JRS Reviewer Reference

Text-reading alternative, not an approved replacement publication. This copy preserves text extracted from the separately published PDF. Automated transcription can lose visual content, table relationships, and original reading order. It has not passed independent assistive-technology or PDF/UA review. The published PDF remains the edition of record.

Original page 1

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

JRS TM

BASIS JUSTIFICATION

CHRONOLOGY REVIEW STANDARD

REASONING Documentation Review Reference

SUFFICIENCY Operational Reference for HR, Compliance, and Investigations

Version 1.0 · Effective May 2026

© 2026 Phillip Wikes

HR COMPLIANCE INVESTIGATIONS

Version 1.0 · Effective May 2026 · © 2026 Phillip Wikes

Original page 2

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

REVIEWER QUICK REFERENCE Apply before any record enters an official system of record.

BEFORE FINALIZATION, ASK: Each question is pass/fail at the record level.

1 Can this record stand on its own?
Would a stranger understand the conclusion without calling the author?

2 What specific evidence anchors this conclusion?
A date, log entry, documented interaction, or referenced record.

3 Is the path from evidence to conclusion visible in the record?
Not in the author's memory. In the document.

4 Are dates, interactions, and policies identifiable?
Each conclusion requires a traceable anchor.

5 Would a later reviewer follow the same reasoning?
Without access to context that exists only in the author's knowledge.

THE ADJECTIVE ALERT SUBMISSION READINESS KEY

Any evaluative adjective appearing without a anchor. Conclusion unsupported. Adjective without

corresponding behavioral anchor fails the Basis Identification condition automatically. Each adjective requires a fact: what occurred, when, and where.

- Evaluative adjectives without a behavioral anchor
- AI-generated sentiment without source verification
- Missing timeline anchors for any repeated pattern
- No policy reference in a policy-based conclusion
- Termination without referenced supporting records

If the conclusion loses meaning when adjectives are removed, it lacks factual anchoring.

STOP	Do not submit. Return to drafter.
Conclusion likely accurate but relies on context	
REVIEW	not in the record. Clarification required.
Self-contained. Anchored to specific evidence.	
READY	Reviewable from the record alone.

THE TIME TRAVELER TEST

"Could a later reviewer reconstruct the basis for this decision without contacting the original author?"

FIVE REVIEW CONDITIONS				
I	II	III	IV	V
Reconstructability	Basis Identification	Chronology	Decision-Process	Evidentiary
A stranger reconstructs the basis two years from now without calling the author.	Each conclusion has a specific, verifiable evidence anchor: date, log, interaction, or reference.	The sequence of events can be followed. Dates and intervals are present.	The path from evidence to conclusion is visible in the record. No unstated assumptions.	Traceability Sufficiency The evidence is sufficient. Source and human-reviewed.

TIME TRAVELER TEST FACT ANCHOR TIMELINE TEST REASONING TRAIL SUFFICIENCY CHECK

RAPID REVIEW	MINIMUM STANDARD
RAPID REVIEW	Prioritize in order. MINIMUM STANDARD Four checks before entry.
1 Unsupported evaluative language without a behavioral date or event	Identify unsupported evaluative language in the record
	Confirm timeline anchors are present for any stated pattern

2	Missing timeline anchors for any documented pattern of conduct	Verify referenced policies or source records are identifiable
3	Escalation conclusions without referenced prior warnings	Ensure each conclusion remains reviewable from the record alone
4	AI-assisted summaries lacking source records or human attestation	Elevated-risk records (termination, accommodation, formal discipline, investigation) require secondary
5	Termination documentation without referenced conduct or performance records	HR, compliance, or legal review before finalization.

Any indicator present: secondary review required before system entry. AI-assisted content requires human attestation before record entry.

Original page 3

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

| OVERVIEW Intended for use at the drafting stage, before records enter official systems of record. This reference provides reviewer questions, failure-mode examples, and practical guidance for documentation entering official organizational records. The core question throughout is this: could a later reviewer reconstruct the basis for this conclusion from the file, without calling the author or relying on context that was never written down? No dedicated software is required. These tools operate within existing HR, compliance, investigation, and audit workflows. The reference is designed to be applied at the drafting stage, before records are finalized or submitted into official systems.

| COMMON USE CASES
This reference assists with review of:

- Performance records and employee evaluations
- Disciplinary documentation and formal counseling records
- Termination and separation documentation
- Investigation summaries and witness accounts
- Accommodation records and interactive process documentation
- AI-assisted draft review before record finalization
- HR escalation records and compliance documentation
- Audit sampling across organizational record types

| THREE REVIEW CHECKS Before finalizing any documentation, apply three tests. These apply regardless of record type or who drafted the document. They address documentation quality, not whether the decision itself was correct. The Time Traveler Test: Can this record stand on its own? If someone unfamiliar with these events reviewed it two years from now, could they reconstruct why this decision was made? Records that require knowing the people involved, recalling prior conversations, or understanding context that was never written down do not satisfy this check. If the reviewer has to guess, the record is incomplete. The Fact Anchor: What specific evidence supports this conclusion? Is

there a date, a log entry, a documented interaction, or a referenced record that grounds it? A conclusion with no verifiable anchor cannot be evaluated from what is documented. If the support is not in the document, it is not available for later review. Reasoning Trail: Is the path from evidence to conclusion visible within the record itself? Reviewers applying this check often find that conclusions which seemed well-supported at the time of drafting cannot actually be traced through the document. The reasoning was in the author's head, not on the page.

| REVIEW CONDITIONS Each conclusion in a record is evaluated against five conditions. These apply to performance records, disciplinary documentation, investigation summaries, and any other documentation entering official systems. In practice, records are sometimes drafted under time pressure or after events have occurred. These conditions apply regardless. The five conditions are not independent tests. They are the components of a single objective, reviewability: whether an independent reviewer, with no access to the author and no outside context, can evaluate whether the conclusions in the record are supported.

