

The NCHERM Group has assisted clients with issues of:

- Anticipation of litigation
- Litigation strategies
- Litigation support
- Settlement negotiations
- Media/public relations
- Standard of care/duty of care opinions/affidavits
- Expert reports
- Depositions
- Trial testimony
- Amicus curiae briefs
- Brief preparation/research

Our breadth and depth of expertise will help you put your best foot forward in court. Our involvement in cases helps to bring them to quick resolution. The NCHERM Group consultants have served as experts in over 50 cases involving:

- Title IX
- Campus conduct codes/due process
- Wrongful death
- Negligence
- Premises liability
- Sexual harassment
- Campus crime, security & safety
- Active shooter prevention
- Hazing
- Office for Civil Rights (OCR)
- Drug/alcohol overdose
- Discrimination claims
- Sexual assault
- NCAA Violations
- 42 USC §1983 actions



For more information, please contact Kate Halligan at 610-579-3725 or [kate@ncherm.org](mailto:kate@ncherm.org).

## EXPERT WITNESS & LITIGATION SERVICES

### *Best Practices for Campus Health and Safety*

The NCHERM Group's experts are leaders in the field of higher education law and policy, and as such, are frequently called upon to serve as expert witnesses and litigation strategists for pK-12, college, and university cases in state and federal courts, government investigations (OCR, program reviews, etc.), and internal investigations.



"Mr. Sokolow is a first class expert for the big case. I suggest using his services when the stakes are high and only the best expert on college and university liability will suffice."

— Mark C. Nanavati, Midlothian, Virginia

"As between the two potential expert witnesses, and based solely on the materials which are presently before the court, Mr. Sokolow appears to understand the use and scope of his testimony better than [the opposing expert]. Mr. Sokolow's report begins with a substantial discussion of the [state] law governing and defining the standard of care and appears to reflect a thorough understanding of his role as an expert in the liability action alone... Mr. Sokolow analyzed the university's compliance with its own procedures, he also discussed federal guidelines, procedures in peer institutions, and other sources from which the court could draw upon the reasonable standard of care... Therefore, both the context of the opinions and their prefatory legal discussion might tend to support the belief that, as between the two, Mr. Sokolow would be better able to avoid testifying impermissibly... Given that [the opposing expert] apparently has nothing to add to Mr. Sokolow's standard of care analysis, it is not clear to the court at this time what value his testimony would add."

— A Federal Judge, Written Opinion