Interlochen but for whom the Investigative Team did not have the opportunity to interview based on one of the following reasons: 1) Interlochen could not reach out to the alum because it was unable to locate current contact information for the alum; 2) Interlochen could not reach out to the alum because neither Interlochen nor the Investigative Team could determine who the alum was; 3) Interlochen and the Investigative Team reached out to the alum, who did not respond or otherwise chose not to participate in the investigation; 4) a family member requested that the Investigative Team not reach out to the alum and the Investigative Team honored this request; 5) Interlochen did not conduct outreach because of its determination to prioritize interviews related to reports of sexual misconduct that involved any form of physical conduct; or 6) Interlochen did not conduct outreach to alums whose accounts were already documented in personnel files because of its determination to prioritize gathering information not previously known to the school. As noted in this report, at Interlochen's request, the Investigative Team will continue to gather and document relevant information received after the release of this report.

¹³ For some Respondents, in addition to email outreach, Interlochen also sought to contact them by certified mail; some of those letters were returned to Interlochen as undeliverable.

Interlochen and the Investigative Team also recognize that additional alums may choose to come forward following the release of this report. The Investigative Team will remain available to Interlochen to conduct any additional interviews and prepare a supplemental report, as needed.

C. Interviews and Review of Written Information

Most interviews were conducted via Zoom, although some were conducted by telephone or in person. Some individuals were interviewed multiple times. Some individuals who participated in interviews provided additional information to the Investigative Team through emails, as did other individuals who chose not to participate in interviews,¹⁴ and as noted above, some individuals shared information with Interlochen, which then shared it with the Investigative Team.

The Investigative Team conducted approximately 180 interviews.¹⁵ These interviews were with individuals who: 1) were alums, or others including relatives of alums, many of whom described experiencing, witnessing, or otherwise being aware of any form of sexual misconduct; 2) were current or former employees of Interlochen; or 3) were responding to allegations that they had engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with students. Those reporting misconduct included individuals with firsthand accounts and/or secondhand accounts of any form of sexual misconduct by an adult affiliated with Interlochen, including physical conduct, non-physical conduct, and/or potential grooming or other violations of professional boundaries. Some individuals reported multiple instances of sexual misconduct by multiple adults. In some instances, the same conduct was reported by multiple individuals. In many instances, the information was speculative and could not be confirmed, and in some instances of secondhand accounts, the Investigative Team made outreach and conducted interviews with alums others believed may have experienced abuse, but the alums themselves denied experiencing any abuse.

The Investigative Team received approximately 70 firsthand accounts¹⁶ that adults affiliated with Interlochen engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with them when they were students.¹⁷ The total number of Respondents reported to have engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with students was 47, with some Respondents reported to have engaged in conduct across decades. These numbers do not include the many additional accounts that the Investigative Team heard from individuals who described firsthand accounts of non-physical sexual misconduct, including grooming, comments of a sexual nature by adults, or feeling uncomfortable around

¹⁴ The Investigative Team recognizes that choosing to participate in any manner – including through an interview or the sharing of written information – in an investigation of this nature is a deeply personal decision.

¹⁵ The Investigative Team spoke with some individuals multiple times. The number of unique individuals who spoke to the Investigative Team at least one time was approximately 150, the majority being alums.

¹⁶ This number includes individuals who shared firsthand accounts of sexual misconduct via interviews with the Investigative Team, emails to the Investigative Team, emails to Interlochen, and/or during conversations with Devey.

¹⁷ If an individual shared that they experienced conduct of a sexual nature by multiple adults while at Interlochen, this investigation includes the conduct by each adult as a separate report.

certain adults. Information about this separate and broad range of conduct is included in Section VI.¹⁸

1. Alums or Others Including Relatives of Alums

The Investigative Team spoke with alums and other individuals who reported any form of sexual misconduct by adults affiliated with Interlochen. The Investigative Team followed consistent protocols to ensure that the interviewee was provided information about: 1) the purpose of the investigation; 2) how information disclosed in the interview would be shared, including that it would be shared with the Board and senior leadership, and that Interlochen then would decide whether and how to share the information more broadly; 3) information about privacy and confidentiality; 4) the availability of resources; and 5) addressing concerns about possible retaliation.¹⁹ In the April 2026 update regarding the investigation, the Investigative Team shared with participants information about privacy, and the contact information for local law enforcement should any individual wish to explore the availability of potential criminal action. The Investigative Team also engaged in communications with alums about questions that arose through the course of the investigation.

The Investigative Team asked each individual a range of questions seeking to understand whether they had firsthand information about adults engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with them and whether they were aware of any adults at Interlochen engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with others. The Investigative Team also asked questions about, or individuals otherwise shared information regarding individuals' connections to Interlochen, their perception about the culture of Interlochen, the context that they believed may have contributed to sexual misconduct, the impact of the sexual misconduct, reporting protocols, and what they would like to see come from this investigation.

2. Individuals Accused of Sexual Misconduct

The Investigative Team sought to interview each of the Respondents who were the subject of reports involving firsthand accounts of physical conduct of a sexual nature. Given the passage of the time, more than one third of the 47 Respondents identified in this report are deceased.²⁰

¹⁸ Some individuals reported student-on-student or employee-on-employee conduct. Although the Investigative Team received this information and recognizes that any form of sexual misconduct is harmful, student-on-student conduct and employee-on-employee conduct are outside the scope of the investigation and are not addressed in this report. In addition, some individuals reported conduct of a sexual nature by an adult affiliated with Interlochen towards an alum once the alum left Interlochen. Although generally this report does not include information regarding conduct that occurred after an alum left Interlochen, this report does include such information when relevant to conduct that reportedly began or occurred at Interlochen, either with the same or a different individual.

¹⁹ In addition, the Investigative Team informed all alums and others including relatives of alums of the availability of external law enforcement processes, with some individuals informed of this during interviews and others informed through email communication.

²⁰ This report indicates that a Respondent is deceased if either Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that an individual is deceased, or the Investigative Team reviewed publicly available obituaries regarding these individuals.

Interlochen, through an email communication from Devey, contacted Respondents to invite them to participate in the investigation and the Investigative Team emailed these Respondents to try to schedule interviews. As noted above, in many instances, for those whom Interlochen did not have current email contact information, Interlochen sent certified letters to the best known address to ensure that they had sufficient notice and the opportunity to participate in the investigation prior to the completion of the report. Four Respondents discussed in Section IV participated in interviews.

Respondents accused of sexual misconduct who agreed to speak with the Investigative Team each received information similar to that shared with alums who participated in interviews. Respondents were asked a variety of questions including, for example, whether they had engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any students. When the Investigative Team had permission to do so from the impacted individual, the Investigative Team directly asked about the reported incidents. Respondents also were asked about or otherwise discussed rules or policies related to adult/student relationships, being one-on-one with students, touching students, and off-campus interactions with students.

3. Current and Former Employees (Institutional Response)

The Investigative Team sought to interview current or former employees to inquire about Interlochen's institutional response in cases where alums reported that Interlochen may have been on notice of possible sexual misconduct by adults affiliated with Interlochen at or around the time of the reported conduct.²¹ The Investigative Team interviewed ten current or former employees regarding institutional response. In addition, some of the former employees who may have had relevant information are now deceased; in other instances, the former employees did not respond to outreach or otherwise chose not to participate in an interview. In addition to asking current and former employees questions about knowledge of specific incidents reported during this investigation, the Investigative Team asked them whether they were aware of any adults at Interlochen engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with students and if so, any actions taken by Interlochen in response to such conduct. The Investigative Team also asked these current or former employees about policies or rules related to adults' relationships and interactions with students, and reporting obligations for adults who became aware of conduct of a sexual nature by an adult towards a student.

D. File Reviews

The Investigative Team reviewed the personnel files, when available, of the former Interlochen employees who were reported to have engaged in sexual conduct with students. The Investigative Team conducted this file review to determine if these files provided additional, relevant information regarding possible sexual misconduct, whether Interlochen had notice of

²¹ None of the current or former employees who the Investigative Team interviewed were employed by Interlochen as administrators in the 1960s or 1970s. In addition, no current or former employees interviewed for this investigation worked at Interlochen in any capacity in the 1960s, and although one did work at Interlochen in the 1970s, this only was for one semester and was not in an administrator position. As a result, in Section IV, the sections on the 1960s and 1970s do not include information from any current or former employees.

such conduct, and, if so, what the institutional response was, if any. In addition, the Investigative Team reviewed information from student files, when available, of alums who reported that an adult at Interlochen engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with them, in order to gather any additional information regarding the reported conduct.

The Investigative Team reviewed dozens of files, and relevant information from the available files is included in this report. For some individuals, including donors, board members, visiting artists, and substitute teachers, Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it would not have maintained a personnel file as these individuals were not employees.²² In other instances, the alum did not know, or chose not to share, the name of the Respondent with the Investigative Team, which limited the ability to request any relevant personnel file. And in some instances, Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it no longer had access to a personnel file. The Investigative Team also was informed that Interlochen's current records retention policy requires that Interlochen maintain personnel files for seven years, and that some, but not all files from earlier than the seven-year retention period had been purged prior to the initiation of this investigation.

E. Privacy and Naming Conventions

The Investigative Team informed each alum with whom it spoke that in any public report for this investigation, the names and identifying information regarding individuals who met with the Investigative Team would be maintained as private. Of note, some individuals only agreed to participate in the investigation given the assurances that identifying information about them or their experience (such as dates when conduct occurred) would not be made public. The privacy of those who reported the conduct is paramount. In order to honor its commitment to maintain this privacy, the Investigative Team did not include details in summaries included in this report that could reasonably identify the impacted individual or other alums. As a result, in addition to using identifiers instead of alum names, the Investigative Team omitted: 1) references to specific dates; 2) alums' majors and minors; 3) references to certain locations, when appropriate; and 4) names and specific titles for adults at Interlochen, when appropriate.

Specific Dates: The Academy student population is relatively small, and, therefore, the Investigative Team determined that to maintain privacy, omitting specific dates of conduct or attendance was critical. As a result, the summaries contained in this report refer to decades rather than specific years. In some instances, particularly when summarizing Interlochen's response to any contemporaneous knowledge, simply referring to a decade was not sufficient, as the amount of time elapsed between the school's notice of conduct and its response was important to document. In those instances, the sections on Interlochen's notice and institutional response summarize, when available, the time that elapsed between notice of conduct and the response, if any, by Interlochen. The Investigative Team recognizes that referencing dates in this manner, rather than simply including actual dates, can make reading the summaries more cumbersome. Given the privacy priorities outlined above, the privacy considerations outweighed concerns regarding the readability of this report.

²² Interlochen did provide available information related to Epstein, Respondent 19, and Respondent 23.

Alums' Majors and Minors: Students at the Academy and the Camp majored and minored in specific areas, such as a specific instrument, theatre, or creative writing, and, depending on the department or division, the number of students in each department or division could be quite small. As a result, this report does not include alums' majors or minors, as doing so could provide the reader with identifying information.

Locations: As certain locations of alleged conduct might identify an alum's major or minor or school activities, the Investigative Team, when appropriate to maintain privacy, removed references to specific locations and used more generic descriptions. Similarly, to protect privacy, the Investigative Team removed references to the location of trips with or to visit an adult affiliated with Interlochen.

Names and Positions of Respondents and Other Adults at Interlochen: For the same reason that the report does not note alums' majors and minors, the Investigative Team, did not provide names or exact positions (e.g., cello teacher, dance teacher, drama teacher) of a Respondent, but rather used the following general terms:

- *Arts Faculty Member:* This refers to any teacher who taught in one of Interlochen's seven Arts Divisions: Music, Dance, Visual Arts, Film and New Media, Creative Writing, Theatre (including Design and Production), and Interdisciplinary Arts. This category also refers to any adult who was a technical teacher, and any adult who directed plays or performance groups such as chorus, band, orchestra, or theatre productions.
- *Academic Teacher:* This refers to any teacher who taught in a traditionally academic department such as history, math, or science.
- *Division Director:* This category refers to any individual who was the chair or head of a department. Interlochen has a Division Director for Academics, Music, Dance, Visual Arts, Film and New Media, Creative Writing, Theatre, and Interdisciplinary Arts.
- *Residence Life Staff Member:* This category refers to anyone whose primary position was related to assisting students in the dorms.
- *Administrator*
- *Board Member or Trustee*
- *Donor*
- *Camp Counselor*
- *Staff Member*

The Investigative Team recognizes that including some of these specific details in individual summaries could help explain the context in which the conduct described occurred. However, in the interest of maintaining privacy, the Investigative Team did not include these details in the summaries, but did consider this information and included it in the discussion of themes and observations, included separately in Section VIII.

III. Firsthand Accounts of Conduct by Respondent 1

As noted in Section I, Interlochen initially asked the Investigative Team to investigate reports involving Respondent 1. This section includes a summary of information provided by alums who reported firsthand accounts that Respondent 1 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them.

Respondent 1 worked at the Academy from the 1960s to the 2010s in various positions, including as an arts faculty member and division director. Five alums reported to the Investigative Team or Interlochen that Respondent 1 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them when they were students; one alum reported that the conduct occurred in the 1960s and four alums reported that the conduct occurred in the 1970s. In addition, two alums reported that Respondent 1 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them only after they had graduated from the Academy.

A. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 1

1. Alum 1

Alum 1 reported that Respondent 1 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1960s. She stated that Respondent 1 was her teacher. Alum 1 stated that Respondent 1 drove her to Traverse City, and that on the 30-minute ride back to Interlochen, Respondent 1 held her hand the entire time. Alum 1 stated that she “sat there frozen” and did not know what to do. Alum 1 stated that after this incident, she acted like it never happened, and that she and Respondent 1 continued to be friendly.

2. Alum 2

Alum 2 indicated that Respondent 1 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s. She stated that Respondent 1 was her teacher. Alum 2 said that Respondent 1 spent a lot of time with her and left a lot of notes for her. Alum 2 said she recalled one note from Respondent 1 that said, “When do we get started?” Alum 2 said that Respondent 1 took her places in his car, including restaurants and places where alcohol was served, and that he purchased alcohol for her. Alum 2 stated that Respondent 1 held her hand when they were driving together. Alum 2 said she went to Respondent 1’s house for a sleepover with other people and that after everyone else went to bed, she was on a couch and Respondent 1 gave her a back rub while she was wearing a “flimsy” nightgown. Alum 2 stated that she also went to Respondent 1’s house multiple times with no one else present, and that they cuddled in bed and there was “kissing and fondling and so forth.” Alum 2 stated that Respondent 1’s conduct towards her slowly progressed and that Respondent 1 performed oral sex on her and digitally penetrated her.

Another alum provided corroborative information.

3. Alum 3

Alum 3 stated that when she was a student, Respondent 1 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her, and that he did so at his house and in his office. Alum 3 stated that probably her first time being touched sexually occurred at Respondent 1’s house. Alum 3 said that on this occasion, Respondent 1 touched her back and the top of her buttocks under her clothes. Alum 3 stated that when she was at Respondent 1’s house and during rehearsals, she was always violated as Respondent 1 would breathe on her and touch her. Alum 3 indicated that one night while at Respondent 1’s home, she woke up to him kissing her, touching her breasts, and removing her shirt. Alum 3 stated that the following year, Respondent 1 progressed to touching her “down

there,” and finger penetration. Alum 3 stated that she spent a long period of time with him at his house one-on-one. Alum 3 indicated that the night after her graduation, she was at Respondent 1’s house, and he instructed her how to perform oral sex on him, explained to her what an orgasm was, and penetrated her with his finger. Alum 3 stated that Respondent 1’s conduct towards Alum 3 continued after Alum 3 left the Academy.

Two alums provided corroborative information.

4. Alum 4

Alum 4 indicated that Respondent 1 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s. Alum 4 indicated that Respondent 1 coached her. Alum 4 indicated that over time, Respondent 1 “pushed the relationship to social interactions such as dinners out, day trips, visits to his home and ultimately to sexual exploitation.” Alum 4 indicated that over multiple years, Respondent 1 engaged in hugging, kissing, fondling of her breasts and genitals, penetrating her vaginally,²³ and receiving and giving oral sex. Alum 4 indicated that Respondent 1’s conduct toward her took place in his parked car in remote locations, at a house Respondent 1 rented, and once at a faculty member’s house owned by Interlochen. Alum 4 indicated that Respondent 1’s conduct toward her continued after she graduated from the Academy.

Three alums provided corroborative information.

5. Alum 5

Alum 5 indicated that Respondent 1 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s. Alum 5 stated that at some point, Respondent 1 heard her play an instrument and lavished praise on her about her playing. Alum 5 stated that when Respondent 1 gave her this praise, he stood close to her and gazed into her eyes. Alum 5 stated that she developed a crush on Respondent 1 and was convinced that Respondent 1 was in love with her. Alum 5 said that she and Respondent 1 arranged to meet up and that they were in his car drinking and driving around campus. Alum 5 stated that during this encounter, Respondent 1 unzipped his pants, exposed himself to Alum 5, and asked her to touch him. Alum 5 stated that she said, “No, no.” Alum 5 stated that Respondent 1 said, “What did you expect to happen tonight?” and then he told her to get out of his car. Alum 5 said that she “remembered that things were spinning,” she felt “more than a buzz,” and she wondered whether the beer was drugged. Alum 5 stated that after this encounter, she saw Respondent 1 around, but did not know if she had any other interactions with him.

6. Alum 6

Alum 6, who attended Interlochen in the 1960s, said that she, along with other students, ate lunch with Respondent 1 in the cafeteria. Alum 6 indicated that she did not recall Respondent 1 acting inappropriately towards her or kissing her while she was at Interlochen. Alum 6 noted that after she graduated from the Academy, she and Respondent 1 kept in touch, and they began a sexual relationship when she was in college.

²³ Alum 4 indicated that when she was a student, Respondent 1 did not vaginally penetrate her with his penis.

7. Alum 7

Alum 7, who graduated in the 1970s, said that after graduation, she and Respondent 1 both were involved in a program out-of-state, and Respondent 1 offered to drive Alum 7 to the program. Alum 7 said that during the drive, Respondent 1 “came on to her and exposed himself,” that she “rebuffed” him, and that Respondent 1 did not continue to force himself on her.

B. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 1

Respondent 1 is deceased.

C. Interlochen Notice and Response

1. Information from Alums

Alum 1: Alum 1 indicated that she did not tell anyone about Respondent 1’s conduct towards her, and that she doubted any adult at Interlochen was aware of this conduct.

Alum 2: Alum 2 stated that people had to have known about Respondent 1’s relationship with her, stating that although there were sign-in and sign-out procedures, “[w]here did they think [she] was?” when she slept over at Respondent 1’s house.

Alum 3: Alum 3 indicated that she thought that Staff Member 1, the residence life staff member who was in charge of sign in and sign out at Alum 3’s dorm, knew about Respondent 1’s relationship with Alum 3, because Staff Member 1 would have had to sign Alum 3 out when she spent the night at Respondent 1’s house and when she went to dinner with him. Alum 3 noted that there were times when she was not back by the evening sign in, or when she did not bother to tell Staff Member 1 that Alum 3 was not coming back. Alum 3 said that Staff Member 1 once took Alum 3 to the side and gave her “some word of caution.”

Alum 4: Alum 4 indicated that she was unsure whether any adults at Interlochen were aware of Respondent 1’s conduct towards her while she was at the Academy. Alum 4 indicated that Staff Member 1 thought that Respondent 1 should not check students out of the dorm to stay at his house overnight, but that Alum 4 did not think that Staff Member 1 could stop Respondent 1 from doing so. Alum 4 indicated that she thought that Staff Member 2 also knew about Respondent 1’s relationship with Alum 4, but probably not until after Alum 4 had graduated from the Academy.

Alum 5: Alum 5 indicated that at the time, she did not tell anyone about Respondent 1’s conduct towards her, and did not have reason to believe that any adult at Interlochen was aware of this conduct.

2. Information from Interlochen

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it no longer had a personnel file for Respondent 1.

Interlochen provided the Investigative Team with correspondence reflecting that in April 2024, an alum discussed above contacted Interlochen by email, reporting Respondent 1's conduct towards her. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that after additional correspondence, the President and Board of Trustees initiated this external investigation.

IV. Firsthand Accounts of Physical Conduct of a Sexual Nature by Other Adults Affiliated with Interlochen

This section includes a summary of information provided by alums who shared with the Investigative Team their firsthand accounts that an adult affiliated with Interlochen engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with them.^{24,25} Section V provides firsthand accounts shared with the Investigative Team regarding conduct of a sexual nature by Epstein. Section VI provides firsthand accounts of non-physical conduct of a sexual nature.

This section is organized, generally, by decade, and each decade includes summaries of information received about Respondents who reportedly engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature during that decade. Some Respondents reportedly engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with multiple students across more than one decade. Those Respondents are listed under the decade when the first instance of alleged misconduct occurred, and the summary includes all subsequent reported conduct in that same section regardless of the decade in which the conduct was reported to have occurred.

The summaries for each Respondent in this section include information regarding: 1) the firsthand accounts reporting that the Respondent engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with an alum or alums; 2) outreach to and any information provided by the Respondent; and 3) information from Interlochen, including from personnel files and other documentation provided by Interlochen, and in some instances, information from current or former employees who participated in interviews with the Investigative Team. As noted above, the Investigative Team did not make findings of fact regarding whether or not the conduct occurred as reported, and also

²⁴ This section includes firsthand accounts of physical conduct of a sexual nature except for those accounts in Section III regarding Respondent 1 and in Section V regarding Epstein.

²⁵ The firsthand accounts summarized in this section include information provided by alums in interviews and written correspondence with the Investigative Team and/or Interlochen, or documented in personnel files or other Interlochen records. If an alum provided a firsthand account and other alums or relatives with whom the Investigative Team spoke were informed or otherwise were aware of this conduct at the time, this report references this corroborative information. Note that in the absence of a firsthand account, this section does not include information that comes only from secondhand accounts. Based on secondhand accounts, the Investigative Team sought to identify individuals referenced in those accounts who may have experienced sexual misconduct, but was not always able to do so. In some instances, the individual who was the subject of a secondhand report denied experiencing the reported sexual misconduct.

did not make findings about Interlochen's institutional response. Instead, the Investigative Team sought to include robust summaries of the information gathered in the investigation.

Alleged Conduct Starting in the 1960s

This section includes 7 firsthand reports of physical conduct of a sexual nature involving 5 separate Respondents.²⁶

A. Respondent 2

Respondent 2 was an arts faculty member at the Camp and the Academy in the 1960s and 1970s. One alum reported that Respondent 2 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1960s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 2

Alum 8 said that Respondent 2 was her arts faculty member at the Camp. Alum 8 reported that Respondent 2 made "all kinds of innuendoes" towards her during a party at the Camp, tried to flatter her and get in her good graces, and commented on how beautiful she was. Alum 8 stated that at the same party, Respondent 2 pinned her against the wall and French kissed her. Alum 8 stated that while she was pinned against the wall, Respondent 2 was pressed against her, and she could feel that he had an erection. Alum 8 stated that she had to "wriggle" away from Respondent 2.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 2

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 2 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 2 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 8 indicated that she doubted that any adults were aware of Respondent 2's conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 2's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 2 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

²⁶ Because of nature of information provided to the Investigative Team, and of the passage of time and its effect on memory including details such as dates, arriving at specific counts is more of an art than a science. The Investigative Team made reasonable efforts, even when, for example, specific dates were not provided, to correctly categorize reports.

