



HRPA Practice Standard: Conducting Workplace Investigations

Purpose of Standard

HRPA regulates its registered HR professionals in the public interest (meaning for the welfare and wellbeing of the general public and society) and holds our members, firms and students to the province's highest standards. Like any regulatory body, professional guidance is critical in helping to supplement the **Code of Ethics and Rules of Professional Conduct** and to provide HRPAs members, firms and students with the tools to protect the public interest by reducing/preventing risks of harm stemming from the practice of the Human Resources HR profession. This practice standard should be read in conjunction with the HRPAs Code of Ethics and Rules of Professional Conduct. Members of the public should expect the HRPAs members, registered firms, and students to uphold the Code of Ethics and Rules of Professional Conduct.

HRPA's risk roster and the extensive research conducted on risks to the public (e.g., workers, workplaces, employers) stemming from the practice of HR found that inappropriately conducted workplace investigations are among the highest risks to the public. As such, HRPAs looked at common mistakes made in workplace investigations and developed this practice standard to assist members, firms and students in avoiding those pitfalls.

This practice standard intends to offer guidance required of all HRPAs members, firms and students in regard to conducting workplace investigations for provincially regulated workplaces in Ontario. **Please note that this standard is not exhaustive, but rather focuses on the minimum expectations of HRPAs member and students. Additionally, this practice standard was written with Ontario provincial jurisprudence in mind. Registrants working in the federal sector whose workplaces are governed by the *Canada Labour Code* should be aware of the differences in the federal jurisprudence and ensure they are complying with all federal laws, including the *Canada Labour Code* and the *Canada Human Rights Act* as regards to their investigation requirements.** HRPAs strongly encourages member and students to pursue additional education, resources, training and support on this topic.

DISCLAIMER: The information provided in this Practice Standard is in respect of the law of the Province of Ontario and is intended for general information only. This Practice Standard is not provided for the purpose of providing legal advice or a complete statement of the law on the particular topics. Every situation is unique and involves specific legal issues. HRPAs members and students are advised to seek legal advice, as applicable, when preparing for and proceeding with a workplace investigation.

Further, this Practice Standard is to be read in conjunction with the applicable employment standards, occupational health and safety, and human rights legislation and does not supersede or replace the legal requirements set out in the legislation.

<p>Target user:</p>	<p>HRPA members, firms and students, employers, executive leadership teams.</p>
<p>Risk of harm to public (e.g. workers, workplaces, employers):</p>	<p>Failure to conduct a proper workplace investigation is a breach of the Ontario <i>Occupational Health and Safety Act</i> and the Ontario <i>Human Rights Code</i>. It can cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • worsening issues of harassment, discrimination, violence and misconduct in the workplace • human rights violations • privacy and confidentiality breaches • retaliation • lack of procedural fairness • Incorrect conclusions arrived at by the investigator • legal exposure • unfair/disproportionate responses to the investigation findings, and • harm to both mental and physical health.
<p>Risk of harm to profession:</p>	<p>Improperly conducted workplace investigations harm the reputation of the profession and can have severe legal consequences.</p>
<p>Critical connection to Code of Ethics and Rules of Professional Conduct:</p>	<p>The following provisions of HRPA’s Code of Ethics and Rules of Professional Conduct, which all members and students must comply with, apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section I. Professionalism: Rule #10. • Section II. Trustworthiness: Rules #6-8 & 11. • Section IV. Competence: Rules #1, 6 & 8. <p><i>Note: This is not an exhaustive list of critical connections this guidance may have to the Code of Ethics and Rules of Professional Conduct. Please ensure you review the Code of Ethics and Rules of Professional Conduct in its entirety.</i></p>

Desired impact of guidance:	Readers of this Practice Standard should gain knowledge and feel more equipped to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Define and recognize key, minimum standards of conducting a fair workplace investigation.○ Understand common mistakes made in workplace investigations and know what to avoid doing.○ Implement and follow all the minimum expectations and requirements outlined when conducting or planning a workplace investigation.○ Be able to reflect on whether those who are conducting a workplace investigation have the required training and skills to conduct a fair workplace investigation.
------------------------------------	---