Reconstructability The Time Traveler Test: A later reviewer with no prior knowledge of these events must be able to understand the basis for the conclusion from what the file contains. No additional context, supplementary explanation, or contact with the original author should be necessary. Records that meet this condition tend to hold up over time. Records that depend on who is still around to explain them do not.

Original page 4

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

Basis Identification The Fact Anchor: Each conclusion needs a specific, verifiable anchor: a date, a documented interaction, a log entry, or a referenced record. Without one, the conclusion cannot be independently verified. General impressions are not evidence. Supporting material may include email timestamps, access logs, witness notes, meeting records, policy references, HRIS records, and performance data. If the anchor cannot be identified, there is nothing to evaluate. Chronology The Timeline Test: The sequence of events should be followable from the record. Enough dates and intervals should be present that one event can be seen to follow another, including prior interventions, escalation steps, and the period under review. Missing dates are the most common single gap in records that fail later review. Decision-Process Traceability Reasoning Trail: The reasoning behind the conclusion should be visible in the record itself. How the decision was reached should be traceable from what is documented, not from what the author recalls. If the reviewer has to fill in the reasoning themselves, the record has a gap. Evidentiary Sufficiency The Sufficiency Check: The evidence in the record should be sufficient to support the conclusion. Where automated drafting has contributed to a record, the source material behind each conclusion should be identifiable, and a human should review and confirm the wording before finalization. Wording that introduces characterizations not present in the source notes is a gap in the record, regardless of how it was generated. Adjective Alert. Evaluative adjectives such as difficult, hostile, unprofessional, poor, aggressive, and uncooperative that appear without a corresponding behavioral anchor do not satisfy the Basis Identification condition. Each adjective requires a fact: what occurred, when, and where. Dates before adjectives. This is one of the most common gaps found in review.

| SUBMISSION READINESS CHECK Before submitting documentation into an official system of record, apply this three-level readiness check. The check concerns whether the record is ready to submit, not whether the decision that was made was correct. STOP. Evaluative adjectives appear

without a Fact Anchor. Timeline or policy basis is absent. The conclusion lacks independent support. Do not submit. Return to drafter for behavioral anchoring before the record enters the system. REVIEW REQUIRED. Conclusion is likely accurate but the supporting basis is not in the record. It may rely on unwritten context or assumptions the reviewer knows but has not documented. Clarification or additional anchoring is needed. A later reviewer cannot verify what is not written down. READY. Record is self-contained. The supporting evidence is identifiable, the reasoning is visible in the file, and the basis holds up without explanation from the author.

DO NOT ASSUME A record that reads smoothly is not necessarily a record that is supported. Reviewers often assume the context will be obvious later. It usually is not.

| RAPID REVIEW APPLICATION When there is not time for a complete review, prioritize these indicators in order. Any one of them is reason enough to require secondary review before system entry. - Unsupported evaluative language without a behavioral date or event - Missing timeline anchors for any documented pattern of conduct - Escalation or disciplinary conclusions without referenced prior warnings or counseling records - AI-assisted summaries lacking identified source records or human attestation - Termination documentation without referenced conduct or performance records Any record showing one or more of these indicators requires secondary review before it enters the official system. If the reviewer has to guess at what the record means, it is not ready.

Original page 5

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

| MINIMUM REVIEW STANDARD When a full review is not possible under time or staffing constraints, reviewers should at minimum complete these four checks before record submission: - Identify unsupported evaluative language anywhere in the record - Confirm timeline anchors are present for any stated pattern of conduct - Verify that referenced policies or source records are identifiable within the document - Ensure the basis for each major conclusion is clear from the file These four checks are the minimum before any record enters an official system. Not every record will receive a complete review in practice. These checks are intended to catch the gaps most likely to matter later. Sometimes the issue is simply that nobody wrote the date down.

| COMMON DOCUMENTATION FAILURE MODES The patterns below represent documentation failures that appear repeatedly in HR, compliance, investigation, and audit review. Most of them share a common characteristic: the record looks complete at the time of drafting, but a later reviewer with no prior knowledge of the events cannot evaluate what it says. The left column shows language as it commonly appears in organizational records. The middle column shows what a reviewer would need to evaluate it. The right column shows a revision with enough documented support to hold up later. These issues are often only identified during escalation or later review, when the original drafter may no longer be available. 01 | UNSUPPORTED GENERALIZATION

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee has attendance issues.	- What specific absences occurred, and on what dates? - What was the documented impact on operations or the team? - What attendance standard applies, and is it on file?	Employee was absent without prior notice on January 5, 12, and February 3,

contrary to
Reconstruction risk: No date, conduct, or policy basis traceable from the Attendance Policy
the record. acknowledged
January 2. Counseling
note on file February 4.