B. Respondent 3

Respondent 3 was an academic teacher at the Academy in the 1960s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 3 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him in the 1960s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 3

Alum 9 stated that Respondent 3 was Alum 9's teacher. Alum 9 stated that Respondent 3 showed interest in Alum 9, praised his work, and invited him to Respondent 3's house for dinner, which Alum 9 said he thought was cool because a teacher was showing interest in him. Alum 9 stated that on one occasion, when other students were not on campus, he stayed at Respondent 3's house for the weekend. Alum 9 stated that during this weekend, Respondent 3 encouraged Alum 9 to be naked so that Respondent 3 could do a sculpture of Alum 9, and that he complied. Alum 9 stated that when Respondent 3 was done with the sculpture, he touched Alum 9, that this felt weird, and that he told Respondent 3 this. Alum 9 stated that when he stayed overnight at Respondent 3's house, they slept in the same bed where Respondent 3 asked Alum 9 to touch Respondent 3's penis, which Alum 9 indicated he did not think he did. Alum 9 indicated that Respondent 3 touched Alum 9's penis each time they were in bed together.

Alum 9 stated that Respondent 3, in the summer, took Alum 9 on a trip. Alum 9 stated that during this trip, he and Respondent 3 stayed in a hotel and shared a bed, and that Respondent 3 asked Alum 9 to touch Respondent 3's penis, and touched Alum 9's penis.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 3

Respondent 3 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 9 indicated that he did not tell anyone at Interlochen about Respondent 3's conduct towards him and he did not think that any adult at Interlochen was aware of Respondent 3's conduct towards him.

Another alum, who was a student at the Academy at the same time, told the Investigative Team that Respondent 3 was let go in the middle of the year because he was "coming on" to some of the male students.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 3's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 3 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

C. Respondent 4

Respondent 4 held various positions at the Academy, including but not limited to, arts faculty member and division director at various times in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1990s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 4 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1960s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 4

Alum 10 stated that she went to Respondent 4's on-campus house to assist Respondent 4 with organizing some items, and that they became friends. Alum 10 also stated that she went to Respondent 4 for help with an assignment, and that he kissed her in his basement. Alum 10 said that she went to his house multiple times after that, that they kissed, and that "eventually" Respondent 4 engaged in sexual intercourse with her on multiple occasions at his house.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 4

Respondent 4 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 10 indicated that she did not think anyone was aware that she went to Respondent 4's house or that any adults were aware of Respondent 4's conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 4's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 4 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

D. Respondent 5

Respondent 5 was a staff member at the Camp during the 1960s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 5 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1960s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 5

Alum 11 said that when she was at the Camp, Respondent 5 asked her out on a date, took her to his apartment, and then tried to take Alum 11's clothes off. Alum 11 stated that Respondent 5 "got aggressive," undid her bra, kept putting his hands on her breasts, took off her dress, and wanted to remove her girdle but that she told him not to and he did not. Alum 11 said that she dressed herself and asked Respondent 5 to take her home.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 5

Alum 11 stated that she did not know Respondent 5's last name. The Investigative Team attempted to identify this individual given the information provided by Alum 11, but was unable to do so, and, as a result could not contact him.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 11 indicated that she did not share information about Respondent 5's conduct towards her with anyone.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 5, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 5.

E. Respondent 6

Respondent 6 was an arts faculty member at the Camp beginning in the 1950s and at the Academy from the 1960s to the 1980s. Three alums reported conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 6; one alum reported that the conduct occurred in the 1960s and two alums reported that the conduct occurred in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 6

a. Alum 12

Alum 12 stated that Respondent 6, on at least two occasions in the 1960s, at least one of which was in a practice room, touched her breasts without asking her permission. Alum 12 said that Respondent 6, when touching her, used the excuse that he was trying to show Alum 12 where her diaphragm was located.

b. Alum 13

Alum 13 stated that on one occasion in the 1970s, Respondent 6 was teaching her how to drive, they stopped somewhere, and he kissed her on the mouth. She stated that Respondent 6 said "some dumb thing like, 'I shouldn't be doing this,' or 'This is wrong,' or, 'This never happened.'" Alum 13 indicated that after this incident, Respondent 6 kissed her maybe once or twice more.

Three alums provided corroborative information.

c. Alum 14

Alum 14 indicated that Respondent 6 was assigned as her teacher in the 1970s. Alum 14 stated that during her first lesson, Respondent 6 had her lie down on the floor. Alum 14 stated that Respondent 6 was trying to flirt, that his hand was on her stomach over her clothes, and that he moved it a little to her upper diaphragm.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 6

Respondent 6 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 12: Alum 12 indicated that while at Interlochen, she did not speak with anyone about her experience with Respondent 6 and that she did not have reason to believe that any adult was aware of Respondent 6's conduct towards her.

Alum 13: Alum 13 stated that she did not think that adults at Interlochen knew that Respondent 6 had kissed her, unless he told them.

Alum 14: Alum 14 stated that after her interaction with Respondent 6, she subsequently asked someone in administration for a different teacher. Alum 14 noted that the person in administration asked her what had happened, and that Alum 14 did not tell them. Alum 14 indicated that she did not think that she talked to anyone about what happened with Respondent 6 and that she did not think any adult was aware of Respondent 6's conduct.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 6's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 6 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

Alleged Conduct Starting in the 1970s

This section includes 20 firsthand reports of physical conduct of a sexual nature involving 13 separate Respondents.

A. Respondent 7

Respondent 7 was an arts faculty member at the Camp. One alum reported that Respondent 7 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 7

Alum 15 stated that while she was at the Camp, Respondent 7 tried to kiss her on two occasions. She stated that he tried to kiss her one time during a day trip. Alum 15 said that on another occasion, Respondent 7 tried to kiss her on campus, that Alum 15 told him, ““You are not supposed to do that,”” and that Respondent 7 responded, ““You are irresistible.”” Alum 15 stated that she ran off.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 7

Interlochen was not able to identify current contact information for Respondent 7, and therefore could not conduct outreach to him.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 15 stated that she did not tell anyone “official” at Interlochen about Respondent 7’s conduct.

b. Information from Interlochen

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it no longer had a personnel file for Respondent 7.

B. Respondent 8

Respondent 8 worked as both an academic teacher and an administrator at the Academy from the 1960s to the 1980s. He held additional positions in the 1990s and 2000s. Respondent 8 also worked at the Camp. Four alums reported that Respondent 8 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them at the Academy in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 8

a. Alum 16

Alum 16 stated that one time she was at Respondent 8’s house with other students, and that at one point during this visit, she and Respondent 8 were alone in the basement. Alum 16 said that she was lying on the floor behind furniture and that Respondent 8 gave her a back rub. Alum 16 stated that Respondent 8 rolled her over, and that Respondent 8’s hands were under her shirt, on the outside of her bra, touching her breasts. Alum 16 stated that Respondent 8 was caressing her lower body and was “going down her belly,” noting that he did not get into her pants. Alum 16 stated that she “wiggled away,” made an excuse to leave the basement, and the interaction with Respondent 8 then ended.

Another alum provided corroborative information.

b. Alum 17

Alum 17 stated that Respondent 8 called Alum 17 sometimes to ask if she wanted to go for a walk in the woods or for a drive. Alum 17 stated that Respondent 8 invited her and another student, to go camping with him. Alum 17 stated that on that trip, Respondent 8 was in the middle of the two girls in the tent, asked Alum 17 if she wanted a backrub and then gave her one. Alum 17 stated that Respondent 8 may have given the other student a backrub before he gave Alum 17 one. Alum 17 stated that many months later, she and Respondent 8 went for a walk in the dark, sat by a brook, and talked for an hour. Alum 17 stated that Respondent 8 signed her back into her dorm at approximately 10:30 p.m. or 11:00 p.m., and that Staff Member 1 was irritated.

Alum 17 stated that later in that same academic year, Respondent 8 asked her to camp in his backyard with another student, and that when she went to his backyard, the other student was not there. Alum 17 stated that as she was sleeping on her stomach, Respondent 8 put his hands down her pants and massaged her buttocks under her clothes. Alum 17 stated that she moved around a little and Respondent 8 immediately removed his hand.

c. Alum 18

Alum 18 stated that she was assigned to Respondent 8's faculty group, and that on one occasion, she told Respondent 8 that she missed having a bathtub, and that Respondent 8 offered his tub for her to use. Alum 18 said that she went to Respondent 8's house to use the tub. Alum 18 said that after she had removed her clothes and went into the tub without the curtain drawn, Respondent 8 came into the bathroom and offered her magazines. Alum 18 stated that Respondent 8 could see her whole body. Alum 18 stated that she told Respondent 8, "No, thank you," pulled the curtain, got up, and went home.

Alum 18 said that on a second occasion, Respondent 8 had her come to his office, and he closed and locked the door. She stated that when she was in Respondent 8's office, he turned off the lights and asked her for a back rub, which Alum 18 declined to do.

Alum 18 said that on a third occasion, Respondent 8 asked her to come with him to his office, where he offered her a backrub and she said no thank you. Alum 18 also stated that Respondent 8 asked for a backrub and said they should go downstairs. Alum 18 stated that Respondent 8 then took her to the basement, locked the door, laid down on the table, unzipped his pants, and said, "Rub where it feels good." Alum 18 said that she was "aghast," turned around, unlocked the door, and walked out.

d. Alum 19²⁷

Alum 19 said that she went on a camping trip with Respondent 8, other students, and another teacher. Alum 19 stated that during this trip, she told Respondent 8 she was cold, and that Respondent 8 then either strongly encouraged her to get into his sleeping bag or said that he would get into her sleeping bag. Alum 19 stated that she and Respondent 8 wound up in the same sleeping bag, which made her feel awkward and strange. Alum 19 stated that she fell asleep in the sleeping bag, and when she woke up, Respondent 8 was gone. Alum 19 said that she did not remember what happened when she was in the sleeping bag with Respondent 8.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 8

Respondent 8 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 16: Alum 16 indicated that while she was at Interlochen, she did not tell anyone about Respondent 8's conduct, and that she did not think any adult was aware of Respondent 8's conduct towards her.

Alum 17: Alum 17 stated that after the nighttime walk with Respondent 8 and after the camping with Respondent 8 in his backyard occurred, Staff Member 1 seemed concerned and asked Alum 17 whether everything was okay. Alum 17 said that she told the staff member that she was fine. Alum 17 said that she did not know if anyone at Interlochen was aware of Respondent 8's conduct towards her.

Alum 18: Alum 18 said that she told a staff member about Respondent 8's conduct, but did not recall whether she told him while she was at Interlochen, or after she left.

Alum 19: Alum 19 indicated that at the time, she did not tell anyone at Interlochen about Respondent 8's conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 8's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was contemporaneously on notice that Respondent 8 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. Interlochen provided the Investigative Team information reflecting that decades after Respondent 8's departure from Interlochen in the 1980s, Alum 18 wrote a letter to Administrator 1 in the 2000s in which she described Respondent 8's conduct towards her when she was a student.

²⁷ Alum 19 did not indicate that Respondent 8 engaged in physical conduct with her, but given the typical size of a sleeping bag, the Investigative Team reasonably understood that physical conduct, whether sexual or not, occurred.

C. Respondent 9

Respondent 9 was an arts faculty member at the Academy in the 1970s. One alum reported that Respondent 9 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 9

Alum 20 stated that Respondent 9 filled in for her regular arts faculty member. Alum 20 stated that during her one lesson with Respondent 9, Respondent 9 pushed his chair right next to Alum 20, put his hand just above her knee and slid his hand up her thigh over her clothing.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 9

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 9 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 9 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 20 stated that her regular arts faculty member came back the week after Alum 20's lesson with Respondent 9, that Alum 20 told him about Respondent 9's conduct towards her, that her teacher's face was "all fury," and that she never saw Respondent 9 again.

b. Information from Interlochen

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it did not have a personnel file for Respondent 9.

D. Respondent 10

Respondent 10 was a residence life staff member at the Academy and worked at the Camp in the 1970s. Two alums reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 10 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 10

a. Alum 21

Alum 21 said that she wrote a poem for class thanking Respondent 10 for a favor he had done for her and another student, and that she gave him a copy of the poem. She stated that at some point after this, Respondent 10 hugged her very close from behind, and thanked her for either the poem or for organizing something in his room, which she said was creepy. Alum 21 stated that after this, during many different incidents in Alum 21's dorm room, Respondent 10 kissed her, put his mouth on her breast, fondled her breasts and between her legs and probably her buttocks, and penetrated her vagina with his fingers. Alum 21 said that on another occasion, when Respondent

10 was in her room, he was on top of her and she said, “No, don’t do that,” and that Respondent 10 penetrated her vagina with his penis without using a condom. Alum 21 stated that she made a big cough, and that Respondent 10 covered her mouth with his hand and told her to be quiet. Alum 21 said that after that incident, Respondent 10 came to her room multiple times to have sex with her. She also stated that Respondent 10 asked her to perform oral sex and she did so multiple times. Alum 21 stated that Respondent 10’s relationship with her resumed after her time at Interlochen.

Three alums provided corroborative information.

b. Alum 22

Alum 22 stated that Respondent 10 invited her and other students to his room and gave them backrubs. Alum 22 stated that Respondent 10 gave her a backrub in his room five to ten times. Alum 22 stated that Respondent 10 had Alum 22 unhook her bra and gave her backrubs under her shirt. Alum 22 stated that during the backrubs, she was lying down and Respondent 10 was straddling her back in a more intimate way than a masseuse would. Alum 22 stated that sometimes during the backrub, Respondent 10’s hands went to the upper sides of her back and brushed the sides of her breasts.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 10

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 10 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 10 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 21: Alum 21 said that Staff Member 2 knew that Respondent 10 was going into Alum 21’s room. Alum 21 stated that the staff member called Respondent 10 and Alum 21 into the staff member’s room and said, “I presume this is just a brother sister thing.”

Alum 21 also stated that Interlochen was aware of Respondent 10’s conduct, as Respondent 10 told her that an administrator, Administrator 2, said to Respondent 10, “Try not to get involved with any students.” Alum 21 also said that she tried to tell several adults at Interlochen about Respondent 10’s conduct towards her. She said that she tried talking to a residence life staff member,²⁸ and that the residence life staff member acted “very weird.” She also stated that she tried to talk to an academic teacher at his house, and that she cried and cried, and did not remember what she told him. Alum 21 stated that she tried to talk to an arts faculty member about Respondent 10’s conduct towards her, but that the teacher was inebriated and talked about his family, and that she did not bring up the topic of Respondent 10. With regard to trying to talk to these three adults at Interlochen about Respondent 10, Alum 21 stated, “Three strikes, you’re out.”

²⁸ Alum 21 indicated that she did not remember the name of this residence life staff member.

Alum 22: Alum 22 indicated that she did not talk to an adult about Respondent 10's conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 10's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 10 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

Alum 21's student file reflected that in the 2000s, Alum 21 wrote a letter to Administrator 1, detailing Respondent 10's conduct toward her. Administrator 1 did not provide any information to the Investigative Team reflecting that he had been previously aware of any reports that Respondent 10 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

E. Respondent 11

Respondent 11 held various positions at the Camp and/or the Academy from the 1950s to the 2000s, including as an arts faculty member. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 11 engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with him in the 1970s.²⁹

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 11

Alum 24 stated that during lessons with Respondent 11, Respondent 11 kept the beat initially by tapping Alum 24's shoulder, and then Respondent 11 progressed to keeping the beat by tapping Alum 24's chest, the upper part of Alum 24's leg, Alum 24's inner thigh, and between Alum 24's legs on his genitals. Alum 24 said that this progression occurred over the span of three months.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 11

Respondent 11 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 24: Alum 24 indicated that he never talked with anyone at Interlochen about Respondent 11's conduct towards him and that he did not think any adult was aware of Respondent 11's conduct towards him.

Alum 23: Alum 23 stated that multiple adults at Interlochen were aware that he was spending time with Respondent 11, including at Respondent 11's house.

²⁹ In addition, another alum, Alum 23, indicated that in the 1990s, Respondent 11 engaged in multiple instances of conduct towards Alum 23 that were "borderline" grooming, including giving him alcohol at Respondent 11's house to the point where Alum 23 was intoxicated, having Alum 23 over to Respondent 11's home alone multiple times to eat and drink, and having Alum 23 sleepover at Respondent 11's house (in a separate room from Respondent 11).

b. Information from Interlochen

A former faculty member stated that in the 1990s, she sent a letter to Interlochen and told other teachers about concerns related to Respondent 11's conduct towards students.

Respondent 11's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 11 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

F. Respondent 12

Respondent 12 was a residence life staff member in the 1970s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 12 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 12

Alum 25 stated that one time she was standing with Respondent 12 in a boy's dorm room, and that she and Respondent 12 had their arms around each other. Alum 25 stated that she was wearing a raincoat, and that Respondent 12 put his arms inside her raincoat as they were talking. She stated that Respondent 12 slid his hand down into her pants and then put his hands under her underwear, touched her buttocks, and fondled her vagina. Alum 25 said that the next thing she remembered was that she was in Respondent 12's room, on his bed, with the door closed. She stated that while in his room, Respondent 12 was lying on his back, and she touched his penis.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 12

Interlochen was not able to locate Respondent 12 in any internal records or databases, and therefore could not conduct outreach to him.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 25 indicated that at the time, she did not tell anyone about Respondent 12's conduct towards her and did not have any reason to believe that any adults were aware of Respondent 12's conduct towards her. Alum 25 said that in the 1990s she wrote a letter to Interlochen, probably writing that something sexually inappropriate happened. She stated that Interlochen responded, acknowledging Alum 25's pain and the impropriety of the situation, and informing her that the institution did not approve of the incident and was trying to make Interlochen a safe place for students. Alum 25 stated that she was satisfied with Interlochen's response.

b. Information from Interlochen

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it had no records related to Respondent 12.

G. Respondent 13

Respondent 13 was an arts faculty member at the Camp and the Academy from the 1970s to the 1980s. One alum reported that Respondent 13 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 13

Alum 26 said that Respondent 13 asked her to perform at an event in Traverse City, which she agreed to do. She said that he drove her to and from the event, and that while he was driving her back, he drove into the woods. Alum 26 stated, “What crossed my mind was that this was the end of my life.” Alum 26 stated that Respondent 13 stopped the car, leaned over and grabbed her, reached for her upper shoulders, and wanted to kiss her. Alum 26 stated that she said, “What are you doing? Get off me.” Alum 26 stated that she was hitting Respondent 13, and that Respondent 13 said something like, “Just a little,” which Alum 26 said she understood to be coercion. Alum 26 stated that Respondent 13’s conduct towards her was “short-lived,” and that he drove Alum 26 back to her dorm.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 13

Respondent 13 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 26 said that at the time, she might have told her roommate about Respondent 13’s conduct but did not tell anyone else.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 13’s personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 13 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

H. Respondent 14

Respondent 14 held various positions at the Academy in the 1970s and 1980s, including as an arts faculty member. One alum reported that Respondent 14 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 14

Alum 27 said that Respondent 14, after seeing Alum 27 perform, suggested that she try out for the Academy, and that before she attended, Respondent 14 gave her free lessons to prepare her for the Academy. Alum 27 said that at the end of her first lesson, which was in Respondent 14’s office, he gave her a peck on the lips. Alum 27 stated that throughout the summer, Respondent 14

kissed her on the lips at the end of lessons, and eventually French kissed her, and that during the school year, Respondent 14 French kissed her during lessons. Alum 27 said that Respondent 14, during lessons, massaged her back over her clothes to get her to relax, and that one time during a back massage, reached around under her arms, hugged her from behind, and put his hands on her breasts and massaged her breasts over her clothes. Alum 27 stated that during a lesson on another occasion, Respondent 14 squeezed her buttocks. Alum 27 stated that during one lesson, Respondent 14 asked her to give him a backrub because he was tense and asked her to massage him under his arms, which she stated was odd. Alum 27 stated that when Respondent 14 asked her to give him a backrub, she did. Alum 27 said that she was very uncomfortable with what Respondent 14 was doing, and that around Christmas, she worked up the courage to ask him to stop. Alum 27 stated that Respondent 14 said that he would stop, and then he stopped touching her inappropriately.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 14

Respondent 14 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 27 stated that, she told her friend about Respondent 14's conduct towards her, and the friend told her to report it to the school. Alum 27 said that she went to Respondent 14 after a lesson and read out loud a letter to him in which she wrote, "Can you promise me that you won't do this to anyone else?" Alum 27 stated that Respondent 14 told her that this was part of how he expressed love, and that he could not promise he would not do it again with anyone else. Alum 27 said that she then went to the leadership of the Academy and reported Respondent 14's conduct towards her. Alum 27 said that the Academy began an investigation and that she learned that several other people came forward and reported that Respondent 14 also touched them inappropriately. Alum 27 said that she was told that during the investigation, Interlochen found that Respondent 14 taped the bottom of the curtain on his office window so that no one could see into his office, and that the school found this "fishy." Alum 27 stated that Respondent 14 stopped coming to class and she was assigned a new teacher. Alum 27 stated an administrator told her that the school was asking Respondent 14 to resign, and that he did. Alum 27 stated that she was told that Respondent 14 was allowed to resign so that it would not go on his record.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 14's personnel file reflected that during the same academic year discussed by Alum 27, administrators had a number of meetings with Respondent 14 regarding his conduct of a sexual nature towards someone.³⁰ Based on information in the personnel file, within days of the third meeting, Administrator 3 wrote a letter of recommendation for Respondent 14, and Interlochen subsequently placed Respondent 14 on a leave of absence. The personnel file reflected that approximately one month later, Administrator 4 wrote a letter of recommendation

³⁰ The information provided to the Investigative Team did not reflect who this person was.

for Respondent 14, and that approximately one month later, Respondent 14 was released from his contract at his request.

I. Respondent 15

One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 15, a staff member at the Academy who the alum chose not to name, engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 15

Alum 28 stated that Respondent 15 asked her to assist with an upcoming performance, and that she said yes. Alum 28 stated that after the performance, Respondent 15 invited her to his place on campus for dinner. Alum 28 stated that she went, and that after dinner, he started taking Alum 28's clothes off, Alum 28 went "numb," and he had sex with her.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 15

Alum 28 chose not to share the name of Respondent 15 with the Investigative Team. The Investigative Team attempted to identify him given the information provided by Alum 28, but was unable to do so, and, as a result, could not contact him.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 28 stated that she told her close friends about Respondent 15's conduct towards her, and that she believed everyone at school knew about what had happened with Respondent 15. Alum 28 stated that she got called into, she thought, Administrator 5's office. She stated that three men were present, including Administrator 5 and, she thought, Administrator 3 and Administrator 6. She stated that they told Alum 28 that they knew about her and Respondent 15, "grilled" her like she was a criminal, and told her that they had to decide whether to kick Alum 28 out. Alum 28 stated that the three men asked her questions like, "When was your last period?" Alum 28 stated that Respondent 15 was immediately fired and given 24 hours to leave the school, and that Alum 28 was put on probation for the rest of the year.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 15, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 15.

