

# Mgt-3320 - case 2

Business



MGT-3320 - Case 1. Evaluate the conduct of Peter Lewiston against the EEOCs definition of sexual harassment. While Peter Lewiston did not overstep the boundaries of what is considered inappropriate conduct or do anything illegal, he did put Gilbury in an uncomfortable situation where she did not want to be. She made it clear multiple times that she did not want Lewiston to treat her like that or try to instigate something further. Based on the EEOC definition of sexual harassment, I think there is definitely a case to hear because Lewiston created an extremely hostile sexual environment.

2. Should the intent or motive behind Lewistons conduct be considered when deciding sexual harassment activities? Explain.

No, I dont think intent or motive should be considered because it does not matter if he did not mean to offend because the reality is that he made Gilbury feel very uncomfortable around him. It was weighing on her mind and could have eventually impacted on Gilburys work. It does not matter if Lewiston had the right intentions because the reality is that he overstepped the mark on this one.

3. If you were the districts EEOC officer, what would you conclude? What disciplinary action, if any, would you take?

If I was the district EEOC officer, I would listen to both sides of the story and then come to a conclusion based on the evidence available. I would have to say that in this instance I would agree that Lewiston was sexually harassing Gilbury because it happened repeatedly over a number of days. I would give Lewiston a strong warning and remind him that any further complaints would result in an instant dismissal for him.