02 | MISSING OBSERVABLE BEHAVIOR

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee demonstrated unprofessional conduct.	- What specific conduct occurred, and on what date? - Who observed it, and is that documented? - What identifiable record supports this characterization? Documentation risk: No specific conduct or supporting record traceable.	Employee interrupted client meetings on April 4 and April 11, despite prior written instruction regarding meeting protocol issued March 28. Incident report on file April 12.

03 | MISSING PERFORMANCE STANDARD

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee does not meet expectations.	- What specific expectations were not met, and over what period? - What documented standard applies, and was it communicated? - What coaching, notice, or performance documentation exists? Independent review risk: Standard, timeframe, and supporting evidence not identifiable from the file.	Employee missed project deadlines on January 20, February 17, and March 1, resulting in delay. Performance improvement plan established January 5. Check-in notes on file for each review period.

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

04 | MISSING TIMELINE ANCHORS

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee repeatedly failed to communicate project updates.	- What specific communications were missing, and on what dates? - What documented expectation or frequency was established? - Is the expectation traceable to a specific instruction or policy? Audit-readability concern: Dates, frequency, and established expectation not visible in record.	Employee did not provide project status updates on March 3, 10, and 17 during scheduled team meetings, despite three documented requests from the project lead on file.

05 | MISSING POLICY TRACEABILITY

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee's behavior violated company policy.	- Which policy was violated, and which section? - Was the employee informed of the policy, and is that documented? - Is the policy acknowledgment on file? Reviewer visibility problem: Policy basis and employee notice not traceable from the record.	Employee's conduct violated Remote Work Policy Section 3.2, acknowledged in writing January 10. Policy and acknowledgment are on file.

06 | UNSUPPORTED ESCALATION LANGUAGE

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
This situation has become a serious performance concern.	- What documented events support this characterization? - What prior warnings or counseling records exist? - What threshold or standard triggers the escalation? Reconstruction risk: Pattern, conduct, and escalation threshold not independently reviewable.	Following three documented counseling sessions (February 3, February 17, March 3), error rate remains above the documented

			threshold. Escalation to formal PIP recommended per HR protocol. See counseling records and performance data on file.

07 | NARRATIVE INFLATION

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee has consistently undermined team morale.	- What specific conduct is being described? - On what dates did it occur, and is that documented? - What documentation exists beyond the characterization itself? Documentation risk: No specific conduct, date, or identifiable basis traceable.	Employee declined to participate in team planning sessions on March 7 and March 14 without stated reason. Two colleagues submitted written notes March 14 referencing project coordination impact. Notes on file.

08 | UNSUPPORTED BEHAVIORAL LABEL

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee has a negative attitude.	- What specific behaviors support this characterization? - On what dates were they observed, and by whom? - Is the relevant conduct documented and on file? Independent review risk: No observable conduct underlying the characterization.	Employee responded to three documented instructions with "I don't see why this is necessary" (February 2, February 9, February 16 meeting notes). Supervisor feedback provided February 17 and on file.

Original page 7

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

09 | MISSING CONTEXT FOR QUALITATIVE JUDGMENT

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee lacks the skills required for this role.	- What specific skills are being assessed, and against what standard? - How was the gap identified, and is that documented? - Was the standard communicated to the employee in advance?	Employee was unable to complete three assigned SQL tasks in the January 15 skills assessment. Rubric and results are on file.
Audit-readability concern: Skills assessed, standard applied, and supporting evidence not reviewable.		Role requires SQL proficiency per job description dated December 1.

10 | AUTOMATED SUMMARY WITHOUT VERIFICATION

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
AI summary: Employee is difficult to work with.	- What source records were reviewed before the summary was generated? - Are the underlying interactions identifiable in the record? - Was human review documented before the record was finalized?	Summary reviewed against meeting notes dated March 4, 11, and 18. No unverified characterizations introduced. Human review completed March 19 prior to finalization, confirmed against original notes by the attesting reviewer.
Reviewer visibility problem: Underlying source not identifiable. Automated summaries can produce a false appearance of evidentiary support without containing any.		

11 | AMBIGUOUS DOCUMENTATION

RECORD STATEMENT	REVIEWER QUESTIONS	SUPPORTED REVISION
Employee discussed concerns with	- What concerns were raised, and on what date?	

Employee raised
leadership. - What outcome or response was documented?
concerns regarding
- What specific conduct or issue is being referenced? overtime
scheduling
Reviewer visibility problem: Substance, outcome, and referenced
during March 12
concern not identifiable from the record. meeting with
the
Operations Manager.
Follow-up request
submitted March 14
and acknowledged by
HR March 15.

Across all of these patterns, the same question applies: does the file actually show the basis for this conclusion? If not, it
needs additional anchoring before it enters an official system.

COMMON PATTERN Most escalation files fail at the timeline level. Conduct is described. Dates are not. Without dates, the pattern cannot be independently established.