Table of Contents

HRPA Practice Standard:.....	1
Conducting Workplace Investigations.....	1
Purpose of Standard.....	2
Overview of Workplace Investigations.....	6
Standards.....	6
1) Confidentiality and Privacy.....	7
2) Privilege.....	8
3) Procedural Fairness, Impartiality and Objectivity.....	9
4) Deciding to Take a Case - Investigator Selection.....	12
5) Interviews.....	13
6) Gathering All Relevant Information, Documentation, and Record Keeping.....	15
7) Communicating Outcomes of Investigation and Addressing Retaliation.....	17
Scenarios.....	17
Evaluation Measures.....	20
References (And Additional Resources).....	21

Overview of Workplace Investigations

Everyone is entitled to a healthy and safe workplace. In Ontario, under both [the Occupational Health and Safety Act](#) (OHSA) and the [Human Rights Code](#) (the “Code”). Where applicable, employers have the duty to investigate complaints and incidents of workplace harassment and workplace violence, whether or not there has been a formal or informal complaint (ex. If the employer becomes aware, or ought to be aware, of an incident of workplace harassment and/or violence, this must be investigated. This includes if a worker is the complainant, witnesses the incident, or learns of such incident through a second-hand report).

For the purposes of this practice standard, workplace investigations are defined as employer-based investigations into complaints, allegations, or incidents of misconduct occurring in the workplace, including but not limited to harassment, discrimination, bullying, privacy breaches, substance use at work, theft, vandalism, retaliation, threats of violence, and assault. Professional workplace investigators typically have experience and this document is meant as **minimum** guidance and expectations when conducting an investigation or working with a workplace investigator.

Standards

The following standards are the minimum expectations that HR professionals are expected to comply with when being involved in conducting workplace investigations. The expectations below are focused on when the HR professional is conducting the investigation. However, similar expectations apply if the HR professional is responsible for choosing someone else to be the investigator and/or is overseeing the investigation. As noted above, this Practice Standard references Ontario-based legislation. For national employers, it is important to ensure you are following all other relevant legislation. HRPA members, firms and students are required and expected to comply with the requirements of all applicable employment standards, occupational health and safety, and human rights legislation when conducting, participating in and/or overseeing a workplace investigation.

1) Confidentiality and Privacy

Understanding confidentiality and privacy obligations should always come first during a workplace investigation – at every step of the process. With respect to confidentiality and privacy during a workplace investigation, HRPAs members, firms and students are expected to:

- a) Instruct complainants, respondents, and witnesses to maintain confidentiality regarding the fact and nature of the workplace investigation itself and in the investigation process, and refrain from sharing information about the investigation or complaint with other employees or witnesses both during and after the investigation. These instructions should be provided in writing, including specific examples of things to avoid- such as discussing particulars of the situation, adding one's own commentary or workplace gossip. Consequences of confidentiality breaches should be clearly explained and outlined in writing. One exception is that complainants and respondents may share information with their respective advisors (union representative, lawyer, etc.) so long as those representatives agree in turn to maintain confidentiality of the investigation and process.
- b) Not share any information about the incident, complaint and/or investigation with anyone unless it is necessary to properly investigate and respond to the incident or complaint, to protect employees/the general public, or if required by law.
- c) Store any documentation, evidence, notes, or any other materials related to the investigation in a secure location, that is separate from the personnel files of the parties and those participating in the investigation process, and only accessible to those who require access on a "need to know" basis.
- d) Not give any guarantee of confidentiality to those who participate in the investigation. Be transparent to all parties involved in the investigation on how privacy and confidentiality will be preserved, and under what circumstances disclosing information about the investigation may be required.
- e) Report, follow up on and act on any breaches of confidentiality, whether before, during or after the investigation.

2) Privilege

Workplace investigations may have solicitor-client privilege and/or litigation privilege attached with them. Questions regarding any privilege protecting the investigation process, records and report may benefit from discussion with legal counsel in advance of the investigation in order to determine the best course of action.

With respect to privilege and workplace investigations, HRPA members, firms and students are expected to:

- a) Understand the two different types of privileges:
 - o Solicitor-client privilege: Also known as “legal advice” privilege, exists where a client, such as employers, communicates with their lawyer for the purpose of seeking or giving legal advice with the intention of the communication being confidential, whether or not litigation is involved.
 - o Litigation privilege: Protects any documents or communications between a lawyer and their client, or a lawyer and a third party, where the document or communication is created for the dominant purpose of preparing for existing or anticipated litigation. Existing or anticipated litigation does not need to be the only purpose for the document having been created, but it must be the main purpose to claim this type of privilege.

