



OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number 2017OPA-0276

Issued Date: 09/08/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 1.075 (2) Failure to Complete Required Training: Employees Shall Promptly Notify Their Immediate Supervisor and the Education & Training Section When and Why (Policy that was issued August 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Final Discipline	Had the Named Employee not resigned, discipline would have been imposed.

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee did not complete mandatory training.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, alleged that the Named Employee did not attend regularly scheduled training.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint memo
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Manual Policy 1.075-POL-2 requires employees to “promptly notify their immediate supervisor and the Education and Training Section when and why they are unable to attend a required training for which they are registered.” The policy further states that this notification must be made “as soon as practicable” and “[t]he employee must provide the reason for not being able to attend training.”

Named Employee #1 was registered to attend the 2017 Core Competencies class, which is a required SPD training. The complainant, who was Named Employee #1’s immediate supervisor, received a notification from SPD’s Training Unit that Named Employee #1 had missed the training. A review of Named Employee #1’s training records indicated that he was registered three times for the Core Competencies training but did not attend the training on any of those occasions. Named Employee #1 withdrew from the first training he was registered for, and was marked as a “no show” for the second and third trainings. Based on OPA’s investigation, for the second missed training, Named Employee #1 did not promptly notify either the complainant or SPD’s Training Unit to withdraw from that training or to indicate that he would not be attending and provide the reason why.

During its investigation, OPA attempted to interview Named Employee #1. However, Named Employee #1 was no longer employed by SPD and indicated, by email, that given the distance his residence was from OPA’s offices, it would be “very difficult” for him to be interviewed in-person. Named Employee #1 did not respond to a subsequent offer from OPA that the interview be conducted telephonically. Notably, in that same email correspondence, Named Employee #1 stated: “I know I failed to attend the training.” Named Employee #1 did not offer any justification for why he missed the training or provide any evidence that he notified his immediate supervisor and the Training Unit as required by policy.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employee #1 did not offer any justification for why he missed the training or provide any evidence that he notified his immediate supervisor and the Training Unit as required by policy. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *Failure to Complete Required Training: Employees Shall Promptly Notify Their Immediate Supervisor and the Education & Training Section When and Why*.

Discipline Imposed: Had the Named Employee not resigned, discipline would have been imposed.

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.