J. Respondent 16

One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 16, a teacher at the Camp who she chose not to name, engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 16

Alum 29 stated that Respondent 16 taught a class that she was in, and that he groomed her and started to become her confidant. Alum 29 stated that she confided in Respondent 16 about her frustration with another student and that he gave her advice. Alum 29 stated that a few days later, Respondent 16 asked her about the situation with the other student, and that during the conversation, he said, ““You know, I’m very fond of you. Have you thought about that?”” Alum 29 stated that she responded, ““No,”” and that Respondent 16 dropped it. Alum 29 stated that on another occasion, he grabbed her in his arms and “laid a huge kiss” on her. Alum 29 stated that after the kiss, Respondent 16 developed a relationship with her. Alum 29 stated that on at least two or three occasions, she and Respondent 16 were “heavily making out” at various locations on the grounds of the Camp, and that Respondent 16’s hands were all over her body while they both were fully clothed. Alum 29 said that Respondent 16 definitely touched her breasts and vagina over her clothes and very likely touched her breasts under her clothes.

Alum 29 stated that at some point, Respondent 16 commented on how much trouble they could get in and how she could be sent home and he could lose his job. Alum 29 stated that on the last day of camp, she viewed their relationship as a “closed chapter,” but that after she went home, Respondent 16 wrote her long, romantic letters and that Respondent 16 visited her in her hometown, where Respondent 16 engaged in sexual intercourse with her for the first time. Alum 29 said that the relationship continued throughout the year and was still ongoing when Alum 29 returned to the Camp the following summer. Alum 29 stated that during her second summer at the Camp, Respondent 16 did not return as a faculty member because he felt it was inappropriate to return to Camp as they were in a relationship and Alum 29 was still a student. Alum 29 stated that Respondent 16’s relationship with her continued for years past her time at Interlochen.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 16

Alum 29 chose not to provide the name of Respondent 16 and requested that the Investigative Team not take steps to ascertain his identity. The Investigative Team honored her request, and as a result, could not contact Respondent 16.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 29 stated that she did not tell any adults at Interlochen about Respondent 16’s conduct towards her because part of the enticement and what excited her about the relationship was the fact that Respondent 16 kept telling her that he could lose his job or be arrested because the relationship was illegal. Alum 29 stated that Respondent 16 told her that he had told one of his friends who worked at the Camp about his conduct towards Alum 29.

Alum 29 stated that during her second summer at the Camp, Respondent 16 came to visit her the same week that her family came, that they all went out to dinner together, and that they ran into an employee of the Camp who said, ““The cat is out of the bag.””

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 16, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 16.

K. Respondent 17

Respondent 17 held various positions at the Camp in the 1970s and 1980s and at the Academy in the 1980s, including as an arts faculty member. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 17 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1970s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 17

Alum 30 reported that while she was a camper, she went on a walk with Respondent 17 in the woods, and that he tried to be “cozy” with her. Alum 30 explained that Respondent 17 tried to walk arm-and-arm with her and “snug” her in by the waist. Alum 30 stated that when Respondent 17 engaged in this conduct, she told him that she did not “do that,” stepped away, and made a comment that the state police patrolled the area well. She stated that once she made her boundaries clear, Respondent 17 “withdrew.”

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 17

Respondent 17 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 30 indicated that she may have told friends about Respondent 17’s conduct towards her, and that she did not think anyone else was aware of Respondent 17’s conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 17’s personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 17 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

L. Respondent 18

Respondent 18 was an arts faculty member at the Academy and the Camp from the 1970s to the 2010s. After he retired in the 2010s, Respondent 18 continued to teach, coach, and work at the Camp through the 2010s. Two alums reported that Respondent 18 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them when they were students in the 1970s.³¹ In addition, Respondent 18 reported to

³¹ In addition, another alum, Alum 31, stated that Respondent 18 was her arts faculty member at the Academy, and that Respondent 18 was “overly friendly” with her. Alum 31 stated that the summer after she graduated from the Academy, Respondent 18 took her off campus to dinner for her birthday. Alum 31

the Investigative Team that he engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with a student in the 2010s.³²

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 18

a. Alum 32

Alum 32 reported that Respondent 18 was her teacher at the Academy. Alum 32 said that prior to her enrollment at the Academy, she took lessons for two years with Respondent 18 on campus or at Respondent 18's house. Alum 32 said that Respondent 18 got her a full scholarship to attend the Academy.

Alum 32 said that at the Academy, Respondent 18 showered her with "inappropriate attention," spent a lot of time with her, gave her a key to his studio, took her on drives across the countryside, and took her to events. Alum 32 said that if she had a good lesson, Respondent 18 took her to dinner one-on-one at restaurants around Interlochen, which occurred approximately every two to three weeks. She said that if she did not learn a lesson quickly enough, Respondent 18 told her that she was not working hard enough for him and it hurt him, and they could not go to dinner, and Respondent 18 then gave attention to another student. Alum 32 said that the attention that she received from Respondent 18 caused everyone to think that Respondent 18 was engaging in a sexual relationship with her, which was a way for Respondent 18 to separate her from her peers, and that she lost friends because of this separation.

Alum 32 indicated that Respondent 18 began to engage in physical contact with her as a part of the normal course of teaching in the performing arts. Alum 32 said that the touching began "innocent enough," such as a big hug that would linger too long, or standing behind her when he was coaching a group of students and rubbing her shoulder. Alum 32 said that Respondent 18 appeared to notice when she became "squeamish" and "tighten[ed] up" and he "backed off." Alum 32 also said that Respondent 18 kissed her on her cheek, on the top of her head, and on her hair, explaining that he did so after concerts, when she helped him with something, or if she had a good lesson. She said that on some occasions when Respondent 18 gave her extended hugs, he had an erection. Alum 32 also said that during her second year, Respondent 18 "convinced" her to take lessons for a different performing art and told her to come to his studio to perform for him so that he could help her. Alum 32 also said that Respondent 18 put his hand all over her stomach and abdomen and told her that he needed to observe how she was "supporting things."

Alum 32 stated that Respondent 18 never engaged in skin-to-skin genital contact or sexual intercourse with her.

indicated that Respondent 18 drove them to dinner and that after dinner, Respondent 18 drove them to his off-campus house, where there was "some discussion" of Alum 31 staying overnight, but that Respondent 18 did not engage in conduct of a sexual nature with her. Alum 31 stated that she told Respondent 18 that she wanted to go back to where she lived and, he replied, "'You expect me to drive you back to camp?'" She said that she responded, "'Yes.'" Alum 31 said that Respondent 18 drove her back to the Camp and that she did not go out to dinner with Respondent 18 again.

³² Interlochen noted that this student attended Interlochen in the 2000s.

b. Alum 33

Alum 33 said that she met Respondent 18 at the Camp, and that while there, Respondent 18 “aggressively recruited her” to the Academy. Alum 33 stated that Respondent 18 fostered a “very, very strong psychological hold” on her that made her “worship and adore him.” Alum 33 noted that Respondent 18 caused her and another alum each to fall in love with him and want him sexually, which pitted them against each other musically and sexually, and caused them to be jealous of each other.

Alum 33 stated that Respondent 18’s relationship with her became “more intense” in her second year, and that during this year, Respondent 18’s hold on her was “borderline sexual.” Alum 33 said that during that year, she spent the night at Respondent 18’s off-campus house approximately two to four times and that she did so because it was too dark to walk home or there was a storm. Alum 33 said that when she stayed overnight at Respondent 18’s house, she slept on the sofa, Respondent 18 slept upstairs, and there was no one else around. Alum 33 said that nothing happened when she stayed overnight at Respondent 18’s house and that they “probably” stayed up talking.

Alum 33 stated that Respondent 18 patted or touched her on her back and shoulder, but not on her genitals. She described this as “fatherly or a little more.”

Alum 33 stated that when she was at home for a school break, Respondent 18 called her and wrote letters to her. Alum 33 said that during the shorter breaks, he sent some letters and then during the summer he called her multiple times and wrote letters to her. Alum 33 noted that the letters contained “nothing about love or desire.”

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 18

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 18 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 18 agreed to meet with the Investigative Team.³³

Respondent 18, in describing how he related to students generally, said that he often suspected that he created a dependency for his students on him, and that he thought he did that because of ego. Respondent 18 stated that he wanted to be relatable to students. He noted, “That in itself was unhealthy and was not in good balance.” He said that he wanted students to respect him and to think he was special. He stated, “I wanted to be their go-to person.”

Respondent 18 said that most of his career was one-on-one with students in private lessons. Respondent 18 said that in the course of teaching private lessons, he placed his hands on students in the normal course of teaching in the performing arts.

Respondent 18 said that outside of lessons, he went on walks with students and sat with them on a park bench to talk when things were difficult for them. Respondent 18 said, “There was always

³³ Alum 31 and Alum 33 each consented to have the Investigative Team share their names with Respondent 18. Alum 32 did not consent to have the Investigative Team share her name with Respondent 18, and, therefore, the Investigative Team did not do so.

good intentions and good results.” Respondent 18 also said that he took students off campus for, for example, medical appointments. Respondent 18 said that he had students, always in a group, to his home, sometimes for dinner. Respondent 18 said that he “full frontal” hugged male and female students.

With regard to Alum 31, Respondent 18 indicated that he did not know her. He also indicated that he did not recall a situation in which he took a recent Interlochen graduate to dinner for her birthday and had some discussion of her staying overnight.

With regard to Alum 33, Respondent 18 denied that he ever pursued or engaged in a romantic or sexual relationship with Alum 33. He also denied ever touching Alum 33 other than touching her in the normal course of teaching in the performing arts, which he indicated was standard practice at the time. Respondent 18 said that he did not remember Alum 33 staying overnight at his house alone, but it could have happened. He also indicated that he did not remember that he wrote letters to Alum 33.

Respondent 18 reported to the Investigative Team that he engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with Alum 34, one of his students at the Academy in the 2010s³⁴ while she was at the Academy and after she graduated. Respondent 18 said he became “obsessed” with her. Respondent 18 said that he engaged in ““at least an emotional affair”” with Alum 34 and that this went on for months. He said that his engagement with Alum 34 was “pretty intense” and was not appropriate. Respondent 18 indicated that he kissed Alum 34 on the mouth and that he did so around campus in the woods. Respondent 18 also stated that he “made out” with Alum 34, which he described as “just physical closeness having to do with feelings of affection.” He said that there was no removal of clothing and that he never engaged in intercourse with Alum 34. Respondent 18 stated that when his relationship with Alum 34 ended, she said, ““Thanks for ruining my life.”” Respondent 18 stated that he did not go “over the line” with any other student.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 31: Alum 31 indicated that she did not tell anyone about Respondent 18’s conduct.

Alum 32: Alum 32 stated that while she was a student at the Academy, she did not speak with anyone about Respondent 18’s conduct towards her. Alum 32 stated that residence life staff members were aware that she was often at Respondent 18’s home late at night or at a group overnight, and told her, ““Of course, you can come back late.”” Alum 32 also indicated that she thought that two of her teachers were aware of Respondent 18’s conduct towards her. Alum 32 stated, ““They all knew that he would take me out to dinner, that I got extra attention, extra opportunities, physical touching, stuff like that.”” She also said that “everyone” thought that she was Respondent 18’s possession.

Alum 33: Alum 33 stated that while at Interlochen, she did not speak with anyone about Respondent 18’s conduct towards her. Alum 33 said that when she spent the night at Respondent

³⁴ Interlochen noted that this student attended Interlochen in the 2000s.

18's house, she called a residence life staff member to let her know, and that this staff member said that it was fine.

b. Information from Interlochen

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it no longer had a personnel file for Respondent 18.

Respondent 18 indicated that at the time, one teacher knew about his interactions with Alum 34 and that two other teachers also may have known.

None of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 18 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

M. Respondent 19

Respondent 19 was an Interlochen board member from the 1970s through the 1990s. Two alums reported that Respondent 19 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them, one in the 1970s and one in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 19

a. Alum 35

Alum 35 stated that he met Respondent 19 at Interlochen, maybe at a concert. Alum 35 stated that Respondent 19 groomed Alum 35, and that Alum 35 attended meals at Interlochen with Respondent 19 multiple times. Alum 35 stated that Respondent 19 invited Alum 35 to Respondent 19's apartment in another state. Alum 35 said that when he was a student at the Academy, Respondent 19 paid for Alum 35 to come visit Respondent 19 during school breaks and the summer, staying with Respondent 19.³⁵ Alum 35 said that the visits typically lasted four or five days. Alum 35 stated that when he stayed with Respondent 19 at his home, Respondent 19 insisted that they sleep in the same bed. Alum 35 indicated that Respondent 19 performed oral sex on Alum 35 every time that he was at Respondent 19's home and that Respondent 19 engaged in anal sex with him on some of these occasions. Alum 35 stated that he froze whenever Respondent 19 engaged in sexual conduct towards him.

b. Alum 36

Alum 36 stated that Respondent 19 invited him multiple times to stay overnight at Respondent 19's home in another state. Alum 36 indicated that each time Alum 36 was at Respondent 19's home, Respondent 19 attempted to give him a massage. Alum 36 stated that there were two occasions when he stayed with Respondent 19 at Interlochen. Alum 36 stated that at Interlochen, Respondent 19 coerced him to sleep with Respondent 19 in the same bed, and that Respondent

³⁵ Information provided by Interlochen reflected that Respondent 19 provided financial support to Alum 35 for an event.

19 massaged his back while he was in his underwear. Alum 36 said that Respondent 19 turned Alum 36 over and touched Alum 36's genitals. Alum 36 stated that one time, Respondent 19 was completely naked next to Alum 36 in the bed and he awoke to Respondent 19's ejaculate next to him, on him, and on the bedsheets.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 19

Respondent 19 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 35 said that at the time, he did not tell anyone about Respondent 19's conduct towards him.

b. Information from Interlochen

The file provided by Interlochen regarding Respondent 19 did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 19 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

A former board member stated that in the 2000s, he was on campus and was leaving his room at the hotel above the Academy cafeteria when he saw Respondent 19 come out of his room with a student.³⁶ The former board member stated that he did not know who the student was, but assumed that he was a student because he was wearing the student day uniform. The former board member stated that he told another board member about seeing Respondent 19 at the hotel with a student.

Alleged Conduct Starting in the 1980s

This section includes 16 firsthand reports of physical conduct of a sexual nature involving 13 separate Respondents.

A. Respondent 20

Respondent 20 was an arts faculty member and a division director at the Camp and the Academy in the 1970s and 1980s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 20 engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with him in the 1980s.³⁷

³⁶ The former board member stated that years before, prior to when he was a board member, he heard rumors of Respondent 19 engaging in relationships with male students that extended beyond that of sponsorship.

³⁷ In addition, another alum, Alum 37, discussed non-physical conduct by Respondent 20. Alum 37 stated that Respondent 20 directed a few performances in which Alum 37 performed. Alum 37 stated that one summer, Respondent 20 talked with Alum 37 and other male students about what men wear and that male

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 20

Alum 38 stated that Respondent 20 engaged in a long process of grooming him, which included Respondent 20 being very attentive, very supportive, and complimentary of Alum 38's work, and taking him out to lunch and dinners. Alum 38 said that after multiple months of grooming, Respondent 20 signed him out of his dorm six or seven times to go to Respondent 20's off-campus house for the night or weekend. Alum 38 stated that on the first or second night, Respondent 20 told him that it was time for bed and time to get into their underwear and tops. Alum 38 stated that after he got into his underwear, Respondent 20 engaged in sexual touching of Alum 38, including touching his genitals, putting Alum 38's head down to perform oral sex on Respondent 20, and performing oral sex on Alum 38. Alum 38 indicated that Respondent 20 engaged in similar conduct the other times that Alum 38 was at Respondent 20's house.

Alum 38 said that during a trip over spring break, he and Respondent 20 shared a hotel room, and that Respondent 20 engaged in oral sex with him multiple times. Alum 38 stated that one night in the hotel room, Respondent 20 threw Alum 38 on the bed and engaged in anal sex with him after he had told Respondent 20 not to do so. Alum 38 stated that Respondent 20 used force to engage in anal sex, and that afterwards, Alum 38 sought medical attention.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 20

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 20 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 20 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 38 stated that after the incident in the hotel room, he told Respondent 20 to leave him alone or he would report Respondent 20 to the administration. Alum 38 stated that he told this to Respondent 20 three or four times, but he "wouldn't stop" and showed up places where Alum 38 was. Alum 38 stated that this was "scary and creepy." Alum 38 stated that he then told Administrator 4 about Respondent 20's conduct, and that Administrator 4 stated that he was going to talk to Respondent 20. Alum 38 stated that he thought Respondent 20 would be fired, but that Alum 38 later was called into Administrator 4's office, and that Administrator 4 called Alum 38 a "slut," said that he "caused all of this," and told him that he had to leave quietly or the school would tell his parents. Alum 38 said that he was driven to the airport by an administrator

bodybuilders wear a strap that covered just the genitals. Alum 37 stated that in the moment, he found this odd, and that later in the day, another student said, "'Wasn't that weird?'" Alum 37 stated that in another instance, Respondent 20 had a discussion with male students about body image while the students were in tight clothing. Alum 37 said that Respondent 20 told them to look in the mirror and do an assessment of what they saw, what they liked, and what they did not like.

who told him that Interlochen had told his parents that he was gay. Alum 38 stated that he heard that the rumors were that he, not Respondent 20, was the problem.

Another alum provided corroborative information.

b. Information from Interlochen

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it no longer had a personnel file for Respondent 20. In addition, none of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 20 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

B. Respondent 21

Respondent 21 was a residence life staff member at the Academy in the 1970s and 1980s. One alum reported that Respondent 21 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 21

Alum 39 stated that she met Respondent 21 at an off-campus party and then began to hang out with him in social group settings. Alum 39 stated that at one point, Respondent 21 invited her and a group of students to an off-campus cabin to have a meal together. Alum 39 said that sometime after this, Respondent 21 gifted her a book with a handwritten note that ended with, ““Love, [Respondent 21].”” Alum 39 stated that at some point after this, Alum 39 went to Respondent 21’s dorm room, they kissed, and then Respondent 21 engaged in sexual contact, “dry humping” her until, she believed, he ejaculated. Alum 39 said that during the incident, Respondent 21’s hands were all over her body, and that Respondent 21 touched her “neck, breasts, back, rear end, and between [her] legs when he was positioning himself.” Alum 39 stated that during the interaction, she and Respondent 21 both had all their clothes on, and that after, she left his room. Alum 39 stated that after this incident, Respondent 21 was polite to her but did not engage with her in a friendly way anymore.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 21

Respondent 21 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 39 indicated that she did not speak with anyone at Interlochen about Respondent 21’s conduct towards her and that she did not know whether any adult at Interlochen knew about Respondent 21’s conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 21's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 21 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. None of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 21 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

C. Respondent 22

Respondent 22 was an arts faculty member at the Academy in the 1980s. One alum reported that Respondent 22 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 22

Alum 40 stated that Respondent 22 was driving a number of students in his car, including Alum 40, that Respondent 22 felt Alum 40's knee twice in his car, and that after the second knee touch, Respondent 22 invited Alum 40 to Respondent 22's cabin. Alum 40 stated that Respondent 22 signed him out of the dorms many times and that they engaged in oral sex at Respondent 22's cabin almost every day during the week. Alum 40 stated that one time, Respondent 22 picked him up at the airport, took him to a hotel room, and they engaged in oral sex.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 22

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 22 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 22 did not respond to outreach by the Investigative Team.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 40 stated that Respondent 22 told him that the "school" confronted him and warned him about his relationship with Alum 40 and that Respondent 22 said that he did not deny his relationship with Alum 40. Alum 40 stated that he and Respondent 22 had oral sex two more times after the Academy confronted Respondent 22. Alum 40 stated that Respondent 22 left the Academy at the end of the year to go to another school "on his own volition," and was not fired.

b. Information from Interlochen

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it no longer had a personnel file for Respondent 22. In addition, none of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 22 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

D. Respondent 23

Respondent 23 served on the Board from the 1980s to the 2000s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 23 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 23

Alum 41 stated that Respondent 23 performed oral sex on Alum 41, both on and off campus. Alum 41 indicated that one incident that occurred on campus was in the summer when Respondent 23 was on campus for a trustee meeting. Alum 41 stated that during this incident, Respondent 23 followed him into a restroom, where Respondent 23 performed oral sex on him. Alum 41 stated that Respondent 23 asked for his phone number and later called him at home, which “freaked [Alum 41] out.” Alum 41 said that on another occasion, he was out of state for a school trip and Respondent 23 invited him to his hotel room where Respondent 23 performed oral sex on him. Alum 41 stated that after the interaction, he did not see Respondent 23 again, and that years later, Respondent 23 sent him an email, asking to get together. Alum 41 stated that he was very angry and responded to Respondent 23 that what Respondent 23 had done to him had been unacceptable.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 23

Respondent 23 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 41 indicated that he never told anyone at Interlochen about Respondent 23’s conduct towards him, and that he believed nobody knew about it.

b. Information from Interlochen

The file provided by Interlochen regarding Respondent 23 did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 23 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. None of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 23 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

E. Respondent 24

Respondent 24 was a staff member at the Academy in the 1980s and the 1990s. Respondent 24 also worked at the Camp in the 1960s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 24 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 24

Alum 42 stated that he went by Respondent 24's office and that Respondent 24 invited Alum 42 in and suggested that they go out to lunch. Alum 42 stated that Respondent 24 signed him out of campus, and picked Alum 42 up in Respondent 24's car. Alum 42 stated that while in the car, Respondent 24 suggested going to his house instead of lunch, which they did. Alum 42 stated that while at Respondent 24's house, they went to the basement, Respondent 24 turned to Alum 42 and asked, "Are you sure you want to do this?" and Alum 42 responded, "Yes." Alum 42 stated that he and Respondent 24 took their clothes off, and that Respondent 24 performed oral sex on Alum 42. Alum 42 stated that this continued approximately once a week throughout the year, either at Respondent 24's house or at the Camp, which was closed for the winter. Alum 42 stated that Respondent 24 signed Alum 42 out all the time, and that as a staff member, Respondent 24 was permitted to do so.