- a) Recognize that it cannot be assumed workplace investigations and/or the investigation report are automatically protected by solicitor-client privilege just because a lawyer is the workplace investigator or has been consulted.
 - o Retaining a lawyer to conduct a workplace investigation is not always the same as retaining a lawyer for the purposes of obtaining legal advice with respect to an incident or complaint of workplace harassment or violence, or in regard to the investigation of such complaint, as required for solicitor-client privilege (see [*De Francesca v. Centric Investigation Services Inc.*](#) for more details on a related Ontario Human Rights Tribunal case).
 - o Should a workplace wish to maintain solicitor-client privilege, the retainer letter to engage the lawyer as the investigator should have a clear description that their mandate is to conduct the investigation and use their investigation report for the purpose of providing legal advice to the client in respect thereof. Please note, however, that even in doing so, the findings of the investigation must be

disclosed and the contents of the investigation report itself still may not be privileged. Again, HRPAs members, firms and students are strongly encouraged to seek legal advice as applicable.

3) Procedural Fairness, Impartiality and Objectivity

The [Government of Canada](#) defines procedural fairness as requiring a fair and unbiased assessment without undue delay, with a right to be heard for the individual(s) impacted by the decision, and a right to understand the basis of the decision made.

When considering, planning for and/or conducting workplace investigations, HRPAs member and students are expected to align with the following:

- a) **Policy Review** - Begin with a fulsome review of the applicable policies and procedures within the workplace. Clear terms of reference or mandate should be established outlining the scope of the investigation and the investigation process. The mandate and details of the investigation process as well as the allegations should, where possible, be shared with the complainant(s) and respondent(s) prior to their first meeting/interview with the investigator to give them time to digest, review and gather evidence to support or respond to the allegations. This should include reference to any legislation and/or internal company policies that are engaged as a result of the allegations. Respondent(s) have the right to know what workplace policies and legislation will be referred to as part of the investigation and the details of the allegations made against them.
- b) **Timely Resolution** - Investigations should commence promptly and be completed promptly, preferably, unless there are extenuating circumstances, timelines stipulated in the workplace policies and/or collective agreement, where applicable, or within 90 days of the formal or informal complaint being known, whichever is shorter. The parties to the investigation should be kept apprised of any delay in the investigation, if it happens.
- c) **Investigation Plan** - Every investigation should start with an investigation plan that is prepared by the investigator and captures the mandate of the investigation, initial list of appropriate witnesses (which may change/expand over the course of the investigation), and other evidence to be obtained. This document should be

maintained and added to, as the investigation unfolds. The investigation plan is not to be shared with the parties, but it should be clear to the complainant(s) and respondent(s) what the scope of the investigation is.

- d) Fairness Principles** - Natural justice (procedural fairness) requires that the respondent is provided with the allegations, or at least the substance of the allegations, prior to being interviewed. This may also be required by the legislation and the employer's policies. Respondents should be given a full and fair opportunity to respond to the allegations, including providing evidence and/or names of witnesses to support their response/defence. In addition, both the complainant and respondent must be provided with any evidence received in the course of the investigation that is probative and potentially adverse to their interests. Each must be granted the opportunity to respond to that information.
- e) Consider Alternative Working Arrangements or Accommodations** - Consideration should be given as to whether any temporary accommodations need to be made during the course of the investigation. For example, and depending on the circumstances, including the nature of the complaint and the workplace, the employer may temporarily remove a party from the workplace, move them to a different department, or move them under the supervision of a different employee while the investigation is underway. While this is an extreme measure, it can be appropriate if it helps to ensure objectivity and safety. The relevant parties should be clearly informed of any such decision and any such move should be done without any impact on the individual's pay or benefits.
- f) Open Mind** - Investigators must maintain an open mind to all possibilities and refrain from any presumptions regarding the parties, the evidence, or the conclusions on a matter. The investigator should be someone who is objective and independent. The full evidence and facts should guide conclusions reached.
- g) Conflicts** - Investigators must recuse themselves from being involved in any part of the investigation if they have a close relationship with any parties involved (including personal or work relationships), are the subject of the complaint or allegations, and/or if they do not have the required training, skills and experience for conducting a thorough investigation.

