Conducting Effective Internal Investigations

Module One: Planning the Investigation

Katherine M. Allen, Associate General Counsel, The Pennsylvania State University
Natasha Baker, Managing Attorney, Novus Law Firm, Inc.
Pamela Heatlie, Director of the Office for Institutional Equity, University of Michigan – Dearborn

Overview of Course

• Purpose: providing guidance for best practices in conducting internal investigations. Any type of internal investigation.
Overview of Course

• Series of modules on the following topics:
  • Module One: Planning the Investigation
  • Module Two: Conducting the Investigation, Interviewing, and Information Gathering
  • Module Three: Reaching a Conclusion and Credibility Determinations
  • Module Four: Writing the Report and Post-Investigation Considerations

Module Overview

Types of Investigations
Value of Good Investigative Practices
Pre-investigation Considerations
Choosing an Investigator
Confidentiality v. Transparency
Receiving and Evaluating the Complaint
Notice
Interim Measures
Developing an Investigative Strategy or Plan
Public Relations Considerations
Types of Investigations

• Employee Discrimination
• Academic Integrity
• Research Misconduct
• Athletics Compliance
• Tenured Faculty Discipline
• Financial or Time Fraud
• Student Conduct

Types of Investigations

• What is the subject matter?
• Who is the respondent, if any?
• What is the process?
  ○ Institutional policies and procedures
  ○ Regulatory or statutory process
  ○ Legal requirements
Types of Investigations

What is the purpose of the investigation?
  - Neutral?
  - Privileged?

What is the role of the investigator?
  - Fact-gathering?
  - Proposed findings?
  - Making a decision?
  - Recommended action?
Why Good Investigations Are Important

• It’s about fair process for all institutions
• Procedural due process for public institutions
  o Property interest: notice and opportunity to be heard
  o Liberty interest: name-clearing hearing
  o Policy determines how much process is due

Substantive due process: decision-making is not arbitrary or capricious
Judicial deference for internal administrative investigations
Good management
Pre-Investigation Considerations

• Interim safety/preservation measures
  o Interim leave/suspension
  o Document retention
  o Sequestration of evidence

• Concurrent investigations
  o Police involvement
  o Government investigator
  o Required notifications
Choosing An Investigator

• What type of case is it?
• Consider actual or apparent conflicts of interest
• Internal or external investigator?

Choosing An Investigator

Are there “political” issues to consider?
• Who are the parties?
• What are the issues?
• Review investigator’s background and training
• Investigator’s credibility and the process is at stake
Confidentiality vs. Transparency

• Tension between maintaining privacy and assuring fair process
• Limits on absolute confidentiality

Confidentiality vs. Transparency

• Applicable policy and law
• FERPA
• Research misconduct
• Employee discipline
Confidentiality vs. Transparency

- Privilege/work product protections
  - Scope may be limited
  - Waiver possible
- Public records
  - State-specific

Investigative Steps

1. Receive/Evaluate Complaint
2. Initiate Investigation/Notification Letters
3. Develop Investigation Strategy
4. Conduct Interviews
5. Gather other Information
6. Write Investigation Report
Receive/Evaluate/Document Complaint

Written complaint vs. in person?

Determine what laws, policies, procedures/practices apply

Evaluate to determine if should be accepted

Evaluate/Document Complaint

• Harmani Case Study Issues:
  • Layoff
  • Harassment
**Notice: Notify Respondent/Parties of Complaint**

- Method of notification
  - Verbally?
  - In writing?
    - Letter or email?

- Information to include:
  - What to expect during the process.
  - Any available resources, e.g., counseling, health/mental health services, representation
  - Prohibition against retaliation
  - Timing – what rights are triggered once notification provided?
  - Any required disclosures?
Interim Measures

• Purpose?
• Who has authority to impose?
• Types of circumstances that might warrant an interim employment/academic suspension?
• For employment, with/without pay?
• Process for implementing interim suspension? Due process considerations?