Alum 42 stated that he had an event outside of Interlochen, that Respondent 24 drove Alum 42 to the event, and that Alum 42 believed he and Respondent 24 stayed together in a hotel. Alum 42 indicated that Respondent 24 would have needed permission and had to have signed Alum 42 out of the dorm to take him on this trip.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 24

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 24 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 24 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 42 indicated that he did not speak with anyone at Interlochen about Respondent 24's conduct towards him, and that he was not aware of any adults at Interlochen knowing about this conduct.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 24's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 24 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. None of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 24 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

F. Respondent 25

Respondent 25 was an arts faculty member at the Academy in the 1980s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 25 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 25

Alum 43 said that she was in one of Respondent 25's classes and that he groomed and preyed on her. Alum 43 stated that Respondent 25 had a van and invited Alum 43 to go driving around with him. Respondent 25 stated that at first, other students also went driving with Respondent 25, that Respondent 25 gave them alcohol, and that they all smoked together in Respondent 25's van. Alum 43 stated that she became Respondent 25's favorite, and that approximately three or four times, she went for drives with Respondent 25 alone. Alum 43 stated that during the last van trip, she was alone with Respondent 25 and that they drank together and smoked together. She stated that they then walked near a wooded area and sat down near the lake and talked, and that Respondent 25 kissed her. Alum 43 stated that after this incident, she distanced herself from Respondent 25. Alum 43 stated that after the kissing incident, Respondent 25 showed up to the places she was and wanted to speak with her, and that he called her at her dorm a few times.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 25

Respondent 25 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 43 indicated that she did not think that she told anyone that Respondent 25 kissed her. Alum 43 also indicated that she did not tell any adult that she went off campus with Respondent 25 in his van. She stated that she thought that she could not tell anyone about Respondent 25's conduct because she might get expelled. She stated that someone reported Respondent 25 and that he was fired for, she thought, taking students out and drinking and driving.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 25's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 25 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. In addition, none of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 24 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

G. Respondent 26

Respondent 26 was an arts faculty member and division director at the Academy in the 1980s and 1990s. Two alums reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 26 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature or otherwise physical conduct with them in the 1980s and/or the 1990s.³⁸

³⁸ In addition to these two alums, Alum 46 stated that she was invited to Respondent 26's once, along with two male students. Alum 46 stated that both of the male students went into Respondent 26's bedroom with Respondent 26 for at least an hour, and, according to the male students, gave her back rubs. Alum 46 stated that she was "terrified" and slept on the couch in the living room.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 26

a. Alum 44

Alum 44 stated that Respondent 26 invited students to her on-campus cabin for meals and served alcohol. Alum 44 stated that he went to Respondent 26's house at least weekly, maybe a dozen times. Alum 44 said that he generally went to Respondent 26's alone and that his roommate may have gone with him one time. Alum 44 said that when he was at Respondent 26's home, she usually asked him to massage her, including times when she asked that he do so with a fork. Alum 44 stated that he massaged Respondent 26's neck, back, and arms, while she sat in a chair at the kitchen table. Alum 44 stated that eventually the massaging got to the point where Respondent 26 "disrobe[d] to partial nudity," and the top of her breasts were exposed. Alum 44 stated that a few times when he was massaging Respondent 26, she reached around and touched him on top of his clothes on his upper thigh and on his groin area between his legs. Alum 44 stated that on some occasions, Respondent 26 gave him a bottle of alcohol to take home with him.

b. Alum 45

Alum 45 said that when she was alone with Respondent 26 at her house, Respondent 26 had Alum 45 scratch her back with a fork. Alum 45 said that Respondent 26 lifted up her shirt so that the fork was touching her skin directly.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 26

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 26 to invite her to participate in the investigation. Respondent 26 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 44 indicated that he did not know if any adults at Interlochen knew of Respondent 26's conduct towards him.

Alum 45 indicated that she may have told Administrator 7 about Respondent 26's use of the fork.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 26's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 26 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

Administrator 7 told the Investigative Team that students came to him stating that Respondent 26 invited them to her house and that they found this uncomfortable. He indicated that he was not aware of Respondent 26 engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with students.

Administrator 8 stated that during a reunion years after Respondent 26 had left Interlochen, alums discussed concerns regarding Respondent 26's behavior, but that the alums did not provide any details regarding Respondent 26's behavior.

H. Respondent 27

Respondent 27 was an arts faculty member at the Camp in the 1970s and at the Academy in the 1970s and 1980s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 27 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 27

Alum 47 stated that Respondent 27 was her teacher, and on more than one occasion, Respondent 27 cornered her, grabbed her by the waist, pressed his genitals against her buttocks, and grabbed her breasts. Alum 47 also said that on one occasion, Respondent 27 walked in on her while she was changing, and said, "something really cheeky like, 'Nice merchandise'" to her. Alum 47 stated that after a performance, Respondent 27 cornered her and tried to rape her. She stated that during this incident, he covered her mouth, was "slobbering" all over her, tried to force his lips on her lips, and kissed her neck. She stated that during this incident, he ripped buttons off her shirt, tried to get her pants off, put his hand inside her underwear going up her buttocks, and was very "forcefully physical" with her. Alum 47 said that she started screaming, and Respondent 27 stopped. Alum 47 stated that after this incident, she avoided Respondent 27. Alum 47 said that Respondent 27 wrote her three long, handwritten letters after this incident, in which Respondent 27 said things like, "You are the best student I ever had," "I see so much promise in you," and "I want to see you more."

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 27

Respondent 27 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 47 indicated that approximately two days after the incident that occurred when she was changing, she reported Respondent 27's conduct to a senior administrator, who she thought was Administrator 3 and that he dismissed her. Alum 47 indicated that she may have mentioned to an academic teacher that she felt uncomfortable with Respondent 27.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 27's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 27 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. In addition, none of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 27 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

I. Respondent 28

Respondent 28 had various roles at Interlochen, including at the Camp and as a residence life staff member at the Academy in the 1980s. One alum reported that Respondent 28 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her at the Academy in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 28

Alum 48 stated that within the first few weeks of school, Respondent 28 pursued her by showing up where Alum 48 was, engaging in conversations with Alum 48, and being on the girls' side even though the campus was segregated by gender. Alum 48 stated that one time, Respondent 28 was sitting outside, that Alum 48 felt like Respondent 28 was waiting for her to come past, and that when he saw her, he said that she was "so pretty" and that he had "picked [her] out of everyone." Alum 48 said that he also said things of this nature to her in the cafeteria. Alum 48 said that one time after a meal, Respondent 28 invited her to his room and that while she was in Respondent 28's room, Respondent 28 was very forceful, pushed her down on the bed, and had sex with her. Alum 48 stated that after Respondent 28 engaged in sex with her, he told her to leave. She stated that after this, Respondent 28 avoided her, and she noticed that he was pursuing other girls.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 28

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 28 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 28 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 48 indicated that she was not aware of anyone seeing her enter or leave Respondent 28's room on the day that he had sex with her, and that she never told anyone about Respondent 28's conduct towards her. Alum 48 stated that Respondent 28 was fired, and that there were rumors that Respondent 28 was fired because he was bragging to other residence life staff members that he was having sex with girls.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 28's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 28 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. In addition, none of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 28 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

J. Respondent 29

One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 29, an unknown community member, engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him at the Camp in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 29

Alum 49 stated that during the summer on the weekends, there were thousands of people who came to Interlochen for concerts. Alum 49 stated that there were men “lurking” around campus and that one such man, Respondent 29, followed Alum 49 into a bathroom. Alum 49 said that Respondent 29 performed oral sex on Alum 49 in the bathroom. Alum 49 indicated that he did not know who Respondent 29 was.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 29

Alum 49 stated that he did not know who Respondent 29 was. The Investigative Team attempted to identify Respondent 29 given the information provided by Alum 49, but was unable to do so, and as a result, could not contact Respondent 29.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 49 indicated that when he was at Interlochen, he did not tell anyone about Respondent 29’s conduct towards him.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 29, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 29.

K. Respondent 30

One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 30, an unknown community member, engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him at the Camp in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 30

Alum 50 said that in the summer, Respondent 30 followed him into a restroom on campus, stood in the stall next to Alum 50, and “started to play with himself.” Alum 50 stated that someone had drilled holes between the stalls of the restroom, and that the circumference of the holes was approximately six inches. Alum 50 described these as “glory holes,” in the “parlance of gay culture.” Alum 50 stated that Respondent 30 had Alum 50 “insert” himself into a hole. Alum 50 stated that Respondent 30 then started “playing” with Alum 50, and then asked Alum 50 to follow him to the gym locker room. Alum 50 stated that Respondent 30 performed oral sex on

him in the gym locker room. Alum 50 stated that Respondent 30 engaged in the same conduct with him the following weekend.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 30

Alum 50 stated that he did not know who Respondent 30 was. The Investigative Team attempted to identify Respondent 30 given the information provided by Alum 50, but was unable to do so, and as a result, could not contact Respondent 30.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 50 indicated that, at the time, he did not tell anyone about Respondent 30's conduct towards him.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 30, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 30.

L. Respondent 31

Respondent 31 was an arts faculty member at the Academy and the Camp in the 1980s. Two alums reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 31 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them in the 1980s. In addition, Respondent 31's personnel file reflected that Respondent 31 was reported to have engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with a third student in the 1980s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 31

a. Alum 51

Alum 51 stated that she met Respondent 31 at the Camp, and that Respondent 31 sought her out several times over the summer and gave her a lot of attention. Alum 51 stated that the following Academy year, Respondent 31 became her arts faculty member, and made occasional sexual comments and advances towards her. Alum 51 stated that Respondent 31 asked her what she was wearing under her uniform, made suggestive comments about her body, and told her how much he liked her body and that he wanted to be alone with her. Alum 51 said that Respondent 31 often made these comments towards her when she was in his office.

Alum 51 indicated that one night, when she and Respondent 31 were leaving his office, Respondent 31 stopped in the stairwell and kissed her on the lips. Alum 51 indicated that on another occasion, Respondent 31 invited her to go to a cabin on campus that she thought was a summer cabin for visiting guests, that Alum 51 walked a little ways off campus to meet

Respondent 31, and that he then drove them to the cabin in his car. Alum 51 stated that once in the cabin, she and Respondent 31 sat on a bed, and Respondent 31 kissed her on her lips and felt around her body, chest, and legs, over her clothes. Alum 51 stated that Respondent 31 took her shirt off and felt more around her chest area under her camisole. Alum 51 said that she got scared and told Respondent 31, “No,” and that she did not want to continue. Alum 51 indicated that he then drove her back to the spot where he had picked her up off campus and Alum 51 walked back to campus.

b. Alum 52

Alum 52 indicated that Respondent 31 was her arts faculty member. She said that her lessons with Respondent 31 were initially in a group setting, and that in her second semester working with him, Respondent 31 suggested that she take private lessons with him. Alum 52 said that Respondent 31 encouraged a closer relationship with him, and said, “There was psychological component to it. Today, we would call it grooming.” Alum 52 said that Respondent 31, during private lessons, made inappropriate comments that were “more on the level of adult flirting than a teacher-student interaction.” Alum 52 stated that Respondent 31 would suggest that in order to “really emot[e]” in performing, you needed to be sexually aware. Alum 52 further said that Respondent 31 engaged in one sexual encounter with her during the summer while she was still a student and before he was fired.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 31

Respondent 31 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 51: Alum 51 stated that after the night at the cabin with Respondent 31, she told Staff Member 3 about what was happening, who then informed others at Interlochen. Alum 51 stated that she then met with a senior administrator at the Academy in his office and that she thought that other individuals also were present for the meeting. Alum 51 stated she remembered that during this meeting, she felt like the situation was her fault. Alum 51 reported that the people in the meeting were very condescending towards her, and that no one apologized for what happened to her. Alum 51 stated that at some point after this meeting, she met with attorneys for Interlochen. Alum 51 stated that these meetings occurred before a break, and that she knew Respondent 31 was not going to be at the Academy when she returned from break, but did not know whether Respondent 31 was fired or put on sabbatical.³⁹

Alum 52: Alum 52 indicated that she did not talk to any adult at Interlochen regarding Respondent 31’s conduct.

³⁹ Alum 51 also stated that once she returned to the Academy after break, Respondent 31 called her and told her how much he loved her and begged her to take back what she had said.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 31's personnel file reflected that Interlochen received contemporaneous reports about Respondent 31's conduct towards Alum 51 and another student. Administrator 1 told the Investigative Team that Respondent 31 had "crossed the line" with a student, although Administrator 1 did not recall the details. He stated that he remembered the relationship was "too close and it had to be confronted and a stop put to it." Staff Member 3 stated that Alum 51 told her about Respondent 31. Although Staff Member 3 did not recall the details, Staff Member 3 stated that she remembered Alum 51 saying something about being in a bed, and that Staff Member 3 told Alum 51, "This isn't normal." Staff Member 3 indicated that she contacted Administrator 4 and Administrator 9, that she and they met with Alum 51, and that after this meeting, Respondent 31 left. Staff Member 3 indicated that she thought Respondent 31 resigned. Based on information in Respondent 31's personnel file, Respondent 31 was terminated approximately four months after Alum 51's report. Respondent 31's personnel file reflected that after Interlochen was aware of the reported conduct by Respondent 31, Administrator 4 and Administrator 3 wrote multiple letters of recommendation for Respondent 31, and a teacher also wrote a letter of recommendation for him.

M. Respondent 32

Respondent 32 was an academic teacher at the Camp in the 1980s and at the Academy from the 1980s to the 2000s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 32 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1980s, and a second alum reported that he engaged in such conduct with her in the 1990s. Respondent 32 acknowledged to the Investigative Team that he had engaged in touching of a sexual nature with one student and "probably" one additional one.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 32

a. Alum 53

Alum 53 reported that Respondent 32 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1980s. She said that Respondent 32 was her sponsor at the Academy and they became close. Alum 53 said that Respondent 32 complimented Alum 53, invited her over for dinner, offered to teach her things, and shared books with her, which Alum 53 stated was flattering. Alum 53 also stated that Respondent 32 asked her for hugs at the end of class and asked her to go for walks with him and to hold hands.

Alum 53 said that the first time Respondent 32 physically engaged with her other than hugging and holding hands was an instance during which he French kissed her when she was taking a nap on his couch. She said that Respondent 32 French kissed her and touched her whenever they were alone at his house or on walks in the woods together. Alum 53 stated that in the woods, she and Respondent 32 made out, he put his hands in her shirt, and he put her hand on his "crotch" over his clothes. Alum 53 stated that on one occasion, she was taking a nap in a bedroom at Respondent 32's house and that Respondent 32 got into bed with her, that there was "complete nudity," that he touched Alum 53's breasts and genitals, kissed her, and showed Alum 53 how to

touch his genitals. Alum 53 also stated that Respondent 32, on one occasion, was in the shower with her and showed Alum 53 how to touch him.

Alum 53 stated that during a camping trip, Respondent 32 visited her in her tent, told her, ““Let’s take off your clothes and I will take off my clothes,”” “humped” Alum 53, and slept in Alum 53’s sleeping bag with her.

b. Alum 54

Alum 54 indicated that Respondent 32 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1990s. She stated that Respondent 32 invited her and other students to his house for a dinner party and that when everyone else was in the kitchen, she was alone with Respondent 32 in the dining room. She stated that he sat very close to her and put his hand high up on her thigh. Alum 54 stated that Respondent 32 touched the edge of her shorts and that his fingers were very close to her “private area.” Alum 54 stated that after Respondent 32 put his hand on her thigh, she stood up and went to the living room. Alum 54 said that Respondent 32 came up behind her in the living room, turned her around and put his hands on her hips over her clothes, and pulled her hips towards him so that her hips were touching the front of Respondent 32. Alum 54 stated that she left and joined the other students in the kitchen.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 32

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 32 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 32 responded to this outreach and agreed to meet with the Investigative Team.⁴⁰

Respondent 32 told the Investigative Team that he did not engage in sexual intercourse with students, “but there was touching,” some of which, he indicated, was sexual in nature. He indicated that he engaged in touching with Alum 53 and “probably” another student whose name he could not remember. He declined to provide more specific information regarding the touching.

Respondent 32 stated that he had taught Alum 53, and that his romantic relationship with her began when she was a student at the Academy but no longer in his class. He described his relationship with Alum 53 as “sort of father-daughter for quite some time.” He stated that then “it became older brother, then close friend, then it just kind of morphed itself into various roles in which [he] was trying to help her at the same time and trying to counsel her.” He noted that Alum 53 had “low self-image” and he was trying to “boost her up and make her feel better.” After Respondent 32 shared this, he ended the interview.

⁴⁰ Alum 53 and Alum 54 each consented to have the Investigative Team share their names with Respondent 32.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 53: Alum 53 stated that when she was a student, Administrator 1 called Alum 53 and Respondent 32 into Administrator 1's office and told them that some people had brought up concerns about how close Alum 53 and Respondent 32 were. Alum 53 stated that she told Administrator 1 that she did not know what he was talking about. Alum 53 stated that after the meeting with Administrator 1, Respondent 32 continued to touch Alum 53 at his house.

Alum 54: Alum 54 stated that she may have told a counselor about Respondent 32's conduct towards her when she was a student in the 1990s and that the counselor told her to talk to someone else. Alum 54 stated that she had a strong relationship with Administrator 1, and told Administrator 1 about Respondent 32's conduct. She stated that Administrator 1 asked Alum 54 to stand up and use a file cabinet to show how Respondent 32 had touched her. Alum 54 stated that after she demonstrated this, Administrator 1 told Alum 54 that she no longer had to go to Respondent 32's class. Alum 54 stated that she did not attend the class for the rest of that year and that the school gave her an A in the class. Alum 54 stated, "They stopped teaching me [that subject] and falsified my records."

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 32's personnel file reflected that Interlochen received a contemporaneous report about Respondent 32's conduct towards Alum 53 in the 1980s. Administrator 1 indicated that he had separate conversations with Alum 53 and Respondent 32, each of whom denied at the time that the alleged conduct had occurred.

Based on Respondent 32's personnel file, Interlochen also received a contemporaneous report in the 1990s about Respondent 32's conduct towards Alum 54, and that Administrator 9 informed Respondent 32 that Interlochen would terminate him if he engaged in any unprofessional touching of students.⁴¹

The personnel file reflected that in the 2000s, Administrator 1 received a letter from Alum 53, informing him of Respondent 32's conduct of a sexual nature towards her in the 1980s, and that approximately a month and a half after Alum 53's letter, Respondent 32 resigned from his position at Interlochen. Administrator 1 told the Investigative Team that Respondent 32's resignation was accepted based in part on what Alum 53 reported in her letter. Administrator 1 indicated that he did not think that he wrote a letter of recommendation for Respondent 32. There were no letters of recommendation for Respondent 32 contained in the file dated after Alum 53's report in the 2000s.

⁴¹ Administrator 1 told the Investigative Team that he did not recall receiving a report that Respondent 32 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with Alum 54.

Alleged Conduct Starting in the 1990s

This section includes 14 firsthand reports of physical conduct of a sexual nature involving 10 separate Respondents.

A. Respondent 33

Respondent 33 was a residence life staff member at the Academy in the 1990s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 33 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1990s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 33

Alum 55 indicated that Respondent 33 engaged in grooming behavior with her by, for example, seeking her out and playing confidant to her. She explained that she went to Respondent 33 about relationship problems, that she felt that he was trying to create division between her and her boyfriend so that she was more isolated, and that Respondent 33 emotionally manipulated her. Alum 55 stated that Respondent 33 gave her hugs and on one occasion, kissed her on the cheek. Alum 55 stated that she was alone with Respondent 33 in his room when these interactions occurred. Alum 55 said that on one occasion, she went off campus in a car with Respondent 33 alone, and that Respondent 33 held her hand or touched her thigh for much of the trip. Alum 55 provided transcribed journal entries that she indicated were from the time when she was a student, and in one entry, she described a car ride during which Respondent 33 caressed her hand and that this was “erotic.” In another journal entry, Alum 55 wrote that her discussions with Respondent 33 were very intimate. In other journal entries, Alum 55 wrote that Respondent 33 kissed her and another student on the cheek, and that Respondent 33 was attracted to this other student.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 33

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 33 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 33 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 55 indicated that she did not think she told anyone about Respondent 33’s conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 33’s personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 33 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. In addition, none of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided

information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 33 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

B. Respondent 34

Respondent 34 was an arts faculty member at the Academy in the 1990s. Two alums reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 34 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them in the 1990s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 34

a. Alum 56

Alum 56 stated that Respondent 34 was her teacher and spent time after class helping her with her training. Alum 56 stated that one time after a post-class tutoring session, Respondent 34 told her to come with him to his office so that he could show her something related to the class, and that when she went to his office, Respondent 34 started rubbing her shoulders and she froze. Alum 56 stated that she felt that someone⁴² came to the front door of the department, that the incident was not acknowledged, and she “just kind of forgot about it.” Alum 56 stated that after the incident in Respondent 34’s office, Respondent 34 continued to single her out for training and invited her to his on-campus house to help prepare for an upcoming performance. Alum 56 stated that on one occasion, Respondent 34 invited Alum 56 to his house, where he rubbed her back, kissed her neck, touched her breasts, and touched close to her vagina under her clothing. Alum 56 said that she did not remember how long Respondent 34 engaged in this conduct but that it was long enough that her instincts kicked in and that she understood this was not a therapeutic massage. Alum 56 stated that she told Respondent 34 she needed to get a glass of water, and that she then went to the kitchen and left out the back door and ran to her dorm, and that when she got back to her dorm, she broke down.

Another alum provided corroborative information.

b. Alum 57

Alum 57 said that one night, she and a group of girls, some of whom were in Respondent 34’s sponsor group, were over at Respondent 34’s on-campus house. Alum 57 stated that the other girls left and Alum 57 stayed. Alum 57 stated that before the other girls left, someone said to her that Respondent 34 gave amazing massages, and that Alum 57 should get one. Alum 57 said that when the other girls left, Respondent 34 offered to give her a massage, stating that this would be great for her muscles. Alum 57 stated that Respondent 34 then gave her a massage on the couch while she was in her underwear. Alum 57 said that he first massaged her muscles and then began to touch her “genital regions” under her underwear. Alum 57 stated that she froze while Respondent 34 touched her. Alum 57 said that she got up to get dressed and that Respondent 34 offered to come to the room that Alum 57 was staying in and give her more massages, to which Alum 57 responded, “Nope, I’m good.” Alum 57 said that she stayed overnight at his house, in a bed by herself.

⁴² Alum 56 indicated that she did not remember who this person was.

Another alum provided corroborative information.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 34

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 34 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 34 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 56: Alum 56 stated that she went to the school office and reported what had happened. Alum 56 stated that her parents came to Interlochen. Alum 56 stated that she met with a small group of administrators, and she was told that because of her age, she could not sue for sexual abuse, and that the school did not have the ability to do anything because of her age. Alum 56 stated that the school was eager to “wrap it up and get it out of the way.” Alum 56 stated that the administrators asked what she wanted to do, and that she responded that if there was no recourse in court, she was not going to do anything as long as Interlochen fired Respondent 34. Alum 56 stated that Respondent 34 was fired “pretty much immediately.”

Alum 57: Alum 57 indicated that she told her parents about Respondent 34’s conduct with her the day after the incident and that her parents called Administrator 1. Alum 57 stated that she talked to Administrator 1 by phone.⁴³ Alum 57 stated that she thought that Respondent 34 was contacted that night and told that he could not have contact with anyone affiliated with the school. Alum 57 stated that the next day, Alum 57 was in Administrator 1’s office with at least one police officer. Alum 57 indicated that Interlochen administrators and the police decided that attempts to prosecute would be unsuccessful. Alum 57 stated that she remembered some mention of her age being a factor. Alum 57 indicated that Respondent 34 was forced to resign in connection with providing students with alcohol and lecturing male students on the use of “roofies” and ways to sexually manipulate women.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 34’s personnel file reflected that Interlochen received contemporaneous reports regarding Respondent 34’s conduct towards Alum 56 and Alum 57. Interlochen also provided information to the Investigative Team that Respondent 34 was terminated from his position at the Academy approximately three days after he was reported to have engaged in conduct of a sexual nature towards Alum 57, and that Interlochen reported the conduct involving both students to child protective services.