- h) Supports for Parties Involved** - Given the potential psychological impacts of either being harassed, or being a party to an investigation, outlining what supports are available to both the complainant and respondent is important. This could include reminders about any Employee Assistance Programs or resources available to the parties. This is a supportive gesture that acknowledges the stress and possible impacts to wellbeing.
- i) Rights of Parties** - Both the complainant and the respondent have rights. Investigators must not only be aware of those rights, but also ensure that the parties have been advised accordingly to ensure a fair process.
- j) Preserve Dignity** - Act with care, respect and sensitivity to all parties involved in the investigation, preserving the dignity of all involved.
- k) Internal Biases** - Be aware of your own biases, including cultural biases, and make conscious efforts to address and minimize them so as not to let them interfere with the investigation, whether intentionally or not. Consider the many different types of biases, including but not limited to:

 - a. **Affinity bias:** Where people tend to relate to or get along more with people who have things in common with themselves, such as faith, ethnicity, socio-economic background, field of work, and so forth.
 - b. **Confirmation Bias:** When a person has suspicions/guess of what occurred and seek out evidence to prove that these suspicions are correct, and neglect evidence that contradicts their suspicions. This goes to the point above about having an open mind and not pre-determining the issue.
 - c. **Status:** If a person who is part of the investigation has a well-regarded status and reputation, the investigator may have pre-conceived expectations and assumptions that they are telling the truth and are innocent. The reverse is also true, if a person is not well-regarded, with a poor reputation, the investigator may have pre-conceived expectations and assumptions that they are not truthful.
 - d. **Priming:** If the investigator is told things about a person prior to meeting or interviewing them, such as that the person often lies about things, this may cause doubts about the person before even speaking with them.

4) Deciding to Take a Case – Investigator Selection

When faced with a workplace investigation, HRPAs and students are expected to:

- a) Be highly knowledgeable of the organization's own policies and procedures (including around harassment, discrimination, workplace violence, complaints, and investigations), the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Ontario Human Rights Code, and all other applicable employment laws.
- b) Be trained and competent to conduct a workplace investigation, with the ability to gather evidence, interview relevant parties, assess credibility, and make conclusions (and recommendations where required by the mandate) based on the facts in a neutral and objective manner. If competencies or training are lacking, it may be appropriate to seek guidance to further the investigation from a trained professional, provided they have signed a confidentiality agreement.
- c) Review and consider any conflict of interests or potential for conflict of interests, ensuring that objectiveness and fairness can be maintained. Often this is a matter of optics. Just because a member or student is confident there is no conflict, that may not be how others see it. If there are any doubts, this decision should involve someone else in the organization who can objectively evaluate the situation. The absence of objectivity can impact the integrity and procedural fairness of the investigation and further the liability for the employer, including if the case ends up in Court or before other tribunals.
- d) Be well-equipped with the required information, resources, and instructions for conducting the investigation (see 3a above), while taking care not to request or accept any unnecessary information that could potentially lead to bias. The [Ministry of Labour's Code of Practice](#) must always be complied with.

5) Interviews

When planning for and/or conducting interviews as part of a workplace investigation, HRPA member and students are expected to:

- a) Schedule interviews in advance and be cautious of timing between interviews to avoid both interaction between witnesses and significant gaps (e.g weeks or months between interviews). If an investigator has limited availability, consider having another investigator conduct the investigation to avoid large time gaps between interviews.
- b) Be clear on whether or not interviewees are able to bring a support person and/or legal representative with them. If third parties are allowed at the interview, their role at the interview should be confirmed in writing, including that they are not to participate in the interview or answer on behalf of the witness.
- c) Thoroughly and separately interview all relevant witnesses and parties, including, but not limited to:
 - a. Alleged victim (or complainant)
 - b. Witnesses to the incident
 - c. Other witnesses deemed appropriate based on input from the parties to the matter – this might include people who can assist in the evaluation of credibility of others
 - d. External people such as former employees where appropriate, available, and accessible
 - e. Respondent
- d) Take time to build rapport with those being interviewed and demonstrate active, respectful listening.
- e) Provide opportunity for each of the complainant and respondent to provide names of any relevant witnesses that could be interviewed and to also provide any relevant documents that are related to the investigation.
- f) When interviewing the complainant have them clearly articulate their issues/ allegations and have them sign off they are accurate and complete.