Original page 8

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

| REVIEWER QUESTION SETS Apply the relevant set before finalizing documentation in each context. These questions reflect what someone reviewing the record later would need to evaluate it. They are most useful at the drafting stage, before records have entered official systems.

Performance Documentation
- What specific, dated examples support each evaluative statement?
- Is the applicable performance standard referenced and on file?
- Are coaching, counseling, or prior feedback records identifiable?
- Could a reviewer follow the conclusion without speaking to the author?

Disciplinary Documentation
- What specific conduct occurred, on what dates, and who observed it?
- What policy applies, and is the employee's acknowledgment on file?
- Are prior warnings or counseling records referenced?
- Is the progression of steps traceable from the record?

Termination Documentation
- Is the stated basis supported by referenced conduct or performance records?
- Does the documented history align with the formal record dates?
- Would the file hold up if the drafter were no longer available to explain it?

Investigation Documentation
- Are source materials and witness accounts identified in the record?
- Are conflicting accounts acknowledged rather than resolved away?
- Do the conclusions stay within what the identified evidence shows?

Most reviewers discover the missing context after escalation, not before. The questions above reflect

what reconstruction
actually requires.
Hiring Documentation
- Are selection criteria documented and applied consistently across candidates?
- Is the basis for the decision identifiable from the record?
- Are evaluative judgments anchored to the stated criteria?

Accommodation Documentation
- Are the interactive process steps documented?
- Is the determination rationale stated and traceable?
- Are referenced medical or functional records identified without disclosing more than the record requires?

In termination and disciplinary contexts, a useful check is whether the record would hold up if the manager who drafted
it were no longer with the organization. If the answer depends on that person being available to explain it, the record is
not ready.
In each of these contexts, the underlying check is the same: does the file explain itself? Would the basis for this
conclusion still be clear to someone reading it six months from now, with no background on the people or events
involved? If not, additional anchoring is needed before the record is finalized.

Original page 9

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

| WORKFLOW INTEGRATION JRS is applied at the drafting stage, before records enter official systems. No system replacement or dedicated tooling is required. It works within whatever workflows are already in place. M1 Basic Review. Manager or HR reviewer applies the three review checks and the Submission Readiness Check before submission. In practice, the depth of this review varies by reviewer and workload. Secondary review is not required for standard-risk records at this level. M2 Risk-Based Review. Applied to elevated-risk records: performance evaluations, disciplinary actions, terminations, and accommodations. The reviewer confirms the support is in the file and the reasoning is traceable before record entry. These are the records most likely to be reviewed later under adversarial conditions. M3 Investigation Review. Applied when evaluating witness summaries, incident records, or narrative conclusions. Source material is identified and conclusions are tested against what is in the file. Conflicting accounts and the limits of what the evidence shows must be acknowledged. M4 Audit Sampling. Compliance or audit personnel periodically sample organizational records for supporting evidence and documented reasoning using the failure-mode catalog. Sampling results may identify departments or record types where documentation quality is consistently low. M5 AI-Assisted Draft Review. Applied before AI-assisted wording enters official records. The human reviewer confirms conclusions are supported by source material, no unverified characterizations have been introduced, and conflicting evidence has not been obscured. Attestation required before submission. Review depth varies in practice. These levels identify where secondary review is required, not where it always occurs.

| REVIEW OWNERSHIP
Who reviews a record depends on the workflow and the record's risk level. Initial review typically

occurs at the
drafting stage, though in practice this does not always happen before records enter official systems. Elevated-risk documentation requires secondary HR, compliance, legal, or audit review before finalization. The
reviewer responsible for attestation is the person who submits the record.

- Drafting-stage review: manager, investigator, or HR reviewer responsible for the record
- Elevated-risk secondary review: HR, compliance, or legal personnel before system entry
- Investigation records: reviewer independent of the drafting chain where staffing allows
- AI-assisted content: the attesting reviewer of record must be a human with direct access to source
  materials

| HIGH-RISK DOCUMENTATION INDICATORS These patterns signal elevated documentation risk and require secondary review before the record is finalized. They are records where the supporting basis is unclear or absent, not necessarily indicators of wrongdoing. Many documentation gaps result from time pressure, rushed drafting, or incomplete note-taking rather than intentional omission. - Evaluative adjectives without a specific behavioral anchor (hostile, difficult, unprofessional, poor) - Disciplinary conclusions that cite no specific conduct dates or incidents - Termination documentation with generalized performance characterizations and no supporting record references - AI-assisted summaries without identified source records or human attestation

Original page 10

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

- Timeline inconsistencies between documented events and formal record dates - Escalation language without documented prior warnings or counseling records on file - Accommodation records lacking documentation of the interactive process - Investigation conclusions that do not acknowledge conflicting accounts or the limits of what the evidence shows When any of these are present, secondary review is required. Do not submit. The issue is often not intent. It is whether the record can be reconstructed without the person who wrote it.

| SECOND-LINE REVIEW ESCALATION When a High-Risk Indicator is present, apply the corresponding secondary review before the record is finalized:

RISK INDICATOR	RECOMMENDED REVIEW
Termination documentation before entry	HR secondary review plus legal or compliance consultation
Accommodation disputes documentation	Legal or compliance review of interactive process
AI-assisted summaries without attestation	Source verification and documented human review before entry
Formal disciplinary action references	Traceability review: confirm specific conduct dates and policy

Investigation conclusions	Independent review of source evidence and acknowledgment of gaps or conflicts
Evaluative language without behavioral anchors	Return to drafter for anchoring before submission

Most escalation files fail at the timeline level. Dates are missing, or the documented events do not match the formal record dates.

| DOCUMENTATION DRIFT IN PRACTICE

Reviewers often rely on memory instead of the written record, especially when documentation is completed after events have occurred. This is more common than most organizations track. The record may look complete to the person who wrote it. The problem usually shows up later, when someone else reads it without that background.

