



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-1276

Issued Date: 04/11/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (2) Standards and Duties: Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy and Department Policy (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

#### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The Named Employee was part of an interview panel for a job opening within the Department, and he developed technical written questions for the interview process.

#### **COMPLAINT**

While providing an interview to OPA regarding another case, the witness alleged that the Named Employee assisted him on a preliminary written exam for a job opening by going over with him the test questions that he (the Named Employee) had developed.

## **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
2. Interview of SPD employee

## **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

The preponderance of the evidence from this investigation did not support the allegation that the Named Employee acted in such a manner as to be considered not “professional” as articulated in SPD Policy 5.001(9). Nor did the evidence from this investigation support the allegation that the Named Employee improperly provided confidential information regarding employment testing information. The only evidence to suggest unprofessional behavior in allegedly providing confidential information regarding employment testing information came from a former employee whose credibility was doubtful. The manner and timing with which the former employee made the allegations suggested a strong self-interest on his part to identify the Named Employee as the source of the confidential information, thus potentially deflecting blame for his wife who was the subject of a related OPA investigation. The former employee’s credibility was also strongly challenged by the fact that email evidence contradicted his specific memory that the Named Employee disclosed the confidential information to him during a face-to-face meeting. The evidence from this OPA investigation showed that the Named Employee was at home on the day of the supposed meeting.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1**

#### Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence did not support the allegation that the Named Employee acted in such a manner as to be considered not “professional.” Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times.*

#### Allegation #2

A preponderance of the evidence did not support the allegation that the Named Employee improperly provided confidential information regarding employment testing information. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy and Department Policy.*

*NOTE: The Seattle Police Department Manual policies cited for the allegation(s) made for this OPA Investigation are policies that were in effect during the time of the incident. The issued date of the policy is listed.*