Investigative Plan

Benefits of written plan:
  • Keep facts straight
  • Keep investigation on course
  • Fill in to become investigative report
  • Particularly helpful with complicated cases
Develop Investigative Plan

• Frame allegations – identify definitions and standards of proof.
• What evidence do you need and how will you get it?
• Scope of investigation.

1. Determine scope of investigation.
2. Develop key questions based on scope of investigation.
3. Identify possible witnesses and other sources of information.
4. Determine order of interviews.
Public Relations Considerations

- Likelihood of publicity – Harmani has hinted about talking with the press
- Designated spokesperson?
- Limitations on information that can be disclosed

Investigation Plan – Key Questions

1. Was the conduct based on race, national origin, or other protected basis?
2. Was the conduct unwelcome? Did R know/should’ve known?
Investigation Plan – Key Questions

3. Subjective: Was the conduct sufficiently serious to create a hostile, intimidating, or abusive environment for Complainant?

4. Objective: Was it reasonable for Complainant to believe that the conduct created a hostile, intimidating, or abusive environment?

Investigative Plan - Standards

What is the burden of proof?
• Preponderance?
• Clear and convincing?

Who bears the burden of proof?
• On institution?
• On parties?
Investigative Plan – Harmani – Layoff – Discrimination

Guiding document: East Coast University Policy on Discrimination and Harassment

• Basis for the alleged policy violation?
• Elements of the definition?
• Prima facie case – member of protected group, adverse action, others treated better?
• Legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason?
• Pretext?

Investigative Plan – Harmani – Layoff – Retaliation

Guiding documents: East Coast University Policy on Discrimination and Harassment, FMLA Policy, any relevant policies re whistleblowing

Elements:

• Protected activity
• Adverse action
• Causal connection
• Legitimate nonretaliatory reason
• Pretext
Investigative Plan – Harmani – Harassment

Guiding document: East Coast University Policy on Discrimination and Harassment

• Unwelcome conduct
• Based on (religion/sex?)
• Severe, persistent, and/or pervasive
  • Subjective/objective
Note

• This training does not cover investigations conducted under the 2020 Title IX Regulations. Other NACUA courses cover those types of investigations.

• The content of this presentation is to provide news and information on legal issues and all content is provided for informational purposes only and should not be considered legal advice.

• The transmission of information in this presentation does not establish an attorney-client relationship with the recipient. The recipient should not act on the information contained in this presentation without first consulting retained legal counsel.

• If you desire legal advice for a particular situation, you should consult an attorney.
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Module Overview

- Interviews: Logistics, Who to Interview, and How to Interview Effectively
- Participation by Parties and Witnesses
- Amnesty
- Required Disclosures – Garrity Rights
- Conducting the Interview – Tips for Good Questioning
- Post-Interview Considerations
- Interviewing High-Level Employees and Police
Interviews – General Considerations & Logistics

Scheduling
Location/technology
Notes/recording/transcripts?
Accessibility

Interviews – Representation & Support

Right to representation/support? Permissible?
Representative’s/support person’s role during interview
Participation by Parties

- Reasons for not wanting to participate?
  - Discuss prohibition on retaliation
  - Ensure it isn’t a barrier within the institution’s control (e.g., amnesty)
- Make decision based on available evidence
  - Should you draw an adverse inference from a failure to participate?
- Can you?

Participation by Witnesses

- Witness refuses to participate, and/or
- One of the parties asks that a particular witness not be contacted
- Ask why
  - Fear of retaliation?
  - Concern about own misconduct?
- Consider how important the information would be, and whether other ways to get it.
Amnesty

“Any individual who reports discrimination or harassment or participates in an investigation will not be subject to disciplinary action by the University for personal use of alcohol or other drugs at or near the time of the incident, provided that such use did not harm or place the health or safety of any other person at risk. The University may offer support, resources, and educational counseling to such individual.”