- g)** Ask appropriate and non-leading questions to those being interviewed, with the goal of helping to determine “who, what, where, when, why, how” in their own words.
- h)** Take detailed notes during all interviews and safeguard the notes through the course of the investigation, including the dates, times of each interview, speaker, as well as who attended.
- i)** Always maintain an objective, respectful, neutral tone and behaviour when interviewing any party.
- j)** Conduct interviews in a private location, where others outside of the interview will not be able to hear or see what is happening. If the interview is being conducted virtually, instructions and guidance should be clear on how to participate, what happens if the connection is lost, the importance of being in a private location not around others, etc.
- k)** Both in advance and during the interview, explain to the interviewees the process being taken in the investigation, their rights within the process, the mandate and process that will be followed, and the timelines. The details of the allegations should, generally speaking, be shared with the complainant and respondent only. It should be made clear to the interviewee whether or not the interview is being recorded. Not every witness needs all the details of the allegations. Information should be shared with non-party witnesses on a need-to-know basis only, and only to the extent necessary, in order to give enough context for a person to share useful and relevant information.
- l)** Refrain from using aggressive language or confrontational tone and treating the interview as if it is an interrogation. Everyone in an investigation spoken with is there voluntarily and as such, must be treated with respect and courtesy.
- m)** Enable the interviewees to fully detail what they want to say, with the opportunity to ask questions, or contact you at a later date should something else come to mind.
- n)** During and following interviews, consider the credibility of what is being said – including any potential motives for false statements, how the information shared compares to other evidence, the demeanor and behaviour of those being interviewed, and the language used in presenting their information during the interview.

- o)** Refrain from asking or evaluating irrelevant information that should not be considered for the investigation (ex. Asking about irrelevant personal health information).
- p)** Take complete notes of all interviewee's statements and have them review the information they provided to ensure it has been accurately documented and there is no misrepresentation of anything they said in the interview. Have the interviewee sign off on the notes taken. If unclear later, when reviewing the information for report purposes, follow up with the interviewee(s) to confirm the information provided.
- q)** Refrain from acting or inferring that you agree with what a person is saying in an interview and are "on their side".

6) Gathering All Relevant Information, Documentation, and Record Keeping

When planning for and/or conducting a workplace investigation, HRPA member and students are expected to:

- a)** Consider and identify all potential sources of information or evidence, including through interviews, documents, witness statements, surveillance, phone records, time sheets, letters, emails, text messages, photos, etc. Take steps to ensure evidence that may be lost, modified or deleted (ex., emails, voicemails, video surveillance) is preserved and maintained in the investigation records.
- b)** Seek to validate the credibility of any documents or evidence (ex. emails can be doctored. By working with the internal I.T. department, it may be possible to find the original source of the emails to confirm accuracy).
- c)** Keep track of when, how, and where any documentation or evidence was received and its importance to the investigation.
- d)** Keep records of the investigation and all complaints or incidents for at least five years from the end of the investigation, including the details about the complaint or incident, the investigation report, notes, witness statements, results of the

investigation, copies of the letter delivered to the parties reporting on the outcome of the investigation, and anything else documented and/or provided to any of the parties associated with the investigation. Note that if the investigation involved a minor or an individual with developmental disabilities, the records should be retained longer than five years. Records should be maintained in a confidential and secure manner.

- e) Write an investigation report that summarizes:
- The parties involved in the complaint/incident
 - Background to the investigation (details of the complaint/incident, date(s) of incident, and dates of when the complaint or incident came to be known to the employer)
 - Investigation steps taken (essentially what was done as the investigator):
 - Interviews conducted with dates
 - Documents collected
 - Policies considered
 - Anything wanted but could not get and why it wasn't possible to get
 - Allegations
 - Allegations investigated are outlined one by one with the evidence considered for each, followed by the analysis and conclusion for each
 - Conclusions – Conclusions as to whether the particular allegation was substantiated or unsubstantiated are provided following each allegation and an overall conclusion is provided if the case was complex and had many allegations. Conclusions must be based on the evidence received and reviewed in the investigation only. There can be no opinion but only comparisons of evidence from which a conclusion (including any conclusion as to an individual's credibility) is made that is based on a balance of probabilities. Balance of probabilities means more evidence supported one view than another or put another way, something (incident / complaint / allegation) was more likely than not to have occurred. Conclusions are best stated as follows: "based on a balance of probabilities the allegation is substantiated / unsubstantiated"

7) Communicating Outcomes of Investigation and Addressing Retaliation

With respect to communicating outcomes of an investigation and addressing retaliation, HRPA members, firms and students are expected to proceed as follows where instructed to do so as part of the investigation process:

- a) Promptly report on the outcome and conclusions of the investigation and any actions being taken to both the complainant and respondent in writing once the investigation has concluded.
- b) After the investigation concludes, remind all parties involved in the investigation that confidentiality of the investigation is to be maintained, retaliation/reprisal must not occur, and what the consequences are should it occur.
- c) As applicable, consider what actions and/or planning may need to take place following the investigation, whether this be restorative justice and/or working together again with the respondent(s) and/or complainant(s).

