No. 06-1595

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

VICKY S. CRAWFORD,

Petitioner

v.

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE,

Respondents


Cal trains on onnuron in

TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS

Robert J. Sniffen

F. Damon Kitchen



В. PE IN RE SE OV SY II. CONCLU

Abbott v. Cro 343 F.3d 537 Anduze v. Flo 151 Fed. App cert. denied, Auguster v. V 249 F.3d 400 Barrett v. Ap 240 F.3d 262 Baynard v. M 268 F.3d 228 $Black\ v.\ Veat$ 155 F. Supp. Blount v. Gli 1998 WL 325 Booker v. Bro Co., 879 F.3ď $Brower\ v.\ Ru$ 178 F.3d 100

Bryant County, (11th C

Burling Railwa

City Sc. Faculty (N.Y. A

Clark G 532 U.S

Coates 164 F.3

Crawfo Nashvi 211 Fee

E.E.O.0 221 F.3

Ellerth 524 U.S

Elrod v 939 F.2

Faragh 524 U.S

Garcett 547 U.S

Ge 52 Gl Di (M Hc Sc 14 Ηε 47 Ηε Ch 20 Hc Ex 54
54
Hc 79
cer
Ja
ant 27
Ja
54 Je_l. Sy

J 1 L A (4 N 9 N 3 N 2 N S (1 N (5 P 6 P 5 P 4 P 1)

 Pr 19

Re Εc (N

 $R\zeta 51$

Ra Di

Sc 18

Sh 18

Vd 90

W; 15

A1 42


Ti 42 Ti 20

42 U.S.0 42 U.S.0 42 U.S.0 Ark. Co Fla. Sta Wis. Sta Merrian (10th ed Metropo Harassr http://w Nationa Educati http://nc 61.asp?i The Am The Nev (2001) .. c"NS boar Stat toge school 15,0 The teac rang socia mair Tak repressive respective with contemp opporting.

¹ Pul was a other mone brief pursa havin ² Nat Stati dt07

§ξ sξ aς aι pi pi Si of di ca aı u: ti tl M pa au eu w no co ao T ao in p cc az si

resi forn practrou imp esse dist ope; bus tens uns nati repo deci (199 the whe adn prot don this



Clari (200: Raili consi enga oppo activ prote becan the I Com: 2409 initia her a 532 I

in th


3 This Count no rea about 271. Sheliev haras autho practi knew McGin Cir. 2 allege allege 775, & action immedemplo.


Crawford, claims solely because sh own alleged expe response to an in employer. Petition register with her informal complair nor did she pai investigation, pro EEOC. It is ec never filed with t that she had beer prior to being legitimate busines below, a person's the available is mechanisms avail do in this case) co. protected under T


A. Section Only To Assist Light I Compla

1. Acti esse elin wor

In her brie Circuit erred in do protected if it is further contends







ensure Titl boards are operations unlikely to complainan conduct. S_{i} (4th Cir. 20 director wa harassmen was respon alleged han Sch. Dist., that "in la members h interactions the same supervise a settings, ar interacting variety of parents and unique staf with which required to multiple ld individuals them deter place.

prima provi VII's 126 \$ 316). made duty circui that Penn. 146 (the c reaso prote

"Title antih mech part proce prom Title U.S. prone other Empl policy"

cd h: e1 h: e1 of sth C as P sth p"r ct H id th m en th an E an C re ha

Pet the Res her pro Could dut avo a h gra for inv

em
a 1
had
of 1
163
the
had
rep
em
bee

5As Ediacti

suc eli thi in


544 Dis

3

pro ope allc ma mer inv able bee con pos tim har Sec star suff emj Glic As who opp a for who emj rea is ε Pric 200 bur star and Pet man

rerclreosddi rvivHIaHri ighriratf*F*7

reasonabl correcting unreason case with afforded defense. Title VII little inc required 1 employer take more may expo Lik informati internal i under the the possi then it is few indiv to employ sole purp adverse a substanti employer employee suspicion Employer budgetary and mor matters, never be more deta legitimate employee



Bool Supj case with reas Mor were asse they inve their cont mat sam em go: VI int en 22 fac an the rec rer en Co thu in s inves the 2000 char;

"[u]n complessed detection Pethat dismingular occurs sayir emplessed of the control occurs oc


entir emplored board discrement well-toll toll to produce.g., 149 loschoot and local count 2005

expect ar staff and secure, instructio environme to fill pos science to would find the qualiceducation


As case belo discourage clause to internal in


The can par occ the bur em lau Exp par inv disc this of cou

Crawford Davidson 2006). T



decisio: sexual unless matter a scho unlikel particij the te employ made t admini employ investi investi small recomn immed the se circum harass: confideinvesti candid respon employ employ harass: termin employ supervi the fine educat: inform.





say
will
ince
be re
inve
emp
emp
abou
of a
inste
case

II.

ensi educ rely thei alloc and qual com teac nece emp the defe emp & C Hed 934 the dist und or en See, F. E sum teac teac Pipk 259 agai disc poor Sys. 200! distr viola "doc As a reso com eduç ram Title scho men teac thei that *Hen*

Dist., 20 districts and in p which le addition, public so personne employed bargaini and spec School e their di determin employed discrimii discrimii agreeme: under 42 discrimii and on discrimii statutes) PeekskillApp. Di retaliatio rights w

⁶ See, e.g., (employee who alleg association concern); I "discrimin gender, di employee Stat. § 100

bargaining a a "just cau County Pub. 2004)(holdin between the created cons in employme Sch. Dist. N 1982)(holdin adverse acti free speech seq. (allowin reasonable c teachers nee prohibition discriminato (prohibiting basis of sex, Petitic interpretatio under Title unjustified k ability to m public schoo personnel w education in Both 1 VII, employe their interna allegations agency inter-

such interr supervision, hold, then problem by m well e printed ad protesta p veh eir E o

S

respec affirm

Respe

FRAN Gener Nation 1680 I Alexan 703-85 *Coun

ROBE Sniffe 211 E Tallah 850-20

F. DA Const 200 W Jackso 904-3

JACK Const 212 E New Y 646-79

May 1