Purpose of the Interview

- Establish a narrative and timelines of events – get the facts!
- Gather information to answer key questions
- Clarify conflicting information
- Understand how all parties perceived events
**Purpose of the Interview**

In devising questions, consider:

- Do I need to know the information?
- Will an answer to my question help me understand what happened?
- Will getting an answer to this question inform the decision?

---

**Interviews – General Considerations**

- Who to interview
- Order of interviews
- Status of the investigation
Who to Interview

• Complainant
• Named respondent/individual making the challenged decision

Who to Interview

• Witnesses
  • Employees (faculty, staff)
  • Students
  • Individuals not associated with university
    • Visitors
    • Contractors
    • First responders
    • Medical personnel
Interviews – General Considerations

• Any required disclosures?
• Details of the incident/circumstances at issue

Interviews – General Considerations

• Ask for other sources of relevant evidence – witnesses, documents, etc.
  • Who would have more information about…
  • Is there anything else?
• For complainant, perhaps: What would you like to see as outcome?
Interviews – General Considerations

1. Set the TONE
2. Develop rapport – put individual at ease
3. Explain your role – neutral, no conclusion has been reached
4. Offer paper copy of policy and where to find it online

5. Explain the steps in process
6. Explain prohibition against retaliation
7. Discuss confidentiality/privacy/information security
8. Access to resources and support
Conducting the Interviews

Do:
• Remain impartial and keep an open mind
• Ask relevant questions that are specific to the incident
• Importance of tone

Conducting the Interviews

Don’t:
• Make premature conclusions
• Allow personal biases, belief system, stereotypes to guide your questioning
• Badger the witness(es)
• Ask accusatory questions/blame the victim
• React to what the witness is saying
Tips for Good Questioning

1. Ask open-ended questions
2. Listen more than talk
3. Give time to answer
4. Use appropriate tone
5. Be comfortable with silence
6. Avoid leading questions
7. Identify conflicting information
8. Ask questions that reveal attitude/belief
9. Avoid questions that imply judgment

Conducting the Interviews

Types of Questions

• “What” questions ask for facts and details
• “How” questions ask about the process, sequence of events, or focus on emotions
• Closed “Who/When/Where” questions ask for the specifics of the situation
Conducting the Interviews

Types of Questions
- Avoid “Why” questions
- Avoid multiple choice questions
- Avoid asking for conclusions

Leading Questions
- Were you upset with Ms. Harmani’s work schedule?
- Did Ms. Harmani’s FMLA leave interfere with the work of the department?
- Were you worried after your conversation with your manager about the grant?
Conducting the Interviews

Useful Phrases
• Would you be willing to tell me more about...?
• How did you feel about...?
• What did you do after...? What happened then?
• What did you mean when you said...?
• What was your reaction to...?
• How did you become involved in...?
• What is your understanding of...?

Concluding the Interview

Thank
Thank the party/witness

Remind
Remind them of institution’s prohibition against retaliation

Inform
Inform parties of next steps

Discuss
Discuss confidentiality/privacy again
**Post-Interview**

• Review interview notes/recording/transcript.
• What do you know to be true? Are there undisputed facts?
• What do you not know?

**Post-Interview**

• How can you find this information out? Another witness? More evidence?
• Circle back to give each party a chance to respond to new information.
Thoroughness/Efficiency

• How many witnesses to interview?
• When to stop?

Interviewing High-Level Management Employees

LEGAL REPRESENTATION  NEUTRALITY  INFLUENCE
Interviewing Police

- As a witness in a non-criminal matter
- When investigating alleged misconduct by law enforcement

Gather Other Information

email  book  SMS  camera

POLICE REPORT

NACUA
National Association of College and University Attorneys
Prepare Timeline

- Use interviews and documentation to develop timeline.
  - Will help to determine relevant follow-up questions for parties and witnesses
  - Will help factfinder/decision-maker understand what happened

QUESTIONS?
Note

• The content of this presentation is to provide news and information on legal issues and all content is provided for informational purposes only and should not be considered legal advice.