In practice, problems tend to arise when reviewers rely on:

- memory of events rather than recorded documentation of those events
- context that seemed obvious at the time but was never written down
- organizational knowledge about participants or history that is not in the file
- general impressions of an employee or situation in place of documented conduct
- AI-generated summaries accepted without checking them against source material

REVIEWER REMINDER What felt obvious during drafting may not be obvious later. The author may remember details the file never captured. If the supporting record cannot be identified quickly, stop and verify before submission.

Original page 11

| WHEN RECORDS DEPEND ON CONTEXT OUTSIDE THE FILE A record becomes difficult to use when understanding it requires information that is not in the record. This is usually not obvious at the time of drafting. The author knows what the document means. The problem surfaces when someone else reads it later, without access to the people or organizational history that the author had in mind. This typically happens when a record requires the reviewer to: - know the participants involved in order to understand the conclusion - recall prior conversations or agreements that were never written down - be familiar with organizational history or context that was never recorded - understand the author's intent from context that exists only in the author's knowledge If the context is not in the record, a later reviewer cannot verify it. That is the practical test. Not whether the record made sense to the people who drafted it, but whether it makes sense to someone reading it cold.

COMMON FAILURE A manager may remember the incident clearly when drafting the record. Two years later, the only thing remaining is the file itself. Future reviewers cannot verify unwritten context.

| INCONSISTENT DOCUMENTATION QUALITY Documentation quality varies considerably across departments, managers, investigators, and review teams. The same conduct may be documented very differently depending on who drafted the record, local documentation habits, time pressure, and how much review occurred before system entry. Review quality often varies by workload and staffing,

and departments may apply documentation standards unevenly. These checks are intended to reduce that inconsistency by giving reviewers a common set of questions regardless of where the record originated. Whether those checks are applied consistently is a separate question. Uneven documentation is the norm. The standard does not change.

| RECORDS THAT DEGRADE OVER TIME Documentation that seems adequate when drafted may become difficult to use months or years later. Personnel change. Organizational structures change. The people who could explain a record may no longer be there. What matters is not whether the record was adequate when written, but whether it holds up when someone needs to rely on it later. Records with dates and referenced support tend to hold together during later review. Records that rely on the author's memory or context that was never written down tend not to hold up. A conclusion without documented support is only an impression. That distinction becomes significant when a record is reviewed outside its original context. A related problem occurs when organizations accumulate repeated unsupported characterizations. Multiple records using the same general language about an employee do not add up to evidentiary support. Each entry still needs specific conduct dates, policy references, or other documented support. Volume does not substitute for content. The file is what survives. Not the meeting. Not the conversation. Not what the manager remembers.

| SOURCE VERIFICATION AND HUMAN ATTESTATION Where automated drafting tools have contributed to a record, the review standard does not change. All major conclusions must be supported by referenced source material before the record enters an official system. It does not matter whether the wording was generated by a tool or typed by the reviewer. The record has to contain the same support either way.

Original page 12

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

Drafting versus attesting. An automated tool may assist in drafting. Only a human reviewer can attest that what the record says is accurate and grounded in the source material. That attestation confirms that AI-assisted wording has not introduced unverified characterizations or sentiment absent from the original source material. The wording may sound accurate. That is not the same as being supported.

VERIFICATION ATTESTATION I have reviewed this AI-assisted draft against my original notes and source records. It accurately reflects the documented interactions. No unverified characterizations or sentiment has been introduced that was not in the original material. I am attesting to its accuracy as the reviewer of record.

The Conflict Check: This draft has not obscured material disagreements or conflicting evidence present in the source notes. Where source material contained contested or incomplete information, that is reflected here rather than smoothed over.

Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

This attestation concerns documentation quality. It does not certify factual accuracy or legal sufficiency.

Sentiment verification. AI-generated characterizations such as the employee seemed uncooperative or the employee appeared hostile must be replaced with or anchored by direct quotes, specific behavioral descriptions, or referenced conduct records before the document enters an official system

of record. The wording may originate in automated drafting. The evidentiary grounding must originate in documented fact.

| HOW THIS REFERENCE IS USED
JRS is designed to work within existing workflows. No system replacement, dedicated software, or structural
change is required. Reviewers apply it at whatever stage documentation quality is being evaluated, most
commonly before records enter official systems.
01 At the drafting stage. Manager, investigator, or HR reviewer applies the three review checks before submitting
documentation into any official system.
02 Before elevated-risk record entry. HR or compliance personnel review performance, disciplinary, termination,
or accommodation records using the Submission Readiness Check and the High-Risk Indicator checklist.
03 During investigation review. Investigators apply the Reviewer Question Sets and failure-mode recognition
when evaluating witness accounts, incident records, or narrative conclusions.
04 As an audit sampling tool. Compliance or audit personnel apply the failure-mode catalog to sample records
for documentation quality. Sampling often surfaces patterns across departments.
05 Before AI-assisted content enters official records. Any documentation involving automated drafting
undergoes source verification and human attestation before record finalization.

| ADMINISTRATIVE NEUTRALITY This reference evaluates whether the record actually supports the conclusions it contains. It does not address whether the underlying organizational decision was correct. Those are separate questions, and reviewers sometimes conflate them. A record can be thoroughly documented and still reflect a poor decision. Documentation quality and decision quality are not the same thing.