Scenarios

Below please find some examples on how content from this standard may apply to HR practice. **Please note that these scenarios are not exhaustive or determinative and are meant for illustrative purposes only.**

Scenario 1

Background	M. is accused by X. of harassment at work, prompting a workplace investigation. S., an internal HR representative who is conducting the investigation begins planning for the investigation and is now ready for the interview phase. When interviewing M., S. notices they are acting agitated, confrontational, rude and condescending throughout. Internally, S. is already starting to think that M. is guilty of harassment given their
-------------------	--

	demeanor and behaviour in the interview. When interviewing X., S. nods as X. talks – giving off the impression that S. is on X.’s side.
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S., the investigator, is letting their internal biases and impressions of M.’s demeanor in the interview pre-determine M.’s guilt without fully looking into all evidence and following a thorough investigation process before coming to any conclusions. • It is being inferred that because the accused is rude, the allegations must be true. • S. nodding as X. talks inappropriately indicates that the investigator already agrees with X. and has taken a side.
Analysis	<p>We all carry internal biases and can give too much weight to what our impressions of people are. However, biases and first impressions of people should not determine the outcomes of an investigation. The investigator in this case is not staying objective and is instead pre-determining a person’s guilt based on how they are acting instead of fully investigating. Additionally, the investigator should not be “taking sides” during interviews by nodding in agreement with an interviewee.</p>
Bottom Line	<p>Stay objective when interviewing people. Be aware of biases that you may be holding and address them so they do not interfere with your investigation steps. Remember that your own impressions of a person do not indicate their innocence or guilt.</p>

Scenario 2

Background	<p>L. is under a workplace investigation for allegations of racial discrimination against another colleague. In interviewing L. about the allegations, the workplace investigator tells L. that what they are saying isn’t credible and they have proof, and to just admit guilt or there will be severe consequences. The workplace investigator uses an aggressive, matter-of-fact tone.</p>
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggressive interviewing tactics are not an effective or fair way to conduct a workplace investigation. Respondents should be given a full and fair chance to explain their side, without aggression or scare tactics from the workplace investigator.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Those who are being interviewed should always be informed ahead of the interview on what the allegations are with ample notice.
Analysis	Aggressive and scare-tactic interviewing can lead to false confessions, coerced confessions, and lack of trust between the investigator and the interviewee – causing a person to feel uncomfortable to say anything or discuss and answer questions fully. Such conduct negatively impacts both the integrity and procedural fairness of the investigation process. In addition, it opens the employer up to liability for damages.
Bottom Line	As an investigator, do not use scare-tactics or be aggressive. Building rapport during an interview is important and interviewees should be treated with respect and given a full, fair opportunity to speak.

Scenario 3

Background	<p>B., the respondent to a workplace complaint has just finished their interview with the workplace investigator. B. wants to debrief with their colleague and friend after an emotional interview with the investigator. B. meets with their colleague in a private meeting room at the office to summarize what happened in the interview and give their own take on the situation. Similarly, C., the complainant, has been keeping their colleague well abreast of the allegations and investigation process.</p> <p>R., an HR manager, is informed by another staff member that they overheard C. telling a colleague details of the workplace investigation and allegations. After learning of this confidentiality breach, R. decides it is not worth the hassle of looking into and ignores it.</p>
Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions with other colleagues about the investigation and allegations is a breach of confidentiality, even if the intent is just to have a friend to talk to about it, and as such both B. and C. have breached the confidentiality of the investigation process. R. ignored the fact that such breaches occurred and did not properly report/escalate the breach of confidentiality which could lead to further breaches and a faulty, biased workplace investigation.

Analysis	Breaching confidentiality during a workplace investigation can jeopardize the integrity and outcomes of the investigation. Breaches of confidentiality, whether before, during or after the investigation should be appropriately responded to and dealt with.
Bottom Line	Those involved in workplace investigations should be well-informed, both in writing and verbally of their duties to uphold confidentiality, which includes not discussing any of the matters with colleagues both during the investigation and afterwards. Consequences of not upholding confidentiality should also be clear. If it becomes evident that a breach has occurred, it should be properly reported and investigated.