• The transmission of information in this presentation does not establish an attorney-client relationship with the recipient. The recipient should not act on the information contained in this presentation without first consulting retained legal counsel.

• If you desire legal advice for a particular situation, you should consult an attorney.
Conducting Effective Internal Investigations

Module Three: Reaching a Conclusion and Credibility Determinations

Katherine M. Allen, Associate General Counsel, The Pennsylvania State University

Natasha Baker, Managing Attorney, Novus Law Firm, Inc.

Pamela Heatlie, Director of the Office for Institutional Equity, University of Michigan – Dearborn

Module Overview

- Corroborating evidence
- Direct and Circumstantial evidence
- Other Types of Evidence
- Weight of Evidence
- Credibility determinations
  - Inconsistencies
  - Plausibility
  - Motives
  - Demeanor of parties and witnesses
  - Effects of Trauma
Corroborating Evidence

- Definition: Evidence that supports other evidence (Documents that support oral reports)
  - What is it?
  - How do you get it?
  - What weight is accorded?

Circumstantial Evidence

- Definition: Evidence that can be used to infer but not prove a conclusion. Contrast: direct evidence.
  - Example: pattern evidence. Should be VERY similar in nature. NOT – general character/bad actor evidence
  - Ask: Does our process allow circumstantial evidence?
  - What weight is it accorded?
Other Types of Evidence

- Character evidence
- Recordings
- Polygraph/lie detector tests

Case Study Review

- What corroborating evidence do we have?
- What circumstantial evidence do we have?
- What else do we need?
Weight of Evidence

• Is all evidence created equal? No.
• Eyewitness vs second-hand/hearsay
• Corroborating evidence
• Direct evidence
• Circumstantial evidence
• Other evidence

Case Study Review

• Weighing the evidence
• What evidence is strong?
• What evidence is weak?
Credibility Determinations

Factors to consider:

Inconsistencies

Plausibility

Motive

Demeanor

Effects of Trauma

Credibility Determinations: Inconsistencies

• Individual is inconsistent in own report.
  • Trauma or fear?
  • Lying?
  • ASK!

• Individual is inconsistent with others.
  • Anomaly?
  • Coached testimony?
  • ASK!
Credibility Determinations: Plausibility

- What is reasonable?
- Level of detail?
- Apply the appropriate standard of proof.
  - Preponderance of the evidence (maybe this)
  - Clear and convincing (maybe this)
  - Beyond a reasonable doubt (rare)
- You will very likely feel uncomfortable. It’s okay.

Credibility Determinations: Motive

- What is the relationship?
- Classify the witness:
  - Witness with an axe to grind?
  - Witness who wants to protect?
  - Witness who loves the limelight?
  - Witness who doesn’t want to be involved?
Credibility Determinations: Demeanor

- Controversial
- Need a baseline for comparison
- Don’t usually know how the person “normally” behaves
- Cultural/regional/religious expectations may cloud assessment

Eyewitness Testimony

- Reliability
- Selective Attention
- **TIP:** Seek corroborating evidence
Case Study Review

• Assessing credibility
  • Inconsistencies?
  • Corroborating evidence?

Credibility Determination: Impact of Trauma (Fear-based Response)

• Impacts ability to retell and recall info
• Likely gaps in memory
• Memories are not encoded chronologically
• Shame, blame and fear
• Reluctance
Note

The content of this presentation is to provide news and information on legal issues and all content is provided for informational purposes only and should not be considered legal advice.

The transmission of information in this presentation does not establish an attorney-client relationship with the recipient. The recipient should not act on the information contained in this presentation without first consulting retained legal counsel.

If you desire legal advice for a particular situation, you should consult an attorney.