



## CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2020

CASE NUMBER: 2020OPA-0043

### **Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings**

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	4.020 - Reporting and Recording Overtime/Out of Classification Pay 4. Supervisor Responsibilities for Monitoring Overtime Use	Not Sustained (Unfounded)

***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:**

An anonymous Complainant alleged that the Named Employee abused overtime and that she improperly oversaw the overtime provided to other employees.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:**

This case was designated as an Expedited Investigation. This means that OPA, with the review and approval of the Office of Inspector General for Public Safety, believed that it could reach and issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation and without interviewing the Named Employee. As such, the Named Employee was not interviewed as part of this case.

### **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

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

#### ***4.020 - Reporting and Recording Overtime/Out of Classification Pay 4. Supervisor Responsibilities for Monitoring Overtime Use***

The Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1), who is employed as a Dispatcher Supervisor in the Communications Unit, "routinely fabricates massive amounts of overtime for herself." The Complainant asserted that NE#1 serves as the payroll clerk for the unit and, as a result, her timesheets were "not closely scrutinized" and she could add as much overtime to herself as she wanted. The Complainant further contended that NE#1 was restricting overtime for other members of the unit even though she was "embezzling the money." Based on this complaint, OPA's investigation ensued.

OPA was unable to interview the Complainant given the Complainant's anonymous status. OPA did, however, interview NE#1's supervisor, who the Complainant identified as a witness. He stated that he approves NE#1's timesheets, including the overtime she works. He denied that NE#1 was abusing overtime. The supervisor further explained that, as part of her job, NE#1 scheduled subordinate employees for overtime. He said that she did so



---

consistent with collective bargaining agreements and by using a program called Schedule Express. Even had she wanted to play favorites, this program prevented NE#1 or any other supervisor from preferentially assigning overtime to certain employees. Ultimately, the supervisor conclusively disproved the Complainant's allegations against NE#1.

Based on this information, OPA found no evidence to support a finding that NE#1, herself, abused overtime, or that she improperly oversaw the overtime provided to other employees. As such, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained (Unfounded)**