



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-0383

Issued Date: 03/31/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 4.010 (2) Employee Time Off: Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor (Policy that was issued September 18, 2013)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (12) Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Not Use Their Position or Authority for Personal Gain (Policy that was issued July 16, 2014)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #3	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.090 (I.A. 1.) Operations Bureau General Personnel Matters: First Watch Hours (Policy that was issued August 18, 2003)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 4.010 (2) Employee Time Off: Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor (Policy that was issued September 18, 2013)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)

Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (12) Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Not Use Their Position or Authority for Personal Gain (Policy that was issued July 16, 2014)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #3	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.090 (I.A.1.) Operations Bureau General Personnel Matters: First Watch Hours (Policy that was issued August 18, 2003)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #3	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.100 (IV.A.1.) Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities: Watch Lieutenants Responsibilities (Policy that was issued July 20, 2010)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

OPA received an internal complaint regarding the Named Employees.

COMPLAINT

The anonymous internal complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 showed up late for work on a regular basis, or not at all, and left early. Named Employee #1 reportedly did this without marking the time off on the time sheets. The complainant alleged that Named Employee #2, in covered for Named Employee #1, entered inaccurate information on time sheets, and also took time off without having it marked on the time sheets. The complainant alleged that Named Employee #3 was aware of what had been going on.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The preponderance of the evidence showed that there were discrepancies in timesheet entries and time worked for Named Employee #1. While it did not necessarily reflect intentionality, fraud or absence without supervisor approval, timesheets must be accurate.

The preponderance of the evidence showed discrepancies in the timekeeping of Named Employee #1, some of which favored Named Employee #1 and some which did not.

The preponderance of the evidence revealed that Named Employee #1 may have logged in more than two hours past the shift time and did not receive any counseling on this from his supervisor.

The preponderance of the evidence showed some timesheet discrepancies for Named Employee #2 during the time period reviewed by OPA.

The complainant alleged that Named Employee #2 used his position to accept pay from the Department for hours not worked. While the preponderance of the evidence did not support this allegation, there appeared to have been instances of poor record keeping and inadequate supervisory oversight of timecard entries.

The preponderance of the evidence showed some discrepancies in timesheet entries for Named Employee #2, but no evidence of intentionality or fraud.

There were several discrepancies and/or inaccuracies in the timesheets for the sergeants under Named Employee #3's command. Named Employee #3 was responsible for reviewing the accuracy of the timesheets for all subordinates.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Employee Time Off: Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor*.

Required Training: Named Employee #1 should be counseled on the importance of documenting all reportable time accurately in the timekeeping records.

Allegation #2

A preponderance of the evidence showed that some of the discrepancies in the timekeeping of Named Employee #1 favored the Named Employee while some did not. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Not Use Their Position or Authority for Personal Gain*.

Allegation #3

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Operations Bureau General Personnel Matters: First Watch Hours*.

Required Training: Named Employee #1 should be counseled on the importance of documenting all reportable time accurately in the timekeeping records.

Named Employee #2

Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Employee Time Off: Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor*.

Required Training: Named Employee #2 should be counseled on the importance of documenting all reportable time accurately in the timekeeping records.

Allegation #2

A preponderance of the evidence did not support this allegation. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Not Use Their Position or Authority for Personal Gain*.

Allegation #3

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Operations Bureau General Personnel Matters: First Watch Hours*.

Required Training: Named Employee #2 should be counseled on the importance of documenting all reportable time accurately in the timekeeping records.

Named Employee #3

Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities: Watch Lieutenants Responsibilities*.

Required Training: Named Employee #3 should be counseled on the importance of documenting all reportable time accurately in the timekeeping records, and ensuring such practices are adhered to by the sergeants under his command.

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.