Original page 13
R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

Process, not outcome. This reference does not assess whether the right decision was made. Its purpose is to confirm that whatever decision was made is adequately documented, and that the basis survives independent review. Nothing more.

| CONFORMANCE A record conforms when it satisfies all five conditions, assessed against the record as it stands by a reviewer with no access to the original participants and no institutional memory of the events. A record is non-conforming when one or more conditions are not met, and the review identifies the specific condition not satisfied. Conformance reflects documentation sufficiency, not the correctness, lawfulness, or merits of the underlying decision. A conforming record may still be disputed on substantive grounds, and a non-conforming record is not made conforming by formatting, restated wording, or secondary review in the absence of supporting information.

| LIMITATIONS

Not legal advice. Organizations should consult qualified legal counsel regarding documentation requirements, applicable law, and jurisdictional standards in their context.

Legal sufficiency. This standard does not establish legal sufficiency. Documentation that satisfies it may still be insufficient under applicable law.

Jurisdiction variability. Documentation standards and legal requirements differ across jurisdictions, regulatory frameworks, and applicable law. Local requirements govern.

Operational context. Intended for use under reasonable constraints. Reviewer judgment is not replaced. Staffing pressure, incomplete records, and varying reviewer skill are day-to-day realities this reference addresses but cannot eliminate.

Implementation without system replacement. JRS operates within existing workflows without requiring dedicated software, system changes, or proprietary tooling.

Illustrative examples. Failure-mode examples, reviewer question sets, and escalation indicators are illustrative and may be adapted to organizational context and applicable requirements.

Purpose. The goal is not more documentation. It is documentation that actually holds up: reviewable by someone with no prior knowledge of the events, supported by identifiable evidence, and usable during later review.

Original page 14

| REVIEW ESCALATION TRIGGERS These thresholds identify when a record requires more than standard review before submission. Any single trigger is sufficient reason to stop.

When Secondary Review Is Mandatory

- Termination documentation with generalized characterizations and no referenced supporting records
- Formal disciplinary action where specific conduct dates or incidents cannot be identified in the file
- Accommodation records that do not document interactive process steps or include a stated determination rationale
- Investigation conclusions that do not identify source materials or acknowledge conflicting accounts
- Any record where AI-assisted drafting contributed wording not reviewed against the original notes

When Legal Review Is Recommended

- Termination records where the documented basis conflicts with prior performance records in the file
- Accommodation denials where interactive process documentation is incomplete or missing
- Investigation conclusions used as the basis for a subsequent disciplinary or termination action
- Records where AI-generated summaries introduced characterizations not present in the original

notes

When AI-Assisted Content Requires Attestation

- Generated wording submitted to a personnel file without review against the original notes
- Investigation findings or witness account summaries produced by an automated drafting tool
- Conflicts between the original notes and generated wording that have not been identified and resolved

When the Record Should Be Returned to the Drafter

- Evaluative conclusions appear without behavioral anchors in the file
- Pattern claims cite no specific dates, incidents, or conduct observations
- Escalation language appears without prior warnings or counseling records to support it
- The reviewer cannot identify the basis from the record. It exists only in verbal explanation

When Evidence Gaps Are Present

- A pattern conclusion rests on fewer than two anchored, documented incidents
- Policy-based conclusions cite no specific policy section or employee acknowledgment
- Investigation findings go beyond what the identified source materials actually show

| ESCALATION TRIGGER MATRIX One trigger is sufficient. Do not submit until the corresponding action is complete.

TRIGGER	REQUIRED ACTION	REVIEWER
Unsupported disciplinary conclusion	Return to drafter. Do not submit.	HR reviewer
Missing timeline anchors for stated or HR pattern	Secondary review before record entry	Compliance
AI-generated evaluative language, unverified	Review against original notes. Resolve gaps.	Attesting reviewer
Termination, no referenced supporting records	HR secondary review plus legal consultation	HR and legal
Investigation conclusion, source not identified	Independent source evidence review	Outside drafting chain
Pattern conclusion, fewer than two anchored instances	Document the gap. Return to drafter.	HR reviewer

Original page 15

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

| REVIEWER WORKSHEET Complete before any record is submitted to a personnel file or finalized case record. Each item is pass or fail. A failed item requires resolution before submission, not after.

Reconstruction Check Could a reviewer unfamiliar with this matter reconstruct the basis for this conclusion from the file alone? Are dates or date ranges present for each stated pattern or repeated conduct claim? Are referenced records, policies, or prior documentation identifiable without calling the

drafter? Does the reasoning hold without verbal explanation from the person who drafted the record? Were AI-assisted summaries reviewed against the original notes before this review?

