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1. **Introduction**

A complaint was received on dated 20th September 2023 from Hina working as UCOO in KPK-Peshawar-City-Khalsa-2 whereby it was alleged that UCPO Ishaque is engaged in favoritism and workplace harassment and unequal treatment. It was alleged that UCPO Ishaque gives preferential treatment to UCOO Riffat, resulting in unfair workloads and tasks. UCOO Hina faces work-related threats from the UCPO, constituting harassment and negatively affecting their morale and well-being. Additionally, the complaint raised concerns about the existence of strong group dynamics within the UC. (The complaint is attached as Annex-1)

Another complaint was received against UCOO Hina by UCPO Ishaq dated 20th September 2023 for non-compliance, poor performance and behavioral issues of UCOO Hina (The complaint is attached as Annex-2)

1. **Methodology**.

The case was investigated by a field visit to the UC and by holding an SOPs session. The investigation team conducted one-on-one sessions with a few CHWs and also interrogated both UCOOs and UCPOs and took their stance. The stance of the complainant UCOO was also taken and recorded in this report.

1. **Investigation.**

The investigative team conducted a visit to the UC at the BHU, where they met with Community Health Workers (CHWs) and Area Supervisors (AS). During a face-to-face meeting, staff members provided their perspectives. All six subordinates of UCOO Hina were interviewed. Four of them mentioned that UCOO Hina exhibits behavioral problems, as she does not carry out her supervisory role effectively and publicly criticizes them for their gaps. AS Naveeda, who used to supervise Hina when she worked as a CHW, stated that since Hina's promotion to UCOO, she consistently humiliates her in front of their colleagues while being lenient with other AS when they make mistakes. She also quoted different instances where she was humiliated by UCOO Hina. UCOO Riffat stated that UCOO Hina is being provided with all the support but she is showing no improvement. (Attached as Annex-3)

UCOO Hina's stance was also taken regarding the complaint. She stated that UCPO Ishaq extends favoritism to UCOO Riffat. She cited an incident where both UCOOs requested a change of area simultaneously where Riffat was given her preferred areas while Hina's request was declined. Hina also quoted an incident during a UPEC meeting in October 2023, where she requested some time to get data from the cupboard but she was reported for unavailability of data, while UCOO Riffat faced no repercussions for a similar action. Additionally, Hina raised concerns about poorly announced meetings and differences in training arrangements between her and Riffat. She highlighted her active involvement in outreach planning and communication with staff. Hina explained that she supports all AS including Naveeda, emphasizing her dedication towards her work responsibilities.

UCPO Ishaq denied all allegations and stated that
UCOO Hina is disrupting the UC and its program activities by being unresponsive. He mentioned that during a September campaign, he discussed Hina's workload concerns with the TDOSO, resulting in the division of UC blocks among UCOOs. In an October UPEC meeting, Mr. Ishaq claimed that Hina was unprepared and unaware of block data of previous campaigns (coverages, NA, and refusal data) and even did not know about her block zero dose data coverages

while UCOO Riffat was well-prepared. During CHW training in October, Hina was assigned to prioritize dispatching field staff over early training attendance due to humanitarian considerations as UCOO Riffat had a longer commute, while Hina resided in the same street as the BHU. Additionally, Mr. Ishaq reported UC staff issues with Hina to the TDOSO and requested feedback from the UC community regarding her performance.

1. **Findings:**

The investigation team has reached to the following conclusions;

a. The inquiry committee found Ms. Hina's mental harassment allegations to be unsubstantiated, as she was unable to provide concrete instances or evidence to support her claims. Therefore, these allegations are considered unverified and not proven.

b. In contrast, it was identified that Ms. Hina has behavioral issues that contribute to the mental harassment of the staff working under her, and these issues also led to the formulation of false allegations.

1. The complainant lodged the complaint was based on perceived shortcomings in programmatic issues, as confirmed by the UCPO and staff working under Ms. Hina.

**Additional Findings**

* 1. The allegations of Hina are not true and she has not been able to provide sufficient evidence to support her allegations. It appears that she has filed a misleading complaint out of a grudge against Riffat and Ishaq. The statements of Hina were not consistent and she was unable to provide satisfactory responses to the questions put on her.
	2. Additional statements by the concerned TDOSO have shed light on the inadequate supervision by Ms. Hina, as these issues had been previously reported to the TDOSO by the UCPO
	3. The investigation team has also identified poor communication skills on the part of Hina. She also has some behavioral issues and she is not managing her teams in an ethical manner. The majority of the subordinate staff working under her supervision is not satisfied with her behavior. UCPO Ishaq has been proven non-guilty as the allegations against him are not proved
1. **Recommendations**

As the allegations of favoritism and workplace harassment and unequal treatment against UCPO Ishaq are not proved and baseless therefore, disciplinary action against Ms. Hina is recommended for her weak supervisory skills, performance gap therefore, it is recommended to issue warning to UCOO Hina.

**Relevant Clause as per SOPs:**

**Capacity Issues - Amber line Areas**

* + **Unprofessional or Casual Behavior towards peers/colleagues.**
	+ **Poor supportive**
	+ **First Time: Verbal warning and counseling session by supervisor**
	+ **Second Time: Explanation followed by written warning letter, where no improvement after verbal warning**