Administrator 1 told the Investigative Team that he recalled something related to Respondent 34 engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with a female student or students, but he did not remember the details.

⁴³ Administrator 1 told the Investigative Team that he did not remember speaking with anyone about Respondent 34’s conduct towards Alum 57.

C. Respondent 35

Respondent 35 was an arts faculty member in addition to holding other roles at Interlochen in the 1980s and 1990s, including at the Camp and the Academy. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 35 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1990s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 35

Alum 58 stated that she worked very closely with Respondent 35, and that they “struck up a friendship.” Alum 58 said that Respondent 35 flirted with her by exhibiting behavior that was “very seductive,” by being closer to Alum 58 than he needed to be, and by “maybe the informal brushing of hands.” Alum 58 stated that Respondent 35’s conduct towards her “felt off.” Alum 58 stated that there was an occasion when she was at Respondent 35’s house, sitting on Respondent 35’s couch telling him something serious and personal, that she said to him, ““But you are probably going to laugh at me,”” and that Respondent 35 took her face in his hands, lifted up her head, and said, ““I’m not laughing at you.”” Alum 58 stated that after this, she “suddenly thought, ‘He is going to kiss me, and I need to get out of here,’” and that she left. Alum 58 stated that after this incident, she started to avoid one-on-one meetings with him, and that Respondent 35 retaliated against her by criticizing her work and trying to get her to come and work more. Alum 58 stated that at one point, Respondent 35 told her, ““Remember I am one of the people who controls your scholarship.””

Alum 58’s mother told the Investigative Team that Alum 58 called her about Respondent 35. Alum 58’s mother said that Alum 58 said that Respondent 35 came on to female students when they stayed behind in class, and invited them to his room.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 35

Respondent 35 is deceased.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums and Alum 58’s Mother

Alum 58 stated that she told her mother about Respondent 35’s conduct, and that her mother flew to Michigan and had a meeting with Administrator 1. Alum 58 stated that during this meeting, her mother told Administrator 1 about Respondent 35’s conduct. Alum 58 stated that Administrator 1 did not believe her mother and nothing was done. Alum 58 indicated that she was not present when her mother spoke to Administrator 1.

Alum 58’s mother indicated that she did not remember exactly what Alum 58 said Respondent 35’s conduct was, but that it bothered Alum 58’s mother enough to go to Interlochen. Alum 58’s mother said that she thought she spoke with Administrator 1 about Respondent 35’s conduct, and

that Administrator 1 tried to pacify her and said not to worry and that it was under control. Alum 58's mother stated that she thought that Alum 58 was present for part of the meeting.

Another alum provided corroborative information.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 35's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 35 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

Administrator 1 told the Investigative Team that he was not aware of Respondent 35 engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with a student.

Administrator 7 told the Investigative Team that in the middle of an academic year, Administrator 1 or Administrator 9 came to him and said that Respondent 35 had been having a relationship with a student^{44,45} and that he was being fired immediately. Administrator 7 said that Respondent 35 was gone in two or three days. Administrator 7 stated that he spoke to Respondent 35, and that Respondent 35 did not deny the relationship and stated that he had "slipped up." Administrator 7 stated that there was no indication that any faculty members had been aware of Respondent 35's relationship with the student.

D. Respondent 36

Respondent 36 was a counselor at the Camp in the 1990s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 36 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him in the 1990s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 36

Alum 59 indicated that he met Respondent 36 because Alum 59 was friends with people who lived in Respondent 36's cabin. Alum 59 stated that it felt like Respondent 36 took Alum 59 under his wing. Alum 59 stated that Respondent 36 had said that he could "do things" for Alum 59, and told Alum 59, "We have connections at Interlochen," and "We can help you become famous." Alum 59 also indicated that Respondent 36 took Alum 59 to an empty cabin a few times per week, where Respondent 36 kissed Alum 59 on the mouth and all over the upper part of his body, and taught Alum 59 how to "touch another male's genitalia." Alum 59 indicated that there were several nights during which Alum 59's counselor was off duty and Respondent 36 watched Alum 59's cabin, and Respondent 36 sat on Alum 59's bed, touching Alum 59 under his sleeping bag when the lights were off while the other campers were present. Alum 59 stated that Respondent 36 touched him sexually maybe four or five times.

⁴⁴ Alum 58 said that the year after her mother spoke to the administration about Respondent 35, Respondent 35 was caught engaging in a relationship with another student and was fired. Administrator 7 and Alum 58 each shared the same name of the student.

⁴⁵ Administrator 7 and Alum 58 each referred to the same academic year when discussing Respondent 35's engaging in a relationship with the student.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 36

Alum 59 stated that he did not know Respondent 36's last name. The Investigative Team attempted to identify this individual given the information provided by Alum 59, but was unable to do so, and, as a result, could not contact him.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 59 indicated that Respondent 36 told Alum 59 that to be a part of Respondent 36's world, Alum 59 could not tell anyone what had happened between them. Alum 59 said that at the time, he did not talk with anyone about Respondent 36's conduct towards him, and that if any adult knew about Respondent 36's conduct towards Alum 59, they never said anything to Alum 59.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 36, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 36.

E. Respondent 37

One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 37, an academic teacher whose name she did not know, engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1990s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 37

Alum 60 said that she was in an academic class at Camp and Respondent 37 walked around the room, came over to her, and started deeply massaging her shoulders on top of her clothing for approximately 15 to 20 seconds. Alum 60 stated that Respondent 37 rubbed her shoulders while he talked to the class, and that it went "on and on" and was very uncomfortable. Alum 60 indicated that she did not remember Respondent 37 massaging or rubbing anyone else's shoulders.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 37

Alum 60 stated that she did not know the name of Respondent 37. The Investigative Team attempted to identify Respondent 37 given the information provided by Alum 60, but was unable to do so, and, as a result, could not contact Respondent 37.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 60 indicated that at the time, she did not tell anyone about Respondent 37's conduct towards her. She indicated that she did not have any reason to believe that any adult at Interlochen knew about Respondent 37's conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 37, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 37.

F. Respondent 38

One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 38, an arts faculty member whose name she did not know, engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 1990s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 38

Alum 61 stated that Respondent 38 attended a school dance dressed as a cat and crawled around and rubbed Alum 61's legs and the legs of other students in a very sexual way. Alum 61 explained that Respondent 38 was on his hands and knees and was "rubbing his body like a cat and sticking his butt out and rubbing his butt" against her legs. Alum 61 stated that she told Respondent 38 to stop, that he rubbed against her more aggressively, that she told him to stop again, and that he kept going. Alum 61 stated that she then kicked him in the ribs, told him to stop again, and said expletives to Respondent 38, but that Respondent 38 "did not break character." Alum 61 said that Respondent 38 did not stop rubbing against her, even after she kicked him in the ribs, and that she had to physically move and go to another part of the room to get away from him. Alum 61 stated that she saw Respondent 38 engage in the same conduct with other students.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 38

Alum 61 stated that she did not know the name of Respondent 38. The Investigative Team attempted to identify Respondent 38 given the information provided by Alum 61, but was unable to do so, and, as a result could not contact Respondent 38.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 61 indicated that she did not know if any adult at Interlochen became aware of Respondent 38's conduct towards her at the dance. Alum 61 said that Respondent 38 was fired in the middle

of the year that he had engaged in the conduct at the dance, although she did not know why he was fired.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 38, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 38.

G. Respondent 39

One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 39, an unknown residence life staff member, engaged in physical conduct with him in the 1990s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 39

Alum 62 said that Respondent 39, a male residence life staff member whose name Alum 62 did not recall, ran around the dorm and pinched him and other students on their rear ends over their clothing.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 39

Alum 62 stated that he did not know the name of Respondent 39. The Investigative Team attempted to identify Respondent 39 given the information provided during this investigation, but was unable to do so, and, as a result could not contact Respondent 39.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 62 stated that another student's mother found out about Respondent 39's conduct and contacted Interlochen. Alum 62 said that Administrator 10 investigated Respondent 39's conduct and that Respondent 39 was terminated.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 39, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 39.

H. Respondent 40

Respondent 40 was an arts faculty member in the 1980s and 1990s at the Academy and at the Camp from the 1980s to the 2000s. One alum reported that Respondent 40 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him at the Academy in the 1990s.⁴⁶

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 40

Alum 63 stated that Respondent 40 was his teacher, and that over time, Alum 63 got to know Respondent 40 more and went to Respondent 40's house, both with other students and alone. Alum 63 stated that Respondent 40 was supportive of him, and that Alum 63 had the sense that Respondent 40 cared about him and needed Alum 63 in his life. Alum 63 stated that Respondent 40's relationship with him was "pretty intense, pretty intimate," and that looking back, the relationship was outside the scope of a student-teacher relationship. Alum 63 stated that Respondent 40 invited Alum 63 to his home or on a walk or to talk, and that Respondent 40 shared things that were "sexual in nature or an innuendo." Alum 63 stated that Respondent 40 shared sexual innuendos about being attracted to other male students and told Alum 63 that Respondent 40 had sex with a male student. Alum 63 said that Respondent 40 asked Alum 63 questions like, "'Who do you like? What turns you on?'" Alum 63 stated that he attended dinner at Respondent 40's house by himself a couple times a month, and also went out for meals with Respondent 40. Alum 63 stated that Respondent 40 would hug Alum 63, and that some of these hugs included Respondent 40 putting his head on Alum 63's shoulder. Alum 63 indicated that the hugs never occurred in public. Alum 63 stated that one night, when he was at Respondent 40's house, Respondent 40 performed oral sex on Alum 63 while Alum 63 was intoxicated. Alum 63 stated that he woke up the next morning in Respondent 40's bed without recollection of how he got there. Alum 63 stated that soon after this incident, Respondent 40 abruptly resigned.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 40

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 40 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 40 responded to this outreach and agreed to meet with the Investigative Team.

Respondent 40 denied that he ever pursued or engaged in a romantic or sexual relationship with a student at Interlochen, or that he ever engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with a student at Interlochen.⁴⁷ Respondent 40 further denied that he ever served alcohol to a student at Interlochen, or that a student ever stayed overnight at his home. He indicated that he did not remember whether he had any one-on-one interactions with any students at his house. Respondent 40 indicated that when he taught at Interlochen, he placed his hands on students in the normal course of teaching in the performing arts, which he indicated was standard practice at the time. He also said that he was sure that he hugged students, "but beyond that nothing."

⁴⁶ Another alum indicated that in the 1990s, he dropped something off at Respondent 40's home, and that Respondent 40 came to the door wearing a bathrobe and invited the alum in to watch a children's movie, and that the alum felt uncomfortable.

⁴⁷ Alum 63 did not consent to have the Investigative Team share his name with Respondent 40, and therefore, the Investigative Team did not so.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 63 stated that he did not speak with any adult at Interlochen about Respondent 40's conduct towards him. Alum 63 said that he thought that faculty members who were close to Respondent 40 could see that he was spending more time with Alum 63 than was appropriate.

b. Information from Interlochen

A former teacher indicated that when she taught at the Academy in the 1990s, she sent a letter to Interlochen regarding her concerns about Respondent 40's conduct, and spoke to a division director about her concerns related to Respondent 40, and that the division director said that Respondent 40 was no longer employed there. The former teacher said that she responded that Respondent 40 was coming back to Interlochen that summer, and that the division director then smirked at her.

Respondent 40's personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 40 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

I. Respondent 41

Respondent 41 worked at the Academy in the 1980s and 1990s, including as a residence life staff member at the Academy, and as a member of the arts faculty at the Camp in the 2000s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 41 engaged in physical conduct with him in the 1990s. Respondent 41's personnel file reflected that in the 1990s, he made comments of a sexual nature to students and took actions that a student and others interpreted as advances.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 41

Alum 64 stated that Respondent 41 was a residence life staff member for Alum 64's dorm. Alum 64 stated that Respondent 41 gave Alum 64 back rubs, which he thought were over his clothes, and also gave back rubs to other students. Alum 64 also stated that Respondent 41 tucked him in at night.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 41

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 41 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 41 chose not to speak with the Investigative Team. Counsel for Respondent 41 wrote to both Interlochen and the Investigative Team that Respondent 41 was unaware of any basis for suggesting that he engaged in any improper conduct and denied any allegation to that effect.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 64 indicated that he was not aware of whether adults at Interlochen knew of Respondent 41's conduct towards him.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 41's personnel file reflected that in the 1990s, Interlochen received contemporaneous reports of Respondent 41 engaging in non-physical conduct of a sexual nature with students on three separate occasions, and that no disciplinary action, beyond documenting the concerns, was taken against him. Respondent 41's personnel file did not reflect that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 41 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with Alum 64.

Administrator 1 informed the Investigative Team that other than one report of Respondent 41 engaging in non-physical conduct of a sexual nature, he was not aware of Respondent 41 engaging in any other conduct of a sexual nature. None of the other employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 41 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

Administrator 1 said that Respondent 41 resigned from Interlochen, but that Respondent 41 was not asked by Interlochen to resign, nor did he resign due to any "issues." Administrator 1 stated that Respondent 41 left Interlochen because he "was ready to move on."

J. Respondent 42

Respondent 42 held various positions at the Academy and the Camp in the 1990s and 2000s, including as an arts faculty member. One alum reported that in the 1990s, Respondent 42 engaged in physical conduct with her that she described as "weird." Three alums reported that Respondent 42 engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with them in the 2000s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 42

a. Alum 65

Alum 65 stated that in the 1990s, while she was in the computer lab in her dorm, Respondent 42 came over to her, put his hand on her face, pulled her face in, and whispered in her ear, "'It is so nice to see your smiling face this morning in practice.'" Alum 65 stated that during this interaction, Respondent 42's lips touched her ear. Alum 65 stated that after Respondent 42 whispered this in her ear, he looked at her and left. Alum 65 said that she did not believe that Respondent 42 engaged in similar conduct with her again.

b. Alum 66

Alum 66 stated that in the 2000s, he experienced two incidents with Respondent 42, both of which occurred in the summer. Alum 66 stated that with regard to the first incident, that Respondent 42 had locked himself out of his house and asked for Alum 66's assistance, and that Alum 66 assisted Respondent 42 in gaining entry. Alum 66 said that afterwards, Respondent 42 decided to take a shower. Alum 66 stated that Respondent 42 walked naked in front of Alum 66 without a towel. Alum 66 said that he thought Respondent 42 was "testing the water" to see how Alum 66 would respond.

Alum 66 stated that the second incident occurred in the summer in a parking lot at Interlochen. Alum 66 stated either his chest hurt or Respondent 42's chest hurt, that he and Respondent 42 were discussing this, and that they wound up in the back of a vehicle, where first Alum 66 massaged Respondent 42's chest muscles, and then Respondent 42 massaged Alum 66's chest. Alum 66 indicated that he could not recall if Respondent 42 massaged Alum 66 over or under his shirt, and also stated that he remembered the feeling of "skin on skin." He stated that Respondent 42's hands "wander[ed] lower and below the waistline." Alum 66 said that Respondent 42 touched his penis and that this was "skin on skin" contact. Alum 66 said that he felt awkward and that he somehow excused himself from the situation.

c. Alum 67

Alum 67 stated that in the 2000s, Respondent 42 came up to Alum 67 after a performance and told Alum 67 what a beautiful performer he was. Alum 67 said that Respondent 42 also told him that he had a group of students over to his house who he thought were the most talented, and that he wanted Alum 67 to join that group. Alum 67 stated that Respondent 42 invited him alone to dinner at his house, and indicated that Respondent 42 drank wine during the dinner. Alum 67 stated that Respondent 42 then took him out on Respondent 42's boat, and that while on the boat, Respondent 42 laid Alum 67 down flat so they could not be seen. Alum 67 indicated that Respondent 42 pushed him down, was holding him down, and started to kiss him. Alum 67 stated that Respondent 42 then performed oral sex on him and that it felt as though it went on for a long time. Alum 67 stated that after this incident, they went back to Respondent 42's house, and that Respondent 42 wanted to go to the jacuzzi, which Alum 67 stated was either in or connected to the bedroom, or in the bathroom. Alum 67 stated that he had his swimsuit on in the jacuzzi, and that Respondent 42 sat behind him with his legs wrapped around him. Alum 67 said that Respondent 42 then pulled his swimsuit down and started to touch Alum 67's penis. Alum 67 said that Respondent 42 moved him to the bed, laid him down, was over Alum 67's face, with Respondent 42's body weight on him, and shoved his penis into Alum 67's mouth, and that Alum 67 was gagging. Alum 67 also indicated that he thought that Respondent 42 performed oral sex on him in the bed. Alum 67 said that Respondent 42 then drove Alum 67 back to campus. Alum 67 indicated that when he immediately distanced himself from Respondent 42 after this, Respondent 42 was "vile and angry at first" and then told Alum 67 that he "wasn't worth [Respondent 42's] time anymore."

d. Alum 68

Alum 68 stated that in the 2000s, Respondent 42 invited Alum 68 to go to the gym, and that on the way to the gym, Respondent 42 said that he had to stop at his house to get something. Alum 68 stated that Respondent 42's house was on the lake, and that Respondent 42 asked him if he wanted to go out on the boat, which they did. Alum 68 said that when they were in the middle of the lake, Respondent 42 turned off the engine, sat next to Alum 68, and touched him through his shorts. Alum 68 stated that Respondent 42 then pulled Alum 68's shorts off and performed oral sex on him. Alum 68 stated that he felt disgusted and wanted to get away, so he jumped into the water to get away and to "feel clean." Alum 68 stated that he swam around for a second and then got back in the boat. He noted that he probably was in a state of shock, and that he did not remember any specific conversations with Respondent 42 after the incident.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 42

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 42 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 42 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alums

Alum 65: Alum 65 indicated that she did not tell any adult at Interlochen about Respondent 42's conduct towards her.

Alum 66: Alum 66 indicated that he did not discuss Respondent 42's conduct towards him at the time of the incidents, and had no reason to believe that any adult at Interlochen was aware of Respondent 42's conduct towards him.

Alum 67: Alum 67 stated that soon after Respondent 42's interactions with him, Respondent 42 was fired. Alum 67 noted that he did not report Respondent 42's conduct at the time, but that there was no way people did not know, and that an arts faculty member asked Alum 67, "Is there anything you need to tell me?" Alum 67 said that he was scared, and so did not say anything to this teacher. Alum 67 stated that years later at a reunion, another arts faculty member said, "I knew about you and [Respondent 42]." Alum 67 stated that he asked the teacher why he did not say anything, and the teacher said, "You were having fun."

Alum 68: Alum 68 stated that when he was a student, somehow a guidance counselor learned of the incident with Respondent 42. Alum 68 stated that a couple of days later, the guidance counselor took Alum 68 out of class and said that he had to go speak to the dean about what happened. Alum 68 said that during a meeting, he talked to the dean of faculty, the dean of students, a female who was "some sort of administrator type person," and a guidance counselor. Alum 68 noted that he was unsure of the names of the individuals with whom he spoke but also that these individuals might have included Administrator 1 and Administrator 11. Alum 68 said that he told the individuals in the meeting what happened and then Respondent 42 "vanished" from campus that same day.

b. Information from Interlochen

Administrator 1 stated that when he was an administrator at Interlochen, the school received a report that Respondent 42 took a male student on a boat⁴⁸ and that something of a sexual nature was reported to have taken place there. Administrator 1 said that he also remembered that Respondent 42 invited the male student to his house, which Administrator 1 said was on campus, and that something happened there. Administrator 1 said that he recalled a meeting he had with Respondent 42 and Administrator 10 to tell Respondent 42 that “he was done at Interlochen.” Administrator 1 stated that he did not know whether Respondent 42 resigned or if Interlochen fired him.

Administrator 12 said that she was aware of a report that Respondent 42 and a student were on Respondent 42’s boat and “there was a sexual encounter,” but that she did not meet with either Respondent 42 or the student regarding Respondent 42’s alleged conduct. Administrator 12 indicated that she was not aware of whether Respondent 42 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any other students. Administrator 12 stated that Respondent 42 was terminated.

The Investigative Team reviewed Respondent 42’s personnel file, which reflected that Respondent 42 wrote an undated letter announcing that he was leaving his position at the Academy for personal reasons. Respondent 42’s personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 42 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

Alleged Conduct Starting in the 2000s

This section includes 3 firsthand reports of physical conduct of a sexual nature involving 3 separate Respondents.

A. Respondent 43

Respondent 43 was an arts faculty member at the Academy in the 2000s. Respondent 43’s personnel file reflected that he engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with one student in the 2000s, and that another student was present when this occurred.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 43

Alum 69 told the Investigative Team that Respondent 43 invited Alum 69 and a male student⁴⁹ to his house because they were his favorite students. Alum 69 stated that at Respondent 43’s house,

⁴⁸ Administrator 1 said that he did not know whether Respondent 42 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with more than one male student.

⁴⁹ Although the Investigative Team did not speak with this male student, because the Investigative Team spoke with Alum 69, whose report included a firsthand observation of Respondent 43’s conduct towards the student, and Respondent 43’s personnel file included a firsthand account by the male student, the Investigative Team included information regarding Respondent 43’s conduct towards the student in this section.

while they were watching television, Respondent 43 put a blanket over himself and the male student, and then gave the male student a “hand job” under the blanket. Alum 69 stated that when Respondent 43 got up to go to the bathroom, the male student turned to her and said, ““What do I do?”” Alum 69 stated that after Respondent 43 returned, they finished what they were watching, and Respondent 43 drove the students back to campus.

Alum 69’s mother told the Investigative Team that Alum 69 called her and said that Respondent 43 had invited Alum 69 and the male student to Respondent 43’s house, that they watched a movie, that Respondent 43 put a blanket on, that he was “playing” with the male student, that this student said, ““Help me,”” and that she did not know what to do.

Respondent 43’s personnel file included a contemporaneous statement by the male student in which the student wrote that Respondent 43 wanted to have more than a teacher-student relationship with him, and that Respondent 43’s conduct included repeated emails and phone calls that progressively became more personal and inappropriate. The male student wrote that Respondent 43 invited him and another student to dinner, and then to Respondent 43’s house to watch a movie. The male student wrote that Respondent 43 placed a blanket on Respondent 43’s lap and on the male student’s lap, grabbed the male student’s hand underneath the blanket and placed it next to Respondent 43’s leg, that Respondent 43 then moved his hand to the male student’s thigh and higher, and that the male student stopped him. The male student wrote that he was shaken, scared, and did not know what to do.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 43

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 43 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 43 did not respond to this outreach.⁵⁰

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum and Alum 69’s Mother

Alum 69 stated that the week after she observed Respondent 43 engaging in this conduct with her friend, she told her mother, and that her mother went to the administration to tell them about Respondent 43’s conduct.

Alum 69’s mother told the Investigative Team that she called the school as soon as Alum 69 called her about the incident. Alum 69’s mother indicated that she did not know who she reported this incident to at Interlochen, or what position that person held.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Outreach was sent to identified personal email addresses, and a certified letter was sent to Respondent 43’s last known home address, which was returned as undeliverable.