Evidence and Anchoring Check Each evaluative adjective is supported by a specific behavioral fact: what occurred, when, and where. Policy references name the specific policy and section. The acknowledgment is confirmed on file. Escalation conclusions reference prior documented warnings, counseling, or performance records. Investigation conclusions identify source materials. Conflicting accounts are noted, not resolved away.

AI-Assisted Content Check Generated wording was reviewed against original notes or documentation before this review. No characterizations appear in the record that are absent from the underlying notes. Where the notes contained gaps or conflicts, the record reflects them. They were not smoothed over. Human attestation is documented and on file before submission.

Record Type Escalation Check Termination: HR secondary review and legal consultation completed or waived in writing. Formal discipline: conduct dates, policy references, and prior warnings are identifiable in the file. Accommodation: interactive process steps and the determination rationale are documented. Investigation: source materials are named and conclusions stay within what the evidence shows.

REVIEWER ATTESTATION This record has been reviewed for documentation quality against the checks above.

Record or File Reference: _____
Record Type: _____ Review Date: _____
Determination: READY (approved) REVIEW REQUIRED STOP (return to drafter)
Reviewer Name: _____ Signature: _____

This attestation confirms review for documentation quality. It does not certify factual accuracy or legal sufficiency.

Original page 16

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

| RECORD SURVIVABILITY ANALYSIS A record adequate at drafting may not hold when it is actually needed. Personnel change. Oversight structures change. Whether the file can stand without the people who created it is the operational test.

How Records Degrade - The original drafter leaves. The file remains. Verbal context does not. - Reviewer turnover means no one is left who can explain what the original documentation was intended to show. - Escalation years after the event requires reconstruction from the file, not from recollection. - In legal proceedings, the record stands alone. Prior participants are not available to supply context. - Retroactively drafted records tend to omit detail that would have been captured closer to the event. Records with specific dates, referenced policies, and identified conduct hold up. Those that depend on unwritten context do not. A conclusion without documented support is only an impression. Someone reading the file cold has no way to know what the author understood but did not write down.

SURVIVABILITY TEST If the person who drafted this record left the organization tomorrow, could the file support an audit or proceeding twelve months from now without supplemental explanation? If not, it is not complete.

| LATER-REVIEW FAILURE CASCADES A documentation gap rarely stays contained. The deficiency is often invisible when the record is created. It surfaces when the file is reviewed under procedural or adversarial pressure.

How a Single Gap Compounds - An evaluative adjective is recorded without a behavioral anchor. The record reads smoothly and is submitted. - A later record for the same employee repeats the same language. No dates are added. The file grows. The support does not. - Escalation to formal discipline references the documented pattern. The characterizations are consistent across records. None cite a specific incident, date, or conduct. - The employee disputes the action. HR review cannot establish the conduct basis from the file. - An audit flags the gap between the escalation record and the absence of prior documented incidents. - Legal review attempts reconstruction. The drafter is no longer with the organization. The file does not hold. Automated Drafting and Cascade Risk Where AI tools produce similar characterizations across multiple records for the same employee, the volume creates an appearance of a documented pattern. No individual entry contains an anchored incident. Repetition is not corroboration. The file can look thorough while containing nothing a later reviewer can independently verify.

COMMON FAILURE Most escalation files fail at the timeline level. Conduct is described. Dates are not. Without dates, the pattern cannot be independently established.

Original page 17

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

| AI-ASSISTED RECORD FAILURE MODES AI drafting tools introduce structural problems that make records appear complete while creating gaps that are not visible until the file is reviewed under pressure. Amplification of unsupported sentiment. Source notes describe a general impression. The generated record states it as a finding. That difference does not appear in the submitted record. Narrative smoothing. AI-generated prose absorbs inconsistencies and conflicting accounts from source notes into a coherent narrative. What the notes actually showed, including gaps, qualifications, and disagreements among accounts, may not survive into the record that gets submitted. Omission compression. Summarization removes material that complicates the conclusion: conflicting accounts, partial witness recollection, prior remediation steps. What remains may be technically accurate as far as it goes. A later reviewer has no way to know what was left out. Confidence inflation. Qualified or uncertain language in source notes becomes declarative in the generated record. The factual basis does not change. The stated certainty does. Neutral framing of unsupported conclusions. Phrases such as concerns were noted or performance was assessed as below standard read as factual. They are not independently reviewable unless the underlying conduct, the applied standard, and the basis for the assessment appear in the record. Cross-record wording contamination. Where AI tools draw on prior records as drafting context, unanchored characterizations from earlier entries carry forward. Each repetition appears to corroborate the prior entry. None of the entries contain support that was not already absent in the first. False consistency across records. Multiple AI-generated records for the same employee may use consistent characterizations regardless of whether the documented conduct was actually consistent. Consistency in drafting inputs is not the same as consistency in fact.

| DOCUMENTATION RISK TIERS Use these tiers to determine review depth before a record is entered. Classification reflects documentation risk, not the severity of the underlying decision.

