



ISSUED DATE: JANUARY 3, 2020

CASE NUMBER: 2019OPA-0720

**Allegations of Misconduct & Director’s Findings**

**Named Employee #1**

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties 4. Employees Must Attend All Mandatory Training	Sustained Rapid Adjudication
# 2	4.010 - Employee Time Off 2. Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor	Allegation Removed

**Imposed Discipline**

**Written 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:**

It is alleged that the Named Employee did not attend a mandatory training session and failed to report for his regularly scheduled shift.

**ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:**

The Complainant, a Department Sergeant, alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) did not attend a pre-scheduled mandatory training session. When confronted about his failure to attend, NE#1 told the Sergeant he overslept and that he had no excuse for not attending the training session, failing to show up for work that day, and not contacting a supervisor to advise what had happened.

NE#1 informed OPA that he wished to process his case by means of Rapid Adjudication (RA). RA is provided for in the Seattle Police Officers’ Guild’s collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with the City. It allows, among other things, for employees to recognize that their conduct was inconsistent with Department policies and standards, and to accept discipline for the policy violation rather than undergoing a full OPA investigation.

After reviewing the complaint, completing its intake investigation, OPA determined this case could be appropriate for resolution by RA. However, before proceeding with its recommendation, OPA sought the Office of Inspector General’s (OIG) input. The OIG concurred with the OPA’s determination. Consistent with the procedure set forth in the CBA, OPA forwarded to the Chief of Police its recommended disposition as well as proposed discipline in the form of a written reprimand. The Chief of Police concurred with OPA’s recommended findings and proposed discipline. NE#1 also agreed to the discipline and, in doing so, stipulated that the finding and discipline were final and could not be appealed or otherwise later disputed.



**ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

**Named Employee #1 - Allegations #1**

***5.001 - Standards and Duties 4. Employees Must Attend All Mandatory Training***

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-4 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-POL-4.) 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.*)

As noted above, NE#1 acknowledged that he did not attend a pre-scheduled mandatory training, failed to show up for work that day, and did not contact a supervisor to advise what happened. By requesting to proceed with RA, NE#1 recognized that his actions in this case were inconsistent with Department policy. Furthermore, NE#1 accepted the discipline recommended by OPA and issued by the Chief of Police. As such, OPA recommends that this allegation be Sustained – Rapid Adjudication. This finding is both final and binding.

Recommended Finding: **Rapid Adjudication - Sustained**

**Named Employee #1 - Allegation #2**

***4.010 - Employee Time Off 2. Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor***

As a result of RA being agreed to and applied to NE#1’s actions in the context of Allegation #1, the remaining allegation in this case were removed.

Recommended Finding: **Allegation Removed**