Tips, Tricks, and Techniques: How to Improve Your Internal Investigations

RODNEY KLEIN RODNEY KLEIN EEO TRAINING

Top Questions I Hear

- 1) Is this required?
- 2) When will it be over?
- 3) Will there be food?
- 4) Are you going to teach us how to harass people?
- 5) How do I become a better investigator?

How I Was Trained

Know Thyself or Know That Thy Can't Always Know Thyself

Investigators

Bias is something we all have

We need to acknowledge that our bias will pull us in certain directions

We probably know or know of the people involved We only see a small number of general fact patterns We see more "no discrimination" than "discrimination"

Investigators

In short, we work at being objective, letting the evidence lead us, keeping an open mind, and listening to others and their points of view.

It won't eliminate the bias, but it will give us a better chance at conducting a complete and impartial investigation.

Got to Know All the Law Stuff

Legal Standards of Proof

Each type of discrimination has its own legal standards. Must know them all.

(disparate treatment, harassment, retaliation, reasonable accommodation, adverse impact)

Don't skip steps. Don't take steps out of order. Don't take shortcuts.

Law Stuff: One Step at a Time

Disparate Treatment: Legal Standards of Proof

- Complainant is a member of a protected class,
- Complainant was harmed,
- Other employees of a different class were not harmed under similar circumstances,
- The employer articulates a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the harm,
- The reason articulated by the employer is a pretext to hide discrimination.

Disparate Treatment: Legal Standards of Proof

It starts with a difference in treatment

Then moves to whether the difference in treatment was because of illegal discrimination: race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, or genetic information

Patient Case Worker

Was fired by Jane for being 4 hours late with an annual patient report required by the State

First offense of this nature

10 Patient Case Workers missed important report deadlines.

6 were reprimanded (2 Black, 4 non-Black)

No repeat offenses

4 were fired – not including Bob (3 Black, 1 non-Black)

But this atstime sert is tookipais of a a some and the same as Bob was. So, were treated better than and the same as Bob was. So, the reason for the difference in treatment couldn't be race. Right? Legal question: Why were similarly situated non-Black

patient case workers treated differently than Bob?

10 Patient Case Workers missed important report deadlines.

6 were reprimanded (2 Black, 4 non-Black)

No repeat offenses

4 were fired – not including Bob (3 Black, 1 non-Black)

Law Stuff: Set up to Fail

Legal Standards of Proof

Harassment:

- Quid Pro Quo/Hostile Environment
- Severe/Pervasive
- Subjectively and objectively hostile
- Liability co-worker/mgmt. official

Retaliation:

- Protected activity/Harm/Connection
- Connection standards

Reasonable Accommodation:

- Where did the interactive process breakdown and why

Legal Standards of Proof

Study your field

Keep up with current precedent

If you don't know something, look it up. That's what they make Google for

Knowledge fallacy about investigators

Always Work from an Investigative Plan





Investigative Plan

Should follow the legal standards

Should list what you need and where you will get it (the more confirmation, the better)

Standards are always the same. Evidence is always different. The Plan is for gather evidence.

Should be continually under construction



Working Hypotheses: What are your ????

Given the fact pattern (i.e. what I can confirm is true), what would have to have happened for discrimination to have occurred?

This will change as questions are answered and new questions arise.

Answers to these questions connect the evidence to the legal standards.

Jane alleges she was not selected for a promotion because of her race, Black. The person selected for the position was non-Black. The department manager states that the decision to select the non-Black applicant was made by a hiring panel of four people.

Bob alleges he was fired in retaliation for making an internal discrimination complaint. Bob's supervisor states that she fired Bob on 3/01 for three incidents of poor performance/poor conduct. Bob made his discrimination complaint on 2/14.

Ibrahim alleges he was demoted from his job because of his religion – Muslim and his national origin – Arab descent. Human Resources states he was demoted because he was found to have discriminated against his female subordinates. Three of his six subordinates filed the internal complaint.

All of Ibrahim's employees were female. Ibrahim gave you copies of emails he sent his manager asking for help and guidance on how to supervisor his team in the months leading up to his discharge.

Thinking and Listening: The Art of interviewing

Witness Interviews

The objective of any witness interview is to hear the truth...

and to recognize it as the truth.

Listening

This means the interview must be in-person

Hold the interview in a safe, private, comfortable space

Engage in dialogue

Ask open-ended questions only

These are questions that start with the letter, "w"

Listening

Listening is both a science and an art form.

The key to listening is being very, very, very quiet



Most people are honest, unless they are properly motivated to be dishonest. Some of those motivations exist with witnesses. This isn't to say people will be dishonest. Only that those motivations to be dishonest are there.

During interviews, a witness will be motivated to say whatever, 1) will get them out of the interview as quickly as possible, and 2) will keep them out of trouble.

The "right" answer is whatever accomplishes those two things

So, if a witness can't tell what the "right" answer is, then they are more likely to fall back on the truth.

Comfortable Dialogue Out of sequence Can confirm

The goal is to hear the truth and to recognize it as truth. This requires thought and strategy to help confirm answers and determine credibility.

Two Heads are Better than

-

0)

Deconstruction

Deconstruction

Sometimes the outcome is obvious. And sometimes it's not.

Beware of confirmation bias: constructing evidence to support what we think is true

Deconstructing the finding (showing through evidence that the finding is incorrect) is a great way to purposefully consider evidence that refutes our contention.

AI: the Watson, not the Holmes



The Story is in the Story

Investigative Reports

In a perfect world the truth is evident for all to see

In an imperfect world, we must explain it

Telling the story of the investigation helps the people who review the findings see the evidence in the appropriate context

And who doesn't love a good mystery



Confidence vs Caution

Don't Stop Working at Your Craft

If you want to be a good investigator, you will be.

Attempts: Brief Observations on Civil Rights, EEO, and the Difficulties of Difference

To receive updates on my latest trainings for HR professionals, send an email to:

rk@rodneykleineeotraining.com







Brief Observations on Civil Rights, EEO, and the Difficulties of Difference