⁵¹ Respondent 43’s personnel file reflected that Alum 69 initially reported the conduct by Respondent 43 to her parents, who then called Interlochen.

b. Information from Interlochen

Administrator 13 told the Investigative Team that the Tuesday after the incident, the male student⁵² and another student came to his office and told him that they had been at Respondent 43's house and that there had been a blanket over them. Administrator 13 stated that he asked the male student if Respondent 43 had touched him, and that the male student said Respondent 43 had not. Administrator 13 stated that after speaking with the male student and the other student, Administrator 13 was asked to go to the president's office and Administrator 1 was there, who informed Administrator 13 that Interlochen had received a call from the other student's parent.

Based on information provided by Administrator 12 during an interview, approximately four days after the conduct by Respondent 43, she spoke with the male student's parents, who told her that there had been inappropriate touching.

Based on Respondent 43's personnel file, approximately four days after the conduct by Respondent 43 towards the male student, Respondent 43, Administrator 1, Administrator 13, and Administrator 10 met to discuss the conduct, and that the day after the meeting, Administrator 1 informed Respondent 43 that his teaching contract for the following year would be on hold, and Interlochen filed a Report of Actual or Suspected Child Abuse or Neglect form with the Michigan Family Independence Agency regarding the conduct.

Administrator 12 told the Investigative Team that after the incident was reported, Interlochen's IT department found many emails reflecting that Respondent 43 had been grooming the male student. Administrator 13 stated that the local prosecutor retrieved Respondent 43's laptop, and discovered that Respondent 43 had corresponded with students online. Based on information from Administrator 12, approximately six days after the incident with the male student, Respondent 43 was arrested.

Based on Respondent 43's personnel file, approximately four weeks after the incident with the male student, Administrator 1 sent a letter to Respondent 43 notifying him that he had been terminated from his position at the Academy effective immediately.

Based on publicly available information, Respondent 43 subsequently pleaded guilty to a count of attempted fourth degree criminal sexual conduct.⁵³

B. Respondent 44

Respondent 44 was an arts faculty member at the Camp in the 2000s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 44 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 2000s.

⁵² Administrator 13 and Alum 69 each shared the same name of the male student.

⁵³ Interlochen confirmed to the Investigative Team that this conviction was related to this incident.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 44

Alum 70 said that Respondent 44 was her arts faculty member. Alum 70 stated that a fellow camper told her to watch out when saying goodbye to Respondent 44, and that the goodbye might be a little uncomfortable. Alum 70 said that at the end of a private lesson during the final week of the summer, she and Respondent 44 were alone, she was packing up her things, and that when she said goodbye to Respondent 44, he grabbed her face and kissed her on the lips. Alum 70 indicated that the kiss did not last long. Alum 70 stated that after the incident, she walked back to her cabin feeling stunned.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 44

Alum 70 indicated that she did not know Respondent 44's first name. The Investigative Team attempted to identify this individual given the information provided by Alum 70, but was unable to do so, and, as a result could not contact him.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 70 indicated that she did not know whether Interlochen was aware of Respondent 44's conduct towards her.

b. Information from Interlochen

Given that the Investigative Team could not identify Respondent 44, Interlochen was not able to provide any information regarding whether it was on notice of any conduct of a sexual nature by Respondent 44.

C. Respondent 45

Respondent 45 was an arts faculty member at the Academy from the 2000s to 2010s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 45 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her in the 2000s.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 45

Alum 71 indicated that Respondent 45 was one of her arts faculty. Alum 71 described several interactions with Respondent 45, including one at a rehearsal and one at prom.

Alum 71 stated that even though she was not the best student in a class taught by Respondent 45, he used her quite a bit as an assistant, during which he put his hands on her hips. Alum 71 stated that she was cast in a performance, and that at the end of a rehearsal, Respondent 45 pinched Alum 71's buttocks over her clothing for approximately one to two seconds. Alum 71 stated that she turned around immediately and looked at Respondent 45 with a shocked expression. Alum 71 indicated that Respondent 45 looked at her, smiled or laughed, and winked.

Alum 71 also indicated that Respondent 45 was a chaperone at the Interlochen version of prom, “MORP,” and that at MORP, he said something about her having done a good job picking out her clothes, and that this comment made her uncomfortable. Alum 71 stated that Respondent 45 said this in front of Alum 71’s friends and Respondent 45’s girlfriend who taught a few workshops at Interlochen.

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 45

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 45 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 45 responded to this outreach and agreed to meet with the Investigative Team.⁵⁴

Respondent 45 said that when he taught at Interlochen, he placed his hands on students in the normal course of teaching in the performing arts. Respondent 45, when asked if he ever touched a student other than while teaching, stated that he occasionally hugged students, which he described as “side hugs” or “dad hugs,” and that if someone was struggling, he would put his hand on their shoulder or hold their hand. Respondent 45 denied that he engaged in any other touching of a student. Respondent 45 said that he occasionally commented on a student’s clothing, for instance if they were not wearing enough clothing during the winter. He also noted that MORP was a “big dress up thing” for students, that students spent a lot of time on their makeup and their dresses, and that he wanted them to feel special, so he told them they were beautiful.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 71 stated that there were other people present during the incident that occurred at the rehearsal, and that if anyone saw what Respondent 45 did to Alum 71, they did not say anything to her. Alum 71 indicated that she never told anyone about Respondent 45’s conduct towards her, and that she was not aware of any adult being aware of Respondent 45’s conduct at the rehearsal. She indicated that she did not inform any adult about Respondent 45’s conduct towards her at the prom but noted that Respondent 45’s girlfriend was present and would have heard it.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 45’s personnel file did not include information indicating that Interlochen was on notice that Respondent 45 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. In addition, none of the employees with whom the Investigative Team spoke for this investigation provided information reflecting that they were aware that Respondent 45 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student.

⁵⁴ Alum 71 did not consent to have the Investigative Team share her name with Respondent 45 and therefore, the Investigative Team did not do so.

Alleged Conduct starting in the 2010s

This section includes 1 report of physical conduct of a sexual nature involving 1 Respondent.

A. Respondent 46

Respondent 46 was a residence life staff member at the Academy in the 2000s and the 2010s and worked at the Camp in the 2000s and 2010s. One alum reported to the Investigative Team that Respondent 46 engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him in the 2010s. Based on a review of Respondent 46's personnel file, a second alum reported to Interlochen in the 2010s that Respondent 46 had engaged in a sexual relationship with him.

1. Alleged Conduct by Respondent 46

Alum 72 stated that Respondent 46 would invite a few students to his room to watch television, hang out, and chat in his living room. Alum 72 stated that Respondent 46 began to treat Alum 72 more as a friend than someone under him, offered Alum 72 alcohol, and drank with him maybe 10 times. Alum 72 indicated that when he and Respondent 46 drank together, it was just the two of them in Respondent 46's room. Alum 72 stated that on one occasion, he was in Respondent 46's room and had a lot to drink, and that Respondent 46 offered that Alum 72 lie down in Respondent 46's bedroom because Alum 72 was feeling "woozy and really drunk." Alum 72 stated that he lay down in Respondent 46's bed, that Respondent 46 got into bed with Alum 72, and that Respondent 46 was comforting Alum 72, and then started fondling his genitals under his clothes and whispered sexual things to him. Alum 72 stated that Respondent 46 asked him if Alum 72 wanted Respondent 46 to give him a hand job or a blow job and that Alum 72 said no. Alum 72 stated that he was barely conscious when Respondent 46 touched him. Alum 72 stated that at some point, he got up, ran to Respondent 46's bathroom, threw up, and then "book[ed] it" to his own room. Alum 72 stated that he messaged Respondent 46 the next morning asking him why, and that Respondent 46 did not respond. Alum 72 stated that after the incident, he did not have much contact with Respondent 46 and that Alum 72 "really shut down the relationship."

2. Outreach to and Response by Respondent 46

Both Interlochen and the Investigative Team contacted Respondent 46 to invite him to participate in the investigation. Respondent 46 did not respond to this outreach.

3. Interlochen Notice and Response

a. Information from Alum

Alum 72 indicated that at the time, he did not tell anyone about Respondent 46's conduct towards him, and that he did not think any adults at Interlochen were aware of Respondent 46's conduct towards him.

b. Information from Interlochen

Respondent 46's personnel file reflected that one year before Alum 72 started at the Academy, Respondent 46's Camp supervisor noted a concern about Respondent 46 demonstrating affection to campers in a way that made some counselors uncomfortable, and recommended that Respondent 46 not be rehired. Administrator 12 decided nonetheless to hire Respondent 46, attributing the concerns to a difficult relationship between Respondent 46 and his supervisor, and Respondent 46 then received a positive evaluation that academic year in his position at the Academy and for his work at the Camp the following summer (right before Alum 72 started at the Academy).

Respondent 46's personnel file reflected that in March of the same academic year as the incident that Alum 72 reported to the Investigative Team, Respondent 46 had a meeting with Administrator 1 and Administrator 14, during which Alum 72's name was referenced, Respondent 46 was asked if anything inappropriate or physical had happened, and he responded that it had not. Approximately four days after this meeting, Administrator 1 informed Respondent 46 that the Academy was not issuing a contract for him for the next academic year at that time, pending a final review of Respondent 46's job performance. Based on Respondent 46's personnel file, Administrator 14 then raised concerns that Respondent 46 took a single student off campus multiple times in his personal vehicle, and had single students in his room. Respondent 46's personnel file reflected that in May of this same year, the hold on Respondent 46's contract was lifted,⁵⁵ and Respondent 46 continued as a residence life staff member for the following academic year. In August before the start of the next academic year, Respondent 46 sent his letter of resignation to Interlochen, and subsequently requested a reference letter, which an administrator considered providing, but did not ultimately do so. Administrator 1 told the Investigative Team that Interlochen terminated Respondent 46.

Based on Respondent 46's personnel file, approximately one month after Respondent 46 sent his letter of resignation, a student and his parent notified Interlochen regarding conduct by Respondent 46 towards the student.⁵⁶ Within approximately two days, Interlochen reported the matter to child protective services and worked with a local detective over the course of the fall, and commenced its own investigation. Based on Respondent 46's personnel file, approximately one month after Interlochen reported Respondent 46 to child protective services, Respondent 46 was informed that he was not welcome on campus and to refrain from contact with any students or their parents, and that no positive recommendations would be provided. Approximately four months later, Administrator 1 emailed Respondent 46 and referenced Respondent 46's failure to cease communication with Interlochen students, that Respondent 46 had to do everything possible to stop the contact, and that if he did not, Interlochen would have to take further action, including the involvement of law enforcement.

⁵⁵ The personnel file reflected that Interlochen requested that a Child Abuse/Neglect Central Registry clearance be performed on Respondent 46, and that in June of the same year, Interlochen was informed that there was no record of Respondent 46 being identified as a perpetrator of child abuse and/or neglect on the Child Abuse/Neglect Central Registry system.

⁵⁶ Administrator 12 also provided information that Respondent 46 had engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with this student, and that Interlochen heard about this the following year.

V. Firsthand Accounts of Conduct by Epstein

As noted in Section I, during the course of the investigation, Interlochen asked the Investigative Team to conduct specific outreach to alums who Interlochen believed might have relevant information regarding Epstein, including regarding potential conduct of a sexual nature with students. Of the eight alums with whom Interlochen connected the Investigative Team regarding Epstein, six responded to this outreach and agreed to meet with the Investigative Team. Of these six alums, two reported that Epstein engaged in physical conduct of a sexual nature with them.

Based on information provided to the Investigative Team by Interlochen, Epstein was a donor to Interlochen from 1990 to 2003, during which time he provided scholarships to individual students and funded the construction of a named lodge. The following summary includes information from firsthand accounts of physical conduct of a sexual nature by Epstein provided by alums during interviews with the Investigative Team.⁵⁷ This summary does not include information from any publicly available sources (e.g., media reports, civil filings, or court records), firsthand or otherwise.

Two alums shared with the Investigative Team that they met Epstein related to the alums' connection to Interlochen. They each indicated that their interactions with Epstein occurred when he was still a donor to Interlochen.

One alum said that when she met Epstein and Maxwell at Interlochen, they offered to pay for her tuition, which they did. She noted that they withdrew financial support for subsequent schooling after she did not engage in requested conduct. This alum said that during the time she interacted with Epstein and Maxwell at Interlochen, they asked her to Epstein's lodge on campus, and that while there, Epstein engaged in sexual conduct with her, brushing against her body over her clothes, in a manner in which he indicated was accidental. This alum also stated that she visited Epstein in New York City on three occasions when she was a student at Interlochen, and that Epstein paid for her flights there. She described being in a room with Epstein in New York, and that his hands were on her. She said that every time he was "handsy" with her, she would freeze until he would stop. She also described being in Epstein's home and massaging his feet and rubbing his back. This alum said that on occasions when she and Epstein were crossing the road, he put his hand on her crotch. This alum indicated that she did not tell anyone about Epstein's conduct towards her until decades later.

The other alum described that she may have met Epstein and Maxwell when she visited a friend in New York during spring break when she was a student at Interlochen, but said that nothing remarkable happened during that break. This alum said that the summer after she graduated from Interlochen, Epstein paid for her flight to New York, and that during the visit to New York, she interacted with Epstein and Maxwell. She said that while Epstein was giving her a tour of his

⁵⁷ Given the national conversation around conduct by Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell ("Maxwell"), the Investigative Team determined that it would be ineffective to use identifiers for them, as, even with such identifiers, it could be clear who these identifiers referred to. Because of the use of their names and in adherence with the general privacy principles articulated in Section II.E, in order to protect the privacy of the alums discussed in this section, the Investigative Team provides limited details regarding them and the reported conduct.

home, he brought her into a room with a massage table, that she gave him a massage, and that he may have asked her to remove her top. The alum said that after she left his home, she never had contact with Epstein or Maxwell again. Two individuals who spoke with the Investigative Team provided information corroborative of this alum's account. In addition, the alum and her mother each shared that this alum disclosed Epstein's conduct to her mother. The mother stated that "pretty quickly after" she learned of this conduct, she called the main number at Interlochen to report Epstein's conduct towards her daughter. She said that she probably gave Epstein's name, and told the person on the phone that she knew he was a benefactor of Interlochen. The mother said that the woman she spoke with said that Interlochen was not aware of any problems with Epstein, that he was not a teacher at Interlochen, and that the conduct had not happened on campus. The mother said that from the conversation, she could tell that she was not getting anywhere, and that she told the woman that she wanted Interlochen to know that this man was preying on their students. The mother indicated that no one from Interlochen ever followed up with her about this call.

Documents provided by Interlochen confirmed that Epstein contributed to the tuition of a small number of alums of the Camp and the Academy, including the alum described above who reported to the Investigative Team that Epstein paid for her tuition. There were no records provided to the Investigative Team reflecting notice to Interlochen of misconduct by Epstein. Further, none of the current or former employees interviewed by the Investigative Team provided information reflecting that they were aware at the time that Epstein had engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with any student. One alum stated that he remembered two adults affiliated with Interlochen gave him warnings about Epstein. The alum knew the position but not the name of one of the adults, and the other adult is deceased.

Finally, although many individuals who participated in this investigation shared concerns related to Epstein and Maxwell and their engagement with and connection to Interlochen, most of these individuals did not report knowing, encountering, or engaging with Epstein and/or Maxwell. Rather, many individuals described Epstein's and Maxwell's reported unfettered access to campus and students and campers as emblematic of a larger structural issue at Interlochen: access to students and campers at Interlochen by adults who were not employees of the institution. See Section VIII. Also, others reported that although they did not have firsthand experiences with Epstein and/or Maxwell, learning that Epstein and Maxwell were present on Interlochen's campus at the same time as the alum impacted them and caused them to rethink certain events that occurred there.

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it renamed the building, which was named after Epstein, Green Lake Lodge in 2009, and demolished the building in June of 2026 after providing local law enforcement the opportunity to photograph the interior and exterior of the building for any future evidentiary use.

VI. Firsthand Accounts of Non-Physical Conduct of a Sexual Nature by Adults Affiliated with Interlochen

Multiple individuals reported to the Investigative Team firsthand accounts of adults affiliated with Interlochen engaging in conduct that they described as sexual, inappropriate, and/or

uncomfortable, but generally did not involve physical contact.^{58,59} This conduct included, but was not limited to: 1) sexual comments and/or questions, some of which may have demonstrated romantic or sexual interest; and 2) conduct characterized as grooming, uncomfortable, inappropriate, and/or odd. This section includes a representative summary of the information shared with the Investigative Team.

A. Sexual Comments and/or Questions

Multiple alums reported that adults affiliated with Interlochen made sexual comments to them or asked them sexual questions. One alum indicated that at Camp in the 1950s, when she had an instrument between her legs, an arts faculty member said, ““You are sitting there with God’s gift between your legs, and all you do is scratch,”” which the alum described as “gross.” One alum stated that in the 1970s, a guest artist was “very flirtatious” with her, and that she was told that this same guest artist asked if she would “put out.” Another alum stated that in the 1970s, a staff member tried to get her to do suggestive poses when he took her senior photos, and that while doing so, he stated, ““Hook your thumb in your belt loop and jut your hip out.”” One alum stated that in the 1980s or 1990s, she and her friend wanted to get cute dresses, and that an academic teacher said to them, ““I know what you guys are going to do. You want to get sexy dresses,”” and then he said, ““I got you.”” One alum indicated that in the 1990s, a guidance counselor asked him sexual questions that were “really weird.”

Several alums also reported that an adult affiliated with Interlochen made comments indicating to them that the adult may have demonstrated romantic or sexual interest in them.

An alum indicated that in the 1950s, an academic teacher stated that he wanted to put her head on a pedestal, that she had good cheekbones, that he was in love with her, and that he wanted to spend more time with her.

Another alum indicated that in the 1960s, an arts faculty member followed her as she headed to her dorm and started to talk to her. The alum stated that the teacher wanted to go out to dinner, and she thought that he wanted to escalate his interactions with her.

An alum stated that in the 1970s, she auditioned for a guest artist, who then invited her to Los Angeles and to dinner. Another alum stated that in the 1970s, she was “hit on” by a diplomat during a school trip. The alum stated that the diplomat followed her or took her on a walk outside and kept sending her red roses every month when she returned to Interlochen, and that someone, maybe the head of counseling, put a stop to this behavior.

⁵⁸ In addition, multiple individuals reported to the Investigative Team that they believed that in the 1990s, an arts faculty member was engaged in a romantic or sexual relationship with a student. Interlochen and individuals interviewed by the Investigative Team shared that this faculty member and the alum married after the alum graduated from Interlochen. The Investigative Team interviewed the faculty member and the alum. The faculty member and the alum denied any romantic or sexual relationship between them while she was a student at Interlochen.

⁵⁹ In addition, an alum from the 1980s indicated that she engaged in a relationship with an employee, that they informed the school about this, and that her parents were aware of the relationship. The alum did not provide further information about the relationship, and also did not provide the name of the employee.

An alum stated that in the 1980s or 1990s, an academic teacher took her and a friend “up to the corners,” that they had coffee, and that then the teacher suggested “doing it again or something more.” The alum stated that she was not the teacher’s student, and that it “just seemed wrong.” Another alum said that in the 1990s, this same teacher invited her to lunch or coffee and talked about how lonely he was. This alum noted that there were “sexual overtones to what he said.”

One alum stated that in the 1990s, an academic teacher left a written note for her soliciting her for sex.

Another alum indicated that in the 1990s, a trustee watched him practice and left notes in his cubby such as, ““Hey, your recital was great. I will be at the next one,”” and subtly praised or complimented him. The alum indicated that one time, the trustee invited him to listen to a recording in the trustee’s car, and that while in the car, the alum felt uncomfortable because the trustee looked at him and at his legs in a “sexual, sensual, and romantic way.” The alum stated that while in the car, the trustee invited him to go off campus to eat and to continue the conversation elsewhere, and that the trustee implied that he was inviting the alum to the trustee’s place.

One alum stated that in the 1990s, an academic teacher made a comment about “[w]omen as sirens,” took her out to coffee or downtown in his car a couple of times, and made comments that her perfume smelled good and her makeup was a “certain way.” The alum also stated another teacher said that she would get by on her looks.

B. Conduct Characterized as Grooming, Uncomfortable, Inappropriate, or Odd

Multiple alums reported that they had feelings of discomfort regarding adults affiliated with Interlochen.

One alum stated that one thing that “threw” her was that in the 1960s, an unmarried member of the arts faculty was having a dinner party, and he asked her to look after the food and be the hostess for the party, which the alum declined to do. Another alum stated that in the 1970s, a member of the arts faculty commented that the snowflakes in her hair looked like sparkles. This alum said that the teacher was not “creepy,” but that his comment was representative of what she described as “the general vibe of the whole place.”

One alum stated that in the 1970s during a school trip, she, other students, and, she thought, a faculty member, all were nude in a sauna, and that although this seemed nonsexual at the time, looking back, this seemed “totally inappropriate.”

Another alum stated that in the 1990s, he wore a fake leather thong for Halloween, and that when he arrived at a teacher’s house, the teacher filmed the alum “up and down” with a camcorder, which the alum described as “really weird” and “strange.” One alum stated that a residence life staff member invited him and other students to watch the *Golden Girls* and pornography. The alum stated that this occurred in the staff member’s room, and added, “It was not sexual abuse per se, but it was not a good environment for kids to be in.”

An alum stated that starting when she was a camper in the 2000s, an arts faculty member groomed her by being close to her emotionally, “narrowed in” on her, and made a comment in front of her mother that she was really special and was mature beyond her years.

In addition, several alums, indicated that they perceived certain adults at Interlochen as “creepy” or as “creeps,” without providing specific information about conduct that led to this perception.

In addition to the conduct described in this section, although at the time it was standard practice for some arts faculty members to make physical contact with students in class and/or during private lessons to assist with instruction, some alums indicated that this type of touching made them uncomfortable.

VII. Impacts of Reported Conduct

Documenting the reported impact of sexual abuse at Interlochen has been a sobering yet essential part of this investigation. The significant, wide-ranging, and, in some cases, long-term effects described by individuals who reported sexual misconduct at Interlochen underscore the importance of maintaining structures and policies that mitigate the opportunities for adults at Interlochen to engage in such conduct in the future. Alums shared with the Investigative Team that due to the sexual misconduct that they experienced or were aware of, they were impacted in a variety of ways including: 1) impact on connection to Interlochen; 2) academic impact; 3) impact on career decisions; 4) impact on mental and emotional health; and 5) impact on personal relationships. One alum shared with the Investigative Team, “Abuse and trauma are heartbreaking for generations.” Below is a summary of information provided by alums about the long-lasting impact of the sexual misconduct reported during this investigation.

A. Impact on Connection to Interlochen

Notably, some alums described their time at Interlochen as generally positive, despite experiencing or being aware of sexual misconduct by adults affiliated with Interlochen, and the impacts in this section are set against the backdrop of a strong connection to Interlochen. During interviews, alums repeatedly expressed positive feedback and observations about Interlochen. For example, alums used the phrases “resoundingly positive,” the “best years” of their life, and “a place of much positive significance” to describe their time at Interlochen. One alum shared that he “will always credit Interlochen’s role in creating the man [he is] today.” Additionally, multiple alums described Interlochen as “idyllic” and “magical.”