Evaluation Measures

For any professional guidance issued by HRP, it is important to continuously assess the degree to which the guidance is having an impact to actual professional practice among HRP members and students. From time-to-time, HRP will assess the degree of this for this particular standard using the following evaluation measures:

- Reviewing HRP complaints data and discipline hearings to determine whether there has been a decrease or increase in the number of complaints or discipline hearings related to this topic,
- Anonymous surveying of HRP member and students to determine whether and how this professional guidance has had an impact on how you practice HR, and
- Anonymous polls and/or surveys of members of the public to assess whether there are any notable changes in this specific area that they are noticing among registered HR professionals.

This is not an exhaustive list of evaluation measures that may be used, and the evaluation measures may be updated at any time. When evaluations are complete, the HRP will transparently share the results.

References (And Additional Resources)

- Ablin Law. "Implicit Bias in Investigations." *Ablin Law*, 18 Aug. 2020, ablinlaw.com/articles/2020/08/18/implicit-bias-in-investigations/.
- Achkar Law. "What to Expect in the Workplace Investigation Process in Ontario: Achkar Law." *Achkar Law - Employment and Litigation Lawyers*, 15 Feb. 2021, achkarlaw.com/what-to-expect-in-the-workplace-investigation-process/.
- Acton, Bob, et al. "BEST PRACTICE INTERVIEWING METHODS IN WORKPLACE INVESTIGATIONS." *Falcongate*, 15 Oct. 2019, falcongate.ca/2019/10/15/best-practice-interviewing-methods-in-workplace-investigations/.
- Ballard, Allison, and Patricia Easteal. "Procedural Fairness in Workplace Investigations: Potential Flaws and Proposals for Change." *Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2018, pp. 177–183, doi:10.1177/1037969x18772134.
- Bolton, Lisa, and Gerald Griffiths. "How to Conduct an Effective (and Defensible) Workplace Investigation." *Canadian HR Reporter*, Sherrard Kuzz LLP, 1 Mar. 2018, www.hrreporter.com/employment-law/news/how-to-conduct-an-effective-and-defensible-workplace-investigation/299279.
- Branigan, Kirsten, et al. "CONDUCTING EFFECTIVE INDEPENDENT WORKPLACE INVESTIGATIONS IN A POST- #METOO ERA." *Dispute Resolution Journal*, vol. 74, no. 1, 2019, pp. 85–110.
- Chisholm, Raquel, and Colleen Dunlop. "Top 10 Mistakes in Conducting Workplace Investigations." *Emond Harnden Labour & Employment Law*, 2015, www.ehlaw.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Top-10-Mistakes-Workplace-Investigations-Slides.pdf.
- Curtis, John. *Procedural Fairness in Workplace Investigations*, 25 Feb. 2020, www.johncurtis.ca/conflict-coach/procedural-fairness-in-the-investigation-process/.
- Dunlop, Joan. "The Challenges of Maintaining Employee Privacy During a Workplace Investigation." *Cenera*, 5 May 2021, cenera.ca/the-challenges-of-maintaining-employee-privacy-during-a-workplace-investigation/.
- Ellis, Leslie, and Lisa Buehler. "Documenting and Preserving Workplace Investigations: What to Keep and How Long to Keep It." *Association of Workplace Investigators Journal*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2014.

HRPA Practice Standard: Conducting Workplace Investigations

Fineblit, Josh, et al. "Guidelines for Employers Issued by Ontario Government as New Workplace Harassment Rules

Take Effect." *Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt*, 2016, www.osler.com/en/resources/regulations/2016/guidelines-for-employers-issued-by-ontario-governm.

Forbes-Chilibeck, Ella. "Workplace Investigations – Best Practices." *Employment Law Ottawa*, Employment Law

Ottawa, 25 Mar. 2017, www.employmentlawottawa.ca/blog/2017/3/25/workplace-investigations-best-practices.

Gerard, Joe. "Investigator Selection – How to Choose Investigators for HR Investigations." *i-Sight*, 2010, [http://i-](http://i-sight.com/resources/investigator-selection-workplace/)

[sight.com/resources/investigator-selection-workplace/](http://i-sight.com/resources/investigator-selection-workplace/).

Goodfellow, Lisa. "Workplace Investigations: Getting It Right in the #MeToo Era." *Miller Thomson*, 16 May 2018,

hrpa.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2020/10/Workplace-Investigations.pdf.

Government of Ontario, Ministry of Labour. "Workplace Harassment: Investigation by the Employer." *Ministry of Labour*,

Government of Ontario, Ministry of Labour, www.labour.gov.on.ca/english/hs/pubs/fs_vvh_employer.php.

