CLOSED CASE SUMMARY



ISSUED DATE: DECEMBER 21, 2017

CASE NUMBER: 2017OPA-0700

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

	Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
	# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties 3. Employees Must Attend All	Sustained
		Mandatory Training	
Imposed Dissipline			

Imposed Discipline

Oral Reprimand

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections are written in the first person.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Complainant, SPD's Compliance Bureau, alleges that Named Employee #1 failed to complete the mandatory 2017 Core Competencies training.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

5.001 - Standards and Duties 3. Employees Must Attend All Mandatory Training

SPD Policy 5.001(3) states that "[e]mployees will attend mandatory training and follow the current curriculum during the course of their duties." The sole exception for missing training is for those officers who are on approved light or limited duty and have received a waiver from a supervisor. (See SPD Policy 5.001(3).) Employees that have missed mandatory trainings as a result of excused absences are required to make arrangements through their supervisor to complete the trainings within a reasonable timeframe. (See id.)

On July 13, 2017, SPD's Compliance Bureau provided OPA with a list of those SPD employees that had failed to complete the mandatory 2017 Core Competencies training. (See Original Complaint Memo.) This list constituted a final and conclusive determination of those employee that had failed to attend the training as it had been vetted through SPD Human Resources and removed the names of those individuals who were out due to Extended Sick, Light Duty, Military Leave, or Administrative Reassignment, as well as culled the list of those individuals who were marked as Exempt or Excused. (See id.) Prior to these steps being taken there was no definitive determination of which employees failed to attend this training without a valid justification. The steps taken by SPD's Compliance Bureau to verify the accuracy of this information ensured that employees who had official approval to not attend this training were not improperly made the subjects of an OPA investigation, thus preserving the resources of the Department and OPA and ensuring fundamental fairness to the employees.

On January 12, 2017, Special Order SO17-003 was issued. (See id.) This Special Order required that all SPD supervisors complete the mandatory 2017 Core Competencies training by March 26, 2017. (See id.) A supplemental



CLOSE CASE SUMMARY

OPA CASE NUMBER: 2017OPA-0700

Special Order was issued on March 6, 2017 (SO17-003-A), which offered the training on two additional dates — March 27 and March 29. (*See id.*) Based on OPA's investigation, this training appears to have been offered a total of twenty-seven times between January 30, 2017 and March 29, 2017. (*See* Core Competencies Training Timesheets.) Named Employee #1 (NE#1) was working on eighteen of the days during which the training was offered. He was registered to take the training on March 23, but he cancelled due to sickness. He stated that he was also sick on the last date of the training (March 29). However, NE#1's timesheet indicates that he worked on March 27, one of the other supplemental dates upon which the training was offered. Moreover, there is no indication that NE#1 ever reregistered for the training after he missed the March 23rd session.

Attending training is not an optional aspect of employment at the Seattle Police Department. It is mandatory. Missing training not only results in employees that have not received up to date tactical, operational and legal instruction, but it also imposes a financial burden on the Department. Lastly, universal attendance at trainings is a cornerstone of constitutional policing and, as explained by the Court-appointed Monitor, is a crucial component of full and effective compliance.

For these reasons, while I have sympathy for NE#1's stated circumstances and while I commend him for his exemplary lack of discipline over his twenty-eight-year career, his failure to attend this training was in violation of policy.

Recommended Finding: Sustained