Multiple alums described the performing arts instruction as a significant, positive aspect of their time at Interlochen. Several alums noted that their artistic training at the Academy influenced their future careers. One alum shared, “I have had an exceptional career so far, and I think that Interlochen has been a part of that.” Many alums also attributed their positive experience to the quality of academic instruction, with, for example, one alum noting that the academics were “extraordinary.” Another alum shared that the “education and comprehensive atmosphere of learning amidst nature, art and brilliant peers” continued to impact her life positively.

Many alums also discussed the long-lasting friendships that came from their time at Interlochen. One alum shared that years after leaving Interlochen, “My best friends are the people I went to school with.” Several alums described their relationship with their peers at Interlochen as familial. For example, one alum stated, “Even when I meet people who I barely knew, we are like a family.”

A number of alums shared that Interlochen saved or changed their lives. One alum reported that despite experiencing misconduct by an adult at Interlochen, her time at Interlochen was “super positive,” and saved her life. An alum who reported sexual abuse by an adult at Interlochen stated that Interlochen was “life-saving.” One alum stated that he had mixed feelings about the investigation because although it was important to raise awareness, being at Interlochen was a “lifechanging experience,” and he did not want to scare others away from attending Interlochen.

Multiple alums described Interlochen as a place of comfort – from the school feeling like home to feeling like the environment was one in which they were able to be themselves. One alum shared that although her experience was “tainted” by misconduct by an adult at Interlochen, she loved being at Interlochen, stating that it “felt more like home than home in some ways.”

Some of those alums who had positive experiences as students at Interlochen reflected that they have struggled to reconcile their positive memories with conduct they experienced or learned about. One alum reported, “It makes me so conflicted – this wonderful institution that negatively impacted my friends in lifelong ways.” Another stated, “The idea of Interlochen being this magical, wonderful place. It is a nice place, and a great place, but it is not magical.” Someone else stated that he was angry because he had put his trust in Interlochen, and that although much of his experience there had been positive, Interlochen failed him.

One alum who graduated in the 1990s expressed his opinion that although Interlochen was a springboard for his career, Interlochen had “no protection in place for predation.” Another alum reflected that she thought that Interlochen was a “beautiful place,” but “like many boarding schools and arts organizations, there [wa]s a darker undertone” of adults “not doing their jobs on many different levels.”

A number of alums said that due to the sexual misconduct that they experienced or were aware of, they had no interest in returning to Interlochen. One individual stated, “I don’t really have a desire to go back there, which is unfortunate. It is a phenomenal organization. I have too many bad feelings.” One alum discussed not attending many reunions and added, “Being that it is a school where everyone is from everywhere, it is rare to see each other unless you go out of the way separately. That was a big loss.” Another alum stated, “It is still one of my favorite places ever, and I still want to go back to the reunion, but I don’t.” One alum who experienced misconduct stated that at the time, “except for what happened,” she loved her experience at Interlochen, but “now looking back, [her] general experience was not a pleasing feeling because it was embarrassment and shame,” and noted that she “couldn’t even think of going to the reunions.” Others indicated that they avoid attending reunions for fear of encountering faculty or staff members who abused them.

Some alums indicated that due to sexual misconduct at Interlochen, they had negative feelings about Interlochen. An alum indicated that her knowledge of a teacher's inappropriate conduct impacted her willingness to give money to Interlochen. Another alum stated, "I don't care about Interlochen. I would never support them. I wouldn't go there. I wouldn't teach there. So, I don't care what happens to Interlochen."

B. Academic Impact

A number of alums shared that sexual misconduct at Interlochen affected their academic performance and choices at Interlochen, with some sharing that due to the sexual misconduct they experienced, they changed majors or changed or dropped their minors. One alum said that although she had a natural inclination in a particular academic area, this was "thwarted" due to the institutional response to the conduct that she had experienced. Some alums shared that the impact spilled over to their post-secondary experiences, affecting, for example, their decisions regarding what colleges or universities to attend. One alum stated that after experiencing sexual abuse, she was lost, and that although her friends applied to performing arts schools, she did not and instead she "just went home." Regarding future academic progress, another alum from the 1980s said, "I only studied with female teachers after that." Another alum discussed the impact on motivation, stating, "I think the major impact was a shift in my overall training plan," and explained, "I do remember it being a pretty significant blow to my motivation to continue as a young artist."

C. Impact on Career Decisions

Multiple alums shared that the conduct that they experienced at Interlochen impacted their career path. An alum shared that she stopped playing and had not made music in a meaningful way in many years. Another alum stated, "I kind of gave up on music," and added, "[I]t's not like music wasn't part of my life, but I gave up on it as part of a career." One alum stated that his spirit was crushed, his whole life was ruined, and he no longer felt that he could engage in the area of performing arts which previously had been his dream. Another alum shared that her experiences at Interlochen contributed to her decision not to pursue a career as a performer explaining, "It all seemed so integrated. If you were going to pursue this, this was going to be part of the deal. You would need to be sexually involved with someone if you would continue to be a performer." An alum stated of her career path, "It really brought me joy and pleasure, but then this experience redirected me significantly."

D. Impact on Mental and Emotional Health

A substantial number of alums reported that their experiences of sexual abuse at Interlochen have had devastating effects on their emotional well-being, both at the time and, for some, that continues to this day. A number of alums described their experiences at Interlochen as traumatizing and life-altering. Many indicated that they have sought therapy throughout the years to process what happened to them or to address anxiety, depression, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder ("PTSD"), eating disorders, insomnia, nightmares, substance abuse, or other self-destructive behavior. Additionally, some alums indicated that their experiences at Interlochen exacerbated prior trauma.

One alum shared that she pulled away from people at Interlochen because of “everything that was happening.” Another alum said that because the relationship that she was in with an adult at Interlochen was a secret, she was stressed about being found out. Someone else shared that she could not say which trauma was greater, the conduct of the adult at Interlochen towards her or the way she was treated by Interlochen staff once she reported the conduct. One alum noted that her awareness of conduct of a sexual nature by adults at Interlochen while she was there added to a feeling that students were there on their own and had to fend for themselves.

One alum reported that after leaving Interlochen, her confidence was badly shaken, and her self-esteem was shattered. Some alums reported that their experiences at Interlochen caused them to question whether the praise and support that they received from faculty was real or for an alternative purpose. One alum stated, “On a personal level, it shattered much of my youthful idealism and faith in adults, as well as my confidence about my own talent,” and stated further that it made her question if a teacher had truly believed in the quality of her work, or if “there had been a more sordid reason.” Another alum stated, “It was a constant situation of your never knowing if you were good, or if you would have gotten the [opportunity] if you had done sexual favors for someone.” Others discussed having difficulty trusting themselves after experiencing conduct of a sexual nature by adults at Interlochen, with one person stating that she had difficulty trusting her instincts, and another stating that she did not trust her decision-making abilities. One alum stated, “It just feels so stupid because all those years I just always told myself that it was me, that it was my fault.” Another alum indicated that she faulted herself for not telling anyone what she experienced to possibly help prevent others from being abused.

E. Impact on Personal Relationships

A number of alums reflected that the sexual misconduct they experienced at Interlochen impacted their personal relationships with others in significant and lasting ways. Many indicated that they found it difficult to trust others. Some alums indicated that the conduct by adults at Interlochen affected their sexual intimacy or romantic relationships. Below are some representative voices describing the impact on personal relationships:

- “I have suffered and my relationships have suffered as a result.”
- “I didn’t have a choice, and my relationships with men after that were screwy, and it didn’t feel like I was in control.”
- “I’ve spent years convincing myself that these types of relationships are normal, and it has skewed my perception of older men.”
- “I feel like this is a pattern of me feeling uncomfortable with people coming on to me, and this is how it started, and so that had an impact on me letting my guard down with intimate partners.”
- “When I meet someone that is kind to me, I’m almost repelled. It’s like, the romantic relationships in my life cannot start with someone expressing interest and being nice to me. [. . .] I can’t tolerate it.”
- “I could almost call that my first sexual encounter in my life, and so this created a lot of distrust in relationships moving forward. To be fair, it also helped me be on my guard a little and know that it’s possible.”

- “[T]hat experience stayed with me, of mistrust and fear. In college, I didn’t date at all for all four years.”
- “I think I started taking a harder look at the people around me. I was just a little more skeptical and cautious, and I tried not to attract attention to myself because I would get it.”
- “I had trust issues in relationships for a number of years. I succeeded despite that. I am happily married now. It took a lot to get through it.”
- “Relationships are tricky. Trusting people is difficult.”

VIII. Themes and Observations Related to Reported Conduct of a Sexual Nature

Throughout this investigation, individuals provided insightful information regarding the context of the reported conduct, and their thoughts as to how or why the reported misconduct occurred. The investigation did not include making determinations about causation. However, the Investigative Team identified common themes and observations that spanned multiple reports by alums of sexual abuse that may provide the foundation for more fully understanding the context of abuse in an institutional setting, including at Interlochen, identifying lessons learned, and shaping protective actions that Interlochen can take to reduce barriers to reporting and strengthen the prevention of and response to abuse.

The Investigative Team noted that these observations span a wide time frame from the 1950s to 2010s. Alums shared many descriptions of Interlochen’s historical environment; their comments, often in the form of direct quotes, have been included to reflect the depth of emotions, including anger, grief, and pain, that many still experience. The Investigative Team noted that the observations may be specific to the alum and the relevant time frame and may not apply to all alums or all relevant time periods in the external investigation. Section IX, below, documents Interlochen’s current policies, procedures, and practices regarding safety and adult/student relationships, some of which are relevant to the themes discussed in this section.

Individuals interviewed by the Investigative Team shared their observations in the following areas: 1) limited communication with family; 2) vulnerability of certain students; 3) adult/student power dynamics; 4) adults’ access to students; 5) gaps in oversight and a permissive environment; and 6) barriers to reporting. The Investigative Team noted that some of the aspects that alums said drew them to the school or were positive aspects of their Interlochen experience (e.g., closeness to teachers, a place where LGBTQ youth could feel safe in their identities, escape from an unsafe or unhappy home life, and opportunities for connection in their fields) were viewed by many (even some of those who described these features as positive) as problematic and creating avenues for abuse.

A. Limited Communication with Family

Historically, students and campers did not have regular communication with home, and therefore, had limited opportunities to discuss concerning behavior with family members. Multiple alums sharing reports of abuse reflected that the lack of many of today’s modes of electronic communication limited their ability to connect with family at home. As one alum who graduated in the 1990s described Interlochen, “It is not a place your parents can get to easily.” An alum from the 1970s wrote that when she was at the Academy, her ability to escape abuse

was very limited given that she was far from home with “no cell phones, no room phones, a hall phone that was one way receiving only,” no direct USPS mail box, and no police station within walking distance. Some alums shared that this limited ability to connect with family left them feeling vulnerable because they did not have the opportunity or ease of access to discuss their day-to-day experiences with a parent or other family member, with one alum who graduated in the 2000s noting that being away from home and living by yourself “automatically makes you vulnerable and isolated from going home and chatting around the dinner table with your family.”

B. Vulnerability of Certain Students

1. Vulnerability Based on Students’ Lack of Experience and Age

Several alums from the 1960s through the 2000s described being naïve or having no understanding of or experience with sexual or romantic relationships or encounters prior to coming to Interlochen. This understandable lack of awareness, given the age of students, may have enhanced vulnerability to grooming and conduct of a sexual nature by adults. An alum who graduated in the 1970s, in discussing a teacher who engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her, stated, “I suspect that he saw me as someone who was vulnerable. Maybe he thought that he was going to help me, but it was classic grooming.” One alum who graduated in the 1990s noted, “Like all teenagers, and as arts teenagers, we were really vulnerable.” An alum who graduated in the 2000s stated, “[T]hese people abused their positions of power with a very vulnerable community of children, children who are living by themselves.”

2. Vulnerability Due to Sexual Identity

Some alums disclosed that Interlochen was the first place where they could safely express or explore their sexuality, but that this also left them vulnerable to predation. For example, an alum from the 1980s stated, “Suddenly I could be gay, and open, and no one cared. But being preyed upon was not what I intended.” One alum who was at Interlochen in the 1990s, wrote that although it was incredible to be in an affirming and supportive environment amid other gay youth, an adult at Interlochen “took advantage of this situation.” An alum who graduated in the 1990s, said that she believed that a teacher targeted closeted gay boys, especially those for whom “coming out” would have been culturally impossible.

3. Vulnerability Caused by Treatment of Children as Adults

Some alums shared that although they had been children while at Interlochen, once there, they were treated as adults, and they felt as though they were on their own. One alum said that when she was at Interlochen in the 1980s, there was a culture in which students had to speak for themselves and noted, “You are out of the house,” and, “It was up to you to not get in trouble. You get to make your own decisions. It takes two people to get in trouble.” One alum from the 1990s shared that she felt as though the students at Interlochen were treated like “full grown adults” rather than as kids. An alum who graduated in the 2000s stated, “[Y]ou [we]re really living by yourself and you’re a kid and figuring things out for the first time.”

C. Adult/Student Power Dynamics

The Investigative Team recognizes the power imbalance inherent in interactions between students and adults. In addition to historical expectations regarding deference to adults, many alums reported that adult/student power dynamics were impacted by the role some adults inhabited in the alums' Interlochen experience and future academic and career prospects given the adults' prestige and connections. Alums reflected that some adults with prestige and connections in a student's field emphasized their connections in the field as a form of grooming. One alum at Interlochen in the 1980s stated, "[He] made you feel that you were one of the chosen ones. [He] made you feel that he had your back and how important it is to have someone like that in your corner." An alum at the Academy in the 2000s noted, "[He] promised me he would ensure I was successful after graduation because of all his contacts." Others noted that they were encouraged to attend Interlochen because they were offered a scholarship by an adult who later groomed them and/or engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them.

D. Adults' Access to Students

1. Access to Students through Teaching Relationship

Some alums who reported that adults engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them noted that these adults were the alums' primary arts faculty. As students in the arts at Interlochen historically participated in one-on-one lessons with their teachers, this provided opportunities for adults to take advantage of the private setting to cross professional boundaries, engage in grooming, and engage in conduct of a sexual nature with students outside the view of other adults and students. One alum who attended the Academy in the 1970s noted that an adult who engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with her used his "musical genius" to gain trust and fulfill the creative needs of students by, for example, offering to coach students privately. She noted of a particular teacher, "This allowed him hours of private one on one time that was never questioned." Many alums described that teaching in the performing arts community historically included physical touch of students' bodies to, for example, ensure proper breathing technique, correct a student's posture, or adjust a student's hand placement. As one alum who was at the Academy in the 1980s wrote, "Performing Arts students were/are/will remain, particularly vulnerable to abuse, as touch IS part of honing our instruments." Previously, the doors to many of the practice rooms and studio spaces where these lessons were held did not have windows or the windows were covered or obscured. This frequent and less visible access to students may have provided the opportunity to engage in inappropriate conduct.

In addition, some of the reported conduct was engaged in by academic teachers, who also had opportunities for one-on-one interactions with students, such as in after-class discussions of coursework, and academic-related excursions off campus.

2. Access to Students in Other Settings

Another common factor across many reports was unsupervised, one-on-one access that teachers and other adults affiliated with Interlochen had to the students in social, non-academic settings.

Many alums explained that Interlochen had a sponsor group program through which Interlochen employees were assigned groups of students to help students feel a sense of family when they were away from home. Several alums specifically described the faculty and staff sponsors acting “in loco parentis.” Some alums described that the sponsor groups involved having dinners, baking cookies, watching movies and listening to music, and other social gatherings with a group of students at the home of a faculty or staff member. Although some alums described sponsor groups as a valued and positive aspect of their Interlochen experience, some alums from the 1980s and 1990s reported that sponsor groups led to one-on-one interactions with students and sponsors in their private homes, and that certain sponsors used solo time to groom and engage in conduct of a sexual nature with students outside the view of Interlochen employees and other students.

Multiple alums from the 1960s through the 2000s reported that even outside of the sponsor program, adults invited students to their homes. As noted in Section III, Section IV, and Section V, some alums reported that it was in this setting – at an adult’s home either with or without other students present – that conduct of a sexual nature occurred.

In addition, a number of alums discussed the various private spaces that existed on or around campus where adults had opportunities to engage in inappropriate behavior with students without being noticed. For example, alums from the 1960s through the 2000s discussed adults engaging in conduct of a sexual nature in faculty studios that were housed in the dormitories, in on-campus faculty housing, in Camp cabins that were uninhabited during the Academy year, in the woods surrounding Interlochen, or during camping trips.

3. Access to Students by Residence Life Staff Members

Multiple individuals reported that residence hall staff members had access to students in the residence halls by virtue of the proximity of their living spaces. Some individuals observed that there were residence hall staff members who took on more of a friend relationship rather than a supervisor relationship with students and that often, the residence life staff members were relatively young. One alum from the 1970s stated, “The [residence life staff members] were more in their late 20s. They were not the most parental or mature kind of people.” Another alum from the 1970s noted that some residence life staff members had “very clear boundaries,” and that others did not and “were more like friends.” Some individuals reported that residence life staff members invited students to the residence hall staff members’ rooms to hang out, where the staff members then engaged in sexual misconduct with the student.

4. Access to Students during Travel

Multiple alums reported that an adult engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with them while traveling, sometimes, but not always, for an official Interlochen event. These off-campus and often, out-of-state excursions, reportedly provided opportunities for inappropriate conduct by Interlochen employees who transported students, or were otherwise present for a school trip. For example, an alum from the 1960s stated that while he was a student, during a non-school-related trip, he and a faculty member stayed in a hotel room together where the faculty member engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with the alum (Respondent 3). An alum from the 1980s reported

that while on a school trip, a trustee invited him to the trustee's hotel room and then engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with him (Respondent 23). Another alum from the 1980s reported that during a spring break trip, a teacher took him to a hotel and engaged in sexual conduct with him that led the student to seek medical attention (Respondent 20). An alum who was at Interlochen in the 1980s noted with regard to traveling to an off-campus event alone with an adult affiliated with Interlochen (Respondent 24), "It was me and him in the car. I'm not sure where I stayed. I think I stayed with him in a hotel. It was messed up. There was no oversight at the camp or at Interlochen."

5. Donor Access to Students

Many alums reported that historically, adults who were not employees of Interlochen – such as donors and trustees – had open access to Interlochen's campus and its students. One alum wrote that in the 1990s, donors were "given virtually free rein," noting that donors went, for example, to classes and rehearsals. Another alum at Interlochen in the 1990s commented on Interlochen's role in providing donors access to students, stating that it was ridiculous that Interlochen "gave children's information to donors."

Multiple individuals reported that donors and trustees spent time on campus interacting with students. Some alums described one former trustee (Respondent 19) who regularly was on campus during the summer and school year, as having wide-ranging access to campus, with one alum from the 1990s noting that the trustee was permitted to walk down the hall in an all-female student dorm. An alum from the 1970s described the same trustee, stating, "When I was a student, he would come on campus and he would pick two students or a couple students and talk them into coming [out-of-state] with him." This alum reported that the trustee flew students to his home on multiple occasions throughout the school year, causing one student to miss a week of school at a time. The trustee was reported to have engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with students while they were visiting him.

Individuals, when discussing donor access, shared their observations about the lack of supervision and the open-nature of the campus. For example, one alum from the 1980s stated, "It was a free and open campus back then." An alum who was at Interlochen in the 1990s observed, "I do know how porous the campus was and I do know how easy it was to slip away and get away and to maintain contact after meeting someone." An alum from the 1990s stated, "I remember that in camp there were so many people coming and going. I met a lot of famous people."

E. Gaps in Oversight and Permissive Environment

Many alums noted that historically, the Academy allowed students significant freedom on campus, and that for some, this freedom was welcome and celebrated. However, a number of individuals indicated that gaps in oversight of students and the permissive environment at the Academy created avenues for adults at Interlochen to engage in conduct of a sexual nature with students. One alum who attended Interlochen in the 1970s indicated that romantic, sexually-intimate relationships between faculty and students were well-known, tolerated, and/or "certainly obvious to Interlochen staff [. . .] who had the responsibility of approving/signing out students to

spend time with faculty after curfew or overnight.” She wrote that these staff members “did not act in a vacuum, but represented a lax environment that allowed a number of male faculty and instructors to act on their basest instincts with impunity.” Another alum who attended Interlochen in the 1970s, shared her observation that adults affiliated with Interlochen engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with students became “normalized,” and that “[s]o much stuff went on with little to no consequences.” Another alum from the 1970s, wrote that if any staff member ever questioned an adult who was taking students off campus for overnight visits at his home, “they did not have the authority to prevent it from happening.”

Multiple individuals, both alums and former employees, indicated that during their time at Interlochen, there were no rules or they were not aware of rules regarding adults being one-on-one with students. One Respondent provided information reflecting that even if there were rules about adults being one-on-one with students, simply having these did not ensure compliance, with this Respondent noting that he had no idea if there were such rules as they “didn’t matter to [him].” A lack of clear protocols or the laxness of compliance with protocols limiting one-on-one interactions with adults historically could have led to students being alone with adults in, for example, homes, vehicles, and hotel rooms.

Many individuals discussed the requirement that when going off campus, students had to sign out of their dorms with a member of the residence life staff so that Interlochen was aware of where students were. Multiple individuals indicated that this was required for visits to off-campus homes of faculty and staff members. Some individuals also indicated that students were required to sign out for visits to the on-campus homes of faculty and staff members. A former residence life staff member who was at Interlochen in the 1990s and 2000s stated, “If they went any place, they had to sign out.” In addition, individuals indicated that there was a requirement that students sign back into the residence halls by a certain time at night. Some individuals noted, however, that the sign-in/sign-out rules were not consistently followed historically. One individual who was at Interlochen in the 1970s stated, “They had some sign-in and sign-out policy, but people would come and go.” Other individuals noted that in instances when a student was at a teacher’s home after sign-in time, residence hall staff members permitted students to return after sign-in time or to stay overnight. Some individuals discussed that although one residence life staff member in the 1970s expressed irritation or concern regarding students signing in late or staying overnight with adults, she did not do anything to stop the conduct.

F. Barriers to Reporting

The Investigative Team considered what barriers may have impacted individual students’ decision to refrain from reporting concerns regarding the conduct of adults at Interlochen. Of note, not every individual expressed concerns related to reporting or indicated that the response by Interlochen was poor. One alum who graduated in the 1990s wrote, “I appreciated Interlochen’s swift action,” and noted that she felt “heard, believed, and valued.”

Some of the potential barriers to reporting described by individuals during this investigation are summarized below.

1. Concern Regarding Getting an Adult in Trouble and/or Being Perceived as the Reason an Adult was Terminated

Some alums discussed not wanting to get adults engaging in conduct of a sexual nature with them in trouble. One alum from the 1950s simply stated, “I didn’t want to get him in trouble.” One alum from the 1970s stated that on occasions when her teacher took her off campus, he did not sign her out and told her not to tell anyone because she and the teacher would “get in trouble” and he could lose his job.

Some of the adults who were reported to have engaged in conduct of a sexual nature with students were well-known and well-loved in the community. Individuals noted that the status of these individuals caused students not to report. One alum who attended Interlochen in the 1970s noted, “[This person’s] fan club was large and proved lasting; no wonder sophomore me did not disclose.”

