



Proof Under Pressure Review

Stress-test one policy against reality: what's written, what actually happens, and whether the proof would survive a claim.

WHAT THIS HELPS YOU DO

Use this review to stress-test any single policy — attendance, overtime approval, discipline, anything — against the real workflow and the documentation it actually produces, before a claim, auditor, or attorney runs the same test with stakes.

WHEN TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

- Before relying on any policy in a termination or claim response
- After a near-miss where the file turned out thinner than expected
- When a policy is 'always followed' but nobody can produce examples
- Annually, for the three policies most likely to end up in a dispute
- When supervisors each run their own version of the same rule

WHAT THIS DOCUMENT HELPS PREVENT

- Policies that exist on paper and nowhere else — discovered under oath
- Exception patterns that quietly rewrite the rule without anyone deciding
- Supervisor improvisation creating five enforcement standards for one policy
- Documentation that records conclusions instead of proof
- Confidential claim responses built on files that can't back them

Faulkner HR Solutions focuses on the system behind the people problem. This tool is designed to help employers slow down the decision, identify the risk, and create proof before the issue becomes a claim, complaint, turnover event, or credibility problem.

BEFORE YOU START: READINESS CHECKLIST

Gather the following before working through this document. Incomplete inputs are one of the most common reasons employer decisions fail under later scrutiny.

Have it	Input	Notes / location
<input type="checkbox"/>	Employee name and role	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Date of incident, request, or separation	



Have it	Input	Notes / location
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supervisor involved	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy or handbook section that applies	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Prior documentation on file	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pay records, if applicable	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant emails, texts, notes, or complaints	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Decision-maker name	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Deadline, if applicable	



PROOF UNDER PRESSURE REVIEW

Pick ONE policy per review. The method: write down what the policy requires, observe what actually happens, hunt the exceptions, and then try to prove your own compliance like an opposing attorney would.

Step 1 — The Policy on Paper

Policy under review (name and handbook section)	
What it requires, in one plain sentence	
Who is supposed to apply it (supervisors, HR, payroll)	
What documentation it's supposed to generate	
Last updated / last trained	

Step 2 — The Real Workflow

Describe what actually happens, step by step, when this policy is triggered. Interview two supervisors separately and compare.

Step per policy	What actually happens	Match? (Y/N)	Why the drift

Step 3 — Exception Hunt

Found	Exception pattern	Examples
<input type="checkbox"/>	Star performers get a different version of the rule	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Busy season suspends the policy informally	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Certain supervisors enforce it; others never have	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Exceptions are granted verbally and recorded nowhere	
<input type="checkbox"/>	The policy's last three triggers were each handled differently	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Everyone can name someone the policy 'doesn't really apply to'	



Step 4 — Supervisor Behavior Check

Supervisor	How they apply the policy	Documentation they actually produce	Variance risk

Step 5 — The Proof Test

Answer as if opposing counsel asked. 'We always do that' is not an answer; a document with a date is.

Provable	Proof question	Where the proof lives
<input type="checkbox"/>	Can you produce the last five times this policy was applied, with documents?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Do the documents show consistent treatment across those five?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Can you prove employees knew the policy (acknowledgments, training records)?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Can you prove supervisors were trained on it?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the exceptions you found look explainable — or discriminatory — plotted against demographics?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	If the policy's last application ended in termination, does the file stand alone without oral history?	

Step 6 — Stress-Test Verdict

Verdict	Meaning	Mark
HOLDS	Practice matches policy; proof is producible; exceptions are documented and defensible	
HOLDS WITH REPAIR	Core practice is sound; documentation or consistency gaps need dated fixes	
FAILS QUIETLY	Policy and practice have diverged; the file would not survive scrutiny — fix before relying on it in any adverse action	

Step 7 — Repair Actions

Repair (rewrite policy to match good practice / retrain to match good policy / build the missing record)	Owner	Date	Re-test date



Repair (rewrite policy to match good practice / retrain to match good policy / build the missing record)	Owner	Date	Re-test date

Role	Name / signature	Date
Reviewed by		
Repairs approved by		

STOP AND REVIEW BEFORE ACTING

If any statement below is true, pause. Get the decision reviewed by HR, counsel, or Faulkner HR Solutions before you act.

- A termination is planned this month under a policy that would currently fail the proof test.
- The exception list maps uncomfortably onto protected classes.
- Two supervisors described two different policies when interviewed separately.
- The policy's documentation requirement has produced zero documents in a year.
- Leadership is more confident about compliance than the evidence supports.
- The same policy failed this review before and the repairs were never dated or done.

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION STANDARD

Before this file is closed, the employer should be able to answer every question below and point to where the proof lives.

Question	Your answer / where the proof is stored
What happened?	
When did it happen?	
Who observed or reported it?	
What policy, standard, deadline, or expectation applies?	
What decision was made?	
Who had authority to make the decision?	



Question	Your answer / where the proof is stored
What alternatives were considered?	
What risk was reviewed?	
What follow-up is required?	
Where is the proof stored?	

COMMON MISTAKES

1. Reviewing the policy binder instead of the behavior — binders always pass.
2. Asking supervisors whether they follow the policy instead of asking them to walk through the last real case.
3. Fixing failures by re-announcing the policy louder, with no change to workflow or records.
4. Testing ten policies shallowly instead of one honestly.
5. Treating a 'fails quietly' verdict as embarrassing instead of as the cheapest possible time to have learned it.
6. Rewriting good practice to match a bad policy out of loyalty to the binder.

WHAT TO DO NEXT

Execute the repair table with dates, then re-test the same policy in 90 days — the re-test is what separates repair from re-announcement. Rotate the review across your three highest-stakes policies annually, and never rely on an untested policy in a termination.

Before you terminate, deduct, discipline, classify, or respond, get the decision reviewed.

Call 210.446.8730 or email thomas@faulknerhrsolutions.info.



If the same people problem keeps repeating, the issue is probably upstream. Faulkner HR Solutions helps employers find the system failure before they blame the wrong thing.

Need help applying this to a real workplace decision?

Faulkner HR Solutions helps Texas employers, nonprofits, municipalities, and growing businesses fix the people systems behind recurring workplace problems.

If this document raised a risk flag, do not guess your way through the next step.

Call: 210.446.8730

Email: thomas@faulknerhrsolutions.info

Website: faulknerhrsolutions.info

DISCLAIMER

This resource is provided for general employer education and planning purposes. It is not legal advice and does not create an attorney-client relationship. Employment laws, agency guidance, and local requirements may change. Employers should review the facts of each situation before acting and consult appropriate HR or legal counsel when needed.