LOW	MODERATE	HIGH	CRITICAL
Routine attendance counseling. Informational summaries without attestation. Termination files unsupported characterizations. Records in anticipated.	Performance records with evaluative language. Counseling records. May resurface if the matter escalates. Secondary review recommended.	Formal disciplinary action. Termination documentation. Accommodation decisions. Records that will appear in proceedings. Secondary review required.	AI-assisted investigation summaries without review against original notes. Records with no evaluative conclusions. No disciplinary or legal consequence anticipated.

Original page 18

R E V I E W E R R E F E R E N C E

| FIELD CONDITIONS This reference is designed for use under ordinary conditions, not ideal ones. The standard does not change based on workload or staffing.

What Reviewers Regularly Encounter - Supervisor notes that are incomplete, partial, or written after the fact - Staffing shortages that require the drafter to also serve as the only reviewer - Records submitted immediately before a deadline with no secondary check - Retroactive drafting where the record is created days or weeks after the event - Conflicting witness accounts with no documented resolution in the file - Significant variation in documentation quality across managers and departments - AI-generated summaries submitted without review against original notes These conditions explain why gaps exist. They do not change what a file must contain. Whoever reads the record later will not know the circumstances under which it was drafted. The file is what remains.

REVIEWER REMINDER What felt obvious during drafting may not be obvious later. If the supporting record cannot be identified quickly, stop before submission. Do not assume the referenced discussion was documented.

| REVIEWER RESPONSIBILITY BOUNDARIES The reviewer's function is bounded. Review confirms what the file shows, not whether the underlying events are accurately described.

THE REVIEWER CONFIRMS	THE REVIEWER DOES NOT CERTIFY
The record can be read and evaluated from the file alone	Factual accuracy of the events described in the record
Each conclusion is linked to identified support in the file	Legal sufficiency under applicable law
	Whether the underlying decision was appropriate
The basis for each conclusion is stated, not assumed	Whether the file is factually complete

AI-assisted content was reviewed against original notes

REVIEWER SCOPE Review confirms what is visible and supported in the file. Factual accuracy and legal sufficiency are outside this standard.

| MINIMUM VIABLE REVIEW STANDARD When full review is not possible, confirm these four elements before the record is finalized. If any one is missing, the record is not ready.

IDENTIFY	ANCHOR	TRACE	FOLLOW
What conduct occurred. Specific enough to describe conduct to conclusion. without calling the author.	When it occurred. A date or traceable timeframe, not a general reference to a period.	What record, note, or source grounds the conclusion. Identifiable in the file.	How the reasoning moves from Visible in the document, not supplied by the reviewer.

Original page 19

| DEPLOYMENT MODELS JRS operates within existing workflows. No dedicated system or platform is required. These models describe how the standard is applied at different points in the documentation and review process. Manager self-review. The drafter applies the three review checks and the Submission Readiness Check before submitting. Appropriate for LOW-tier records where the manager has received documentation guidance. HIGH and CRITICAL-tier records require secondary review regardless. HR secondary review. HR reviews elevated-risk records after drafting and before the record is entered. Baseline model for MODERATE and HIGH-tier records, including performance evaluations, disciplinary actions, and accommodation records. Investigation review workflow. An independent reviewer applies the Reviewer Question Sets against the investigation record before finalization. Conflicting accounts and evidentiary gaps are identified and noted. The reviewer is outside the drafting chain where staffing permits. Audit sampling model. Compliance or audit personnel sample records periodically using the failure-mode catalog. Sampling surfaces patterns across departments or record types. It is a retrospective check, not a pre-submission control. AI-assisted review control layer. Applied before AI-assisted content enters finalized records. The human reviewer compares generated wording against original notes, identifies characterizations not present in those notes, and completes attestation. Required for CRITICAL-tier records. Legal escalation routing. Applied when review identifies a CRITICAL-tier trigger or when a record will be used in active or anticipated proceedings. HR routes to legal before submission. Legal review does not replace HR review.

| SECOND-LINE REVIEW MODEL Each level is additive. Higher-risk records move through more levels before they are finalized. Secondary review does not always occur in practice. That gap is what this structure addresses.

REVIEW LEVEL	APPLICATION
Manager drafts	Initial record creation. The drafter applies self-review checks and is accountable for accuracy and completeness.

HR reviews	Secondary review before record entry for elevated-risk files. Confirms the file contains the basis for each conclusion.
Compliance escalates	Applied when HR identifies a trigger requiring escalation. Covers systemic patterns or records with regulatory implications.
Legal reviews	CRITICAL-tier records and records in active or anticipated proceedings. Reviews from a litigation standpoint.
Audit samples	Periodic retrospective check across record populations. Identifies systemic gaps. Not a pre-submission control.

| JRS IMPLEMENTATION MATURITY LEVELS These levels describe where an organization currently operates. They are not a sequence. Organizations may apply different levels across record types depending on volume, staffing, and risk profile.

LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 5
Self-Review	Secondary Review	AI Verification	Audit Integration	Policy Integration
Drafter checks before submission. No secondary review.	HR or compliance reviews elevated-risk records before entry.	AI-assisted content reviewed against original notes and attested before entry.	Periodic sampling across record populations. Identifies systemic gaps.	Review standards embedded in policy and training schedules.