Individuals noted that beloved teachers and staff members sometimes left midyear without explanation, which led to speculation on the part of students that the adult had engaged in inappropriate conduct; sometimes, the student with whom the adult was rumored to have engaged in this conduct became the subject of those conversations. Some students shared that they were reluctant to get a teacher in trouble, or to be the perceived cause for the dismissal of a respected teacher. One alum who graduated in the 2000s wrote, “I didn’t want to be the reason [the adult] got fired, so I remained silent.”

2. Concern that Reporting Would Subject the Student to Discipline

Several alums from the 1970s and 1980s shared their reluctance to report concerns regarding the conduct of an adult at Interlochen because they feared that they then would be the subject of discipline, such as expulsion. One alum who was at Interlochen in the 1970s shared that she was told by older students that if she did not “go along with the faculty,” contraband would be hidden in her room, and she would be sent home, although she did not indicate whether the older students shared specific examples of this. An alum who was at Interlochen in the 1980s said that she did not feel as though she could report a teacher’s behavior because she thought she would be expelled or would otherwise get in trouble for drinking when with a teacher. Similarly, another alum who discussed an incident that occurred in the 1980s stated, “It never occurred to me to report him because I was so worried about getting in trouble for alcohol. In those days, there was a stiff repercussion for alcohol use. You would be suspended or expelled.” One alum stated, “There was a pervasive atmosphere of fear at Interlochen that if you spoke up against any of the faculty, you could lose your scholarship and college recommendations, so I continued to be very afraid throughout my time at Interlochen until I got into [college].”

The Investigative Team noted that multiple alums discussed the readiness with which Interlochen expelled students for infractions such as smoking. This perception may have contributed to students’ beliefs that they would be subject to discipline if they reported a concern regarding conduct by an adult if such conduct involved a student doing something that was against the rules (e.g., drinking) or being somewhere that they should not have been (e.g., at a faculty member’s home after sign-in).

3. Concern Regarding Returning Home

Multiple alums shared that coming to Interlochen was a way to escape an abusive, unsafe, or difficult experience at home or in their previous school, describing Interlochen as a haven for youth who felt out-of-place at home. Many alums shared that in coming to Interlochen, they finally fit in and had found a community of other young people who were as interested in the arts as they were. Notably, one alum, who attended Interlochen in the 1960s stated, “Interlochen saved my life. I have a long history of abuse [. . .] When I say that Interlochen saved my life, it saved my life. Had I not gone there, I would not be alive, and if I had been alive, I don’t know what the effects would be.” Another alum, who attended Interlochen in the 1970s, in discussing an unsafe home life, said, “Music was one of the things that protected me.” Given the reported respite that some individuals stated they felt at Interlochen, reporting misconduct and then possibly returning home as a result, may not have been a safe, welcome, or viable option. One alum who attended Interlochen in the 1970s wrote that although she knew what the adult did was wrong, she did not tell her parents as they would have removed her from school, and she was “desperate to obtain a serious education.”

4. Concern that Report of Misconduct Would be Minimized or Ignored

Some alums discussed that when they reported concerning conduct to faculty, staff, or administrators, nothing happened or their report was in some way minimized. One alum noted that after filing a report in the 1980s, “Things were minimized, we were accused of blowing things out of proportion, of having creative imaginations.” An alum who attended Interlochen in the 1970s wrote, “So much stuff went on with little to no consequences.” Another alum who attended Interlochen in the 1970s noted, “[N]ot one single faculty member I approached was at all helpful.” An alum who attended Interlochen in the 1980s wrote, “Interlochen’s institutional response has been to deny responsibility [and] blame the students.” One alum said that when her mother reported to an administrator conduct that an adult engaged in with her in the 1990s, the administrator did not believe her mother.

5. Lack of Reporting Options or Training on These Options

Although many alums discussed feeling as though they could report concerns to teachers or others with whom they had close relationships, multiple individuals who attended the Academy or the Camp through the 2000s reflected that they did not receive or recall receiving information regarding who to report concerns to regarding conduct by an adult. Some alums reflected that they may have received such training but did not register it as relevant at the time. One alum who graduated in the 1970s indicated that she would not have known when she was a student where to have gone with a concern regarding conduct of a sexual nature by an adult, and noted that some adults at Interlochen did not seem to be a safe place to share such information. An alum who was at Interlochen in the 1990s stated that there was no place to go to report conduct of a sexual nature, especially related to conduct by an adult of the same gender, explaining, “[I]t was inappropriate to be gay to begin with, and on top of that you are talking about abuse.”

As described in Section IX, Interlochen has informed the Investigative Team that currently there are a number of avenues for reporting concerns and that students regularly receive training and information about reporting options and available resources.

IX. Current Protocols and Practices

Interlochen provided the Investigative Team with information regarding current protocols and practices regarding student safety. The Investigative Team has summarized this information below, recognizing both the importance of having such protocols and practices, while also acknowledging that: 1) Interlochen's current protocols do not correct the harms done to alums in the past; and 2) having such protocols does not eliminate potential risks but rather requires buy-in from all adults on campus to work towards protecting students, including by complying with the requirements and expectations set forth in the policies and procedures.

Interlochen maintains written policies and procedures that address, among other areas, student supervision and safety, mandated reporting, and expectations regarding professional boundaries between students and adults affiliated with Interlochen.⁶⁰ Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that Interlochen's Board of Trustees maintains oversight of Interlochen's child protection program, and the Audit and Risk Management Committee, which expanded in 2015 to focus on safety, risk, and compliance, conducts an annual review of child protection policies and reported incidents and concerns. The Audit and Risk Management Committee also utilizes a tailored Compliance Grid to track and monitor compliance obligations, including with respect to child protection. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that Interlochen's administrators and subject matter experts review Academy and Camp policies and procedures at least annually and update educational programming and training accordingly. Interlochen also regularly engages external subject matter experts to review Interlochen policies and procedures regarding, for example, sexual misconduct prevention and response systems. Below is a summary of the current policies, procedures, practices, and structures in place in support of student safety at Interlochen.

A. Expectations Regarding Professional Boundaries

Several Interlochen policies address professional boundaries for adults at Interlochen. Interlochen maintains a *Code of Ethics*, which addresses the safety and welfare of students, requires faculty and staff to, for example, comply with all Federal and state laws and Interlochen policies and procedures, and protect students from abuse, exploitation, and unsafe environments. In addition, the *Standards of Conduct* prohibits abusing or mistreating students, and unprofessional and/or improper interactions or communications with students. The *Behavior Management Policy* notes that sexual contact with a student is "completely unacceptable" and prohibits, for example, relationships between employees and students that extend beyond a professional level.⁶¹ The *Behavior Management Policy* notes that there is a clear power difference between adults and students and that employees are caretakers for students.

⁶⁰ Information in this section either was provided by statements from Interlochen and/or was in relevant Interlochen policies and procedures.

⁶¹ The *Behavior Management Policy* also indicates that adults should avoid being alone with students in a sealed room where windows or doors are completely covered.

Interlochen employees are directed to only touch students on the hand, shoulder, and upper back,⁶² never in “a place on a student’s body that is normally covered by a bathing suit,” and never against a student’s will. Further, the policy notes that any physical contact with a student, when possible, should take place in the company of other adults. The policy prohibits adults from sharing their romantic lives with students and from sharing inappropriate sexual messages or images with students. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that all staff must sign an acknowledgement that they have read and will comply with the *Behavior Management Policy*.

In addition to these policies in the Academy Employee Handbook, there are specific provisions for the Camp articulated in the Interlochen Arts Camp (IAC) Faculty Guide regarding Interactions Between Employees, Students, and their Families, which details expectations for Interlochen employees, including, for example, refraining from engaging in impropriety, and outlines Characteristics of Healthy Relationships with Students, such as recognizing adults’ responsibility for maintaining appropriate boundaries. The Faculty Guidebook also has specific Guidelines for Interactions with Students, which notes, for example, “Generally, employees should not be alone with a student in a non-public space, or behind a closed door.”

Interlochen has specific policies regarding residence life staff members. The *Residence Life Staff Manual* provides specific guidance about boundaries, including maintaining a 2:1 ratio (two students and one adult, or two adults and one student, but not alone with a student), maintaining both physical and emotional boundaries with all students, and serving as a mentor, rather than a friend. The *Camp Life Manual* provides similar protocols for supervision and engagement in the Camp, outlining the role of a cabin counselor, setting expectations about professional boundaries and communication, and providing information about physical, mental, emotional, and social development for each age of campers.

Interlochen maintains a policy regarding trustee interactions with minor students. Trustees are required to follow the *Policy for ICA Trustee and Retired Trustee Interactions with IAA and IAC Minor Students*. This policy provides that interactions “be conducted in a professional and respectful manner,” and that current or former trustees should refrain from engaging in behavior or conversation that could be “perceived as inappropriate or compromise the safety and well-being of the minor student.” Further, under this policy, interactions with minor students should always occur in the presence of a staff member or in settings where interactions are observable. The policy also notes, “Physical contact is to be avoided, and particularly so if there is any potential that it’s unwelcomed by the minor student.” The policy also indicates that direct personal social media connections or email contact with individual minor students are not allowed.

B. Policies and Procedures Regarding Interactions Outside of Classroom

Interlochen maintains written policies and procedures governing contact outside of the classroom. Faculty members are prohibited from hosting an individual Academy student at their home, but they may invite a group of students. Students visiting faculty homes off-campus must note their destination in the sign-in/sign-out book at the student’s residence hall, and faculty

⁶² Note that Interlochen guidelines prohibit employees from giving or receiving backrubs from students or campers.

members must escort individuals returning to the residence hall if they are returning after sign-in. On occasion, faculty and staff members may host a student long-term over vacations.

For group off-campus trips, Interlochen maintains written guidelines for Quick Trips (defined as a trip that is a day trip less than 50 miles from Interlochen with 10 or fewer students) and Big Trips (defined as an overnight trip, a trip more than 50 miles from Interlochen, or a trip with more than 10 students). Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that parent permission always is required for off-campus trips. In addition, policy requires a minimum of two chaperones for any off-campus trip, with a ratio of at least one chaperone for every ten students.

The Camp's Student Living Regulations provide that faculty members may not visit the students in the division where they live, may not take students off campus, and may not have students as guests in faculty homes, guest accommodations, Stone Hotel lobby, or staff housing.

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that under the Scholarship Donor Stewardship Procedures, interactions with donors are structured to protect student privacy and maintain professional boundaries. These procedures note that Meet and Greets between donors and students occur in public or virtual spaces under adult supervision, and that although all students write thank you letters, all letters are reviewed by Interlochen staff to ensure appropriateness. These procedures note that Interlochen has a responsibility to avoid creating the appearance that scholarship recipients are beholden to donors in any way other than through "substantive expression of gratitude for the scholarship through paths of communication generated by Interlochen staff."

C. Policies and Procedures Regarding Reports of Misconduct

1. Reporting Options for Students and Requirements regarding Responding to Student Reports

Students have multiple pathways for reporting concerns, including using an online form that provides an option for anonymous reporting, and making a direct report to any Interlochen employee. In addition, anyone can send an email to safetyconcern@interlochen.org or submit anonymous information to [OK2Say](#), Michigan's student safety program that allows students to confidentially report tips on potential harm or criminal activities directed at students, school employees, and schools. For emergencies, students can contact Campus Safety, Health Services, or 911.

Interlochen's policies include information about investigation and resolution processes for students and employees. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that reports are reviewed by an Internal Response Team, which may include the Student Support Team, Campus Safety, Residence Life leadership, Health Services and Counseling staff, and Human Resources, and that the first priority is to assess and ensure the immediate safety of the student, to take action to coordinate medical or mental health support for the student, and to secure the environment to prevent further risk, if necessary. If a current employee is alleged to have been the cause of abuse or neglect, Interlochen policy provides that the employee will be temporarily removed from

student contact. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that Interlochen may also take additional protective measures such as adjusting housing, class, or program assignments.

2. Mandated Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect

Interlochen maintains a *Child Protection Law Policy*, which details faculty and staff reporting responsibilities related to suspected abuse or neglect. All Interlochen employees are considered mandated reporters and are required to report suspected child abuse or neglect to their supervisor, to a school counselor or Director of Student Support, and the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services.⁶³ Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that a copy of the policy is provided to faculty, staff, students, trustees, and members of Board committees, and that all students, employees, and Board members receive training on mandated reporting. Interlochen also maintains a *Whistleblower Policy*, which provides reporting responsibilities for trustees, officers, and employees, including reporting violations or suspected violations of Interlochen's *Child Protection Law Policy*, among others.

3. Reporting of Violations of Professional Boundaries

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that in addition to suspected abuse or neglect, Interlochen employees are required to centrally report concerns about student-on-student interactions, student safety or well-being, and concerns about professional boundaries.

4. Reporting of Trustee Conduct

The policy on trustee conduct with minor students requires that any concerns regarding the behavior of any current or former trustee's behavior towards a minor student be reported immediately to the president or corporate secretary.

D. Background Checks

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that Interlochen employees are required to complete pre-employment background checks, which include reference checks, criminal record checks, and child protective services record checks. Reference checks include specific questions related to suitability to work with minors. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that volunteers and trustees are also required to complete background checks and clearances on a periodic basis. Further, applicants are required to disclose criminal conviction information.⁶⁴

E. Training and Education Related to Policies, Procedures, and Practices

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that all faculty and staff at both the Academy and the Camp are required to participate in training at the beginning of each academic year and/or Camp season, and regular training occurs throughout the year. Interlochen provides training

⁶³ The employee may also request the assistance of the counseling team or an administrator in making the external report.

⁶⁴ In addition, the Employee Handbook requires employees to disclose any arrest, conviction, or guilty plea for any criminal conduct.

regarding reporting of suspected abuse or neglect, maintaining professional boundaries, emergency response procedures, and behavioral intervention and escalation protocols, in addition to other required content. Residence life and Camp life staff members also receive training on multiple topics such as boundaries, counseling, visitation procedures, and crisis response. Residence life staff members also complete the Association of Boarding Schools (“TABS”) Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response Training, which helps faculty and staff to identify sexual misconduct and understand its impacts, create healthy and appropriate boundaries with students, develop practical strategies for identifying risk factors, preventing incidents, and promoting a culture of respect, and develop the skills to respond to disclosures of sexual misconduct. In addition to resources available through Interlochen’s membership with TABS, Interlochen maintains a membership with ATIXA, which provides access to training and resources related to sexual misconduct, discrimination, and harassment.

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that students and campers participate in a student orientation, which includes information about, for example, Interlochen’s policies, boundaries, campus safety, reporting concerns, community standards, and resources available on campus such as Counseling and Advising. Interlochen indicated that trainings are reinforced through community meetings, advisory groups, and weekly Provost News communications.

New employees also are required to attend training as part of a 60-day on-boarding program. This training includes, among other topics, campus safety orientation, code of ethics, and anti-harassment training.

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that trustees also receive training on policies and procedures.

F. Structures and Resources Relevant to Student Safety

1. Campus Safety and Physical Security

Interlochen maintains a Campus Safety Office which provides 24/7 supervision of campus, and is staffed by more than 20 full- and part-time Campus Safety Officers, many of whom have prior law enforcement experience. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that Safety Officers routinely patrol campus to conduct building checks and monitor activity, and that Campus Safety also oversees and monitors campus access controls and more than 200 security cameras across campus, including in the public spaces of residence halls, and in campus exterior areas. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that it is working to further implement AI-assisted camera technology to instantly flag persons in unauthorized areas or entering campus without permission, and that Interlochen facilities are equipped with building access controls, some with keycard access, and residence halls have door alarms.

Campus Safety oversees the photo identification and credentialing process for all employees and visitors. All employees and volunteers are provided with an Interlochen photo ID card which they are required to visibly display. Visitors to campus are required to register with Campus

Safety and to enter through the front gate.⁶⁵ Visitors receive ID credentials, which must be worn visibly at all times while on campus. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that Campus Safety also uses RFID-based vehicle identification to enhance access controls and create records of entry.

2. Residence Life Structure and Policies and Procedures

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that live-in residence life staff members in each of the seven residence halls use structured programming to support student welfare, including through hall meetings, safety briefings, and conflict mediation and restorative practices. Residence life staff members check students into the hall each night to ensure that all students are safe and present.⁶⁶ Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that students may not leave campus without the permission of their residence life staff member and parent/guardian.

Residence life staff members document observations and concerns in a running log. They also participate in roving patrols of campus during designated shifts and complete a roving log, which helps to identify trends in student behavior and awareness of where students are spending time.

3. Community Meetings

Community meetings bring the entire Academy together around important subjects in support of students, reinforcing shared values and institutional priorities. Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that these meetings provide structured opportunities for education and awareness, such as safety training reminders, sex education, reporting mechanisms, and community norms, and that Interlochen uses these meetings to reinforce a culture of transparency and collective responsibility for student safety and well-being by delivering consistent, centralized messaging to all students and staff at once.

4. Advisory Groups

All Academy students participate in advisory groups, which meet once a week and are co-led by faculty and staff advisors. The mission of the advisory program is to provide time and space for the guidance and support of all students and to ensure that each student is connected to a consistent adult advisor and peer group. The advisory experience aims to establish a supportive student/adult relationship outside of the student's main area of focus, and students are encouraged to bring concerns to an advisor or any trusted adult. Advisory groups reinforce community standards, safety protocols, behavioral expectations, and mandated reporting awareness.

⁶⁵ Interlochen follows alternative security protocols for major campus events (e.g., concerts and commencement), including security screenings, crowd flow monitoring, and emergency exits.

⁶⁶ In addition, attendance in class for both the Academy and the Camps is tracked and faculty are required to report attendance for each class, even if all students are present, to ensure the safety of all students.

5. Student Support and Mental Health Services

Interlochen's *Student Support and Mental Health Services Policies and Procedures* provide written protocols for supporting students and addressing mental health concerns. The Student Support Team generally includes the School Mental Health Team, the Learning Specialist Team, and the Director of Student Support. Within those teams, Interlochen has licensed and/or certified school counselors, social workers, a psychologist, and other mental health professionals. Students have access to counseling and mental health services 24/7 either through Interlochen's team or contracted off-campus mental health professionals.⁶⁷ Any information regarding sexual assault, bullying, discrimination, and harassment shared with a school counselor must be reported to the Director of Student Support.

Interlochen informed the Investigative Team that any faculty or staff member can submit their concerns about a student's wellbeing, which are then aggregated and used to identify potential students of concern, and that faculty meet regularly with the Student Support Team to discuss students of concern, and a core group of administrators meets weekly to review and discuss students of concern, ensure appropriate supports are put in place, and work with families.

X. Conclusion, Including Thoughts by Alums Regarding What They Hope Will Come from Investigation

As part of the investigation, the Investigative Team asked individuals what outcomes they hoped might result from the investigation. Below is a summary of the suggestions provided to the Investigative Team regarding desired outcomes, as shared through the lens of alums and other individuals based on their experiences. The Investigative Team notes that in many instances, these perspectives, particularly as to recommendations for policy and procedure, are rooted in the individual's experience at Interlochen at the time they attended, and are not necessarily a reflection of the current framework in place at Interlochen today. As reflected in Section IX, Interlochen's policies and practices incorporate an integrated framework for student safety, and many of the recommended enhancements are already a part of Interlochen's policies and procedures.

A number of individuals shared that they hoped that this investigation would lead to cultural changes at Interlochen. One individual noted that they "would like to see a survey of the community culture" that presently exists at Interlochen. Some individuals shared that they hoped the investigation would result in institutional and/or cultural changes at Interlochen, including closer monitoring of students, prioritizing support of all students, and the expansion of diversity, equity, inclusivity, and anti-bias programs. One individual questioned why – given the make-up of the student body – Interlochen has never had a woman president and also added that Interlochen should have more people in leadership roles who are trained in matters concerning gender-based violence. One individual said that "a lot is made of" star students, and that faculty should "keep their eye out" for quieter, more "ordinary" students. Another individual noted that there was an understanding that as a student at Interlochen, "you have to be successful, you have to be famous," and that Interlochen should, instead, prioritize supporting students. One

⁶⁷ Interlochen also maintains an Incident Management Team and a Response Plan related to suicide prevention, suicide risk assessment, and non-suicidal self-injury. The Student Support Team is also trained in Behavioral Threat Assessment and Management.

individual noted that faculty members should not be expected to have students in their homes and that Interlochen “should definitely stop saying to faculty that they should be these kids’ parents.”

Some individuals shared that they hoped that Interlochen would institute structures to prevent future sexual misconduct, including policies to ensure appropriate handling of reports of sexual misconduct, more stringent background checks and hiring policies for faculty and staff, trainings for faculty and staff members regarding appropriate boundaries, and education for students regarding healthy student-teacher relationships and how to file reports of misconduct.⁶⁸ Multiple individuals said that it was important that a designated adult, for example, a counselor or advocate, be made available to students regularly as a safe resource to discuss and report issues.⁶⁹ Some individuals indicated that they hoped that Interlochen would update policies and practices in order to limit opportunities for adults to engage in misconduct with students, including policies or protocols regarding donors’ behavior and access.

Some individuals discussed the importance of restorative efforts, and assisting individuals who experienced sexual misconduct financially, including by paying for mental health services. One individual suggested establishing a fund for care and support of individuals impacted by sexual misconduct at Interlochen, and that those impacted have a say in how to allocate these funds. Another individual indicated that Interlochen should facilitate a “survivors’ group” so that impacted individuals could connect with each other in order not to feel isolated.

Multiple individuals shared that they hoped that this investigation would result in accountability. One individual indicated that she believed impacted individuals “should be able to pursue charges against their perpetrator(s)” using information collected during the course of this investigation.⁷⁰ In addition, a number of individuals shared that they hoped that this investigation would result in transparency from Interlochen, including the institution acknowledging, taking responsibility for, and/or apologizing for past harms caused by abuse and by Interlochen’s failure to protect students. One individual stated that she wanted Interlochen to “own up to what was going on,” not excuse it as “just being part of the time,” and “not be so concerned about raising money.” Another individual stated that she wanted the current Interlochen administration to take accountability without distancing themselves, and not “to say, ‘Oh, that was then. We would never allow this now.’”

The Investigative Team thanks all those individuals who provided information throughout this investigation. Many of those who did so questioned whether their experience was important enough to bring forward or questioned what reporting now could accomplish. To these individuals and to everyone who participated, the importance of what you have shared is immeasurable. You helped paint a picture of a well-loved institution where significant harm is

⁶⁸ See Section IX for a detailed discussion of the current structures to prevent and respond to misconduct, prevention and education training, and student support and resources.

⁶⁹ Interlochen has five dedicated counselors available to Academy students. While they are required to maintain the confidentiality of information shared with them, this confidentiality does not extend to suspected child abuse or neglect.

⁷⁰ As noted in Section II, the Investigative Team provided contact information for local law enforcement to most individuals who participated in the investigation, either during the interview or via email.

reported to have occurred, which in some cases has had lifelong impacts. Your voices have been heard and have created a foundation of information and awareness for Interlochen to integrate into its policies, procedures, and practices as it maintains the many positives of Interlochen, while ensuring the safety and welfare of students by incorporating lessons learned through this investigation.