Government of Ontario. "Code of Practice to Address Workplace Harassment." *Ontario.ca*, 2021,

www.ontario.ca/page/code-practice-address-workplace-harassment.

Hudson, Deborah. "Evidence Collection: Practical Tips for Workplace Investigations: Queen's University IRC." *Queen's*

University IRC | Building – Better – Leaders, Feb. 2020, irc.queensu.ca/evidence-collection-practical-tips-for-workplace-investigations/.

i-Sight. "Investigation Interviews: A Best Practices Guide." *i-Sight*, 2014, [i-sight.com/wp-](http://i-sight.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Investigation-Interviews-A-Best-Practices-eBook.pdf?x15763)

[content/uploads/2014/11/Investigation-Interviews-A-Best-Practices-eBook.pdf?x15763](http://i-sight.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Investigation-Interviews-A-Best-Practices-eBook.pdf?x15763).

Jeffrey, Monica R. "Overview of Workplace Investigation Law in Canadian Jurisprudence." *Association of Workplace*

Investigators, www.awi.org/page/canada_jurisprudence.

Latall, Ashley. "The Hidden World of Unconscious Bias and Its Impact on the Neutral Workplace Investigator." *Journal*

of Law and Policy, vol. 24, no. 2, 2016, pp. 411–467.

Mahil, Ritu, and Katy E. Allen. "A Review of the Standards of Procedural Fairness in Workplace Investigations." *Lawson*

Lundell LLP, 12 Mar. 2018, www.lawsonlundell.com/labour-and-employment-law-blog/a-review-of-the-standards-of-procedural-fairness-in-workplace-investigations.

HRPA Practice Standard: Conducting Workplace Investigations

- Matukas, Peter. "Who Should Your Workplace Investigator Be?" *HR Professional Now – HR Professional Now*, 2019, hrprofessionalnow.ca/legal-words/710-who-should-your-workplace-investigator-be.
- McGrath North. "Warning About Confidentiality During Workplace Investigations." *McGrath North*, 1 Mar. 2013, www.mcgrathnorth.com/publications/warning-about-confidentiality-during-workplace-investigations/.
- Muller, Deb. "Collecting and Storing Workplace Investigation Documents." *Human Resources Management Software Solution*, 2016, www.hracity.com/blog/collect-store-workplace-investigation-documents.
- Murphy, Kenda. "Workplace Investigations: Interviews, Note Taking and Other Best Practices." *Rubin Thomlinson*, 23 Sept. 2015, rubinthomlinson.com/workplace-investigations-best-practices/.
- O'Kelly, Orlagh. "Workplace Investigations: Fairness Is Key." *Field Law*, Aug. 2020, www.fieldlaw.com/News-Views-Events/173402/Workplace-Investigations-Fairness-is-Key#utm_source=Mondaq&utm_medium=syndication&utm_campaign=LinkedIn-integration.
- Phillip, Amelia. "Workplace Investigations 101: Five Key Steps to Take in a Workplace Investigation." *MacDonald & Associates*, 6 Aug. 2019, macdonaldassociates.ca/2019/08/06/workplace-investigations-101-five-key-steps-to-take-in-a-workplace-investigation/.
- Rubin Thomlinson. "When Can I Tell My Story?" *Rubin Thomlinson*, 27 Jan. 2020, rubinthomlinson.com/when-can-i-tell-my-story/.
- White, Jennifer. "Who Do You Choose? Workplace Investigator Selection in the Ontario and Federal Jurisdictions." *Rubin Thomlinson*, 25 Aug. 2016, rubinthomlinson.com/choose-workplace-investigator-selection-ontario-federal-jurisdictions/.
- Williams HR Law. "Workplace Investigations: Part 1 – What They Are, and Why They Matter." *Williams HR Law LLP*, 2018, www.williamshrlaw.com/workplace-investigations-part-1-what-they-are-and-why-they-matter/.
- Williams HR Law. "To Disclose or not to Disclose: Privilege in Workplace Investigations." *Williams HR Law LLP*, <https://www.williamshrlaw.com/to-disclose-or-not-to-disclose-privilege-in-workplace-investigations/>.
- Wolf, Pamela. "Workplace Investigations: How to Get It Right." *Labour Law Journal*, 2019, pp. 250–261.
- Woska, William J. "Legal Issues for HR Professionals: Workplace Investigations." *Public Personnel Management*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2013, pp. 90–101., doi:10.1177/0091026013484568.