



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JUNE 6, 2025

FROM: INTERIM DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0458

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

| Allegation(s): | | Director's Findings |
|--|---|---------------------|
| # 1 | 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional | Sustained |
| # 2 | 5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication | Sustained |
| Imposed Discipline | | |
| Resigned Prior to Proposed DAR – Termination | | |

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 is a civilian manager who oversaw Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a temporary contract civilian employee. The Complainant alleged NE#1 arrived more than nine minutes late to work, requiring that another employee be mandated to work overtime. The Complainant alleged NE#1 dishonestly claimed to have only been about three minutes late.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

NE#1 separated from the Department in February 2025, while this investigation was ongoing. As such, no contractual 180-day deadline applies to this case.

On April 16, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA investigated this case by reviewing the internal Blue Team complaint, facility access logs, email correspondence, and unit policies and expectations. OPA interviewed the Complainant and two witness employees. OPA contacted NE#1 to offer her the voluntary opportunity to be interviewed, which she affirmatively declined.¹

¹ OPA was originally unable to compel NE#1's interview because she was out on leave. NE#1 later separated from the Department.



Blue Team Complaint

The Complainant submitted an internal Blue Team complaint to OPA on December 10, 2024, detailing the following. NE#1 submitted her timesheet for a full day of pay without using the required .25 hours of leave.² NE#1 called to report she would be about five to ten minutes late for her shift, but did not follow the “Late Arrival Guidelines” that require employees to email their arrival time and how they are covering their time. NE#1’s supervisor, Witness Employee #1 (WE#1), emailed NE#1 to request this information. NE#1 replied that she was only about three minutes late and did not make up her time. A co-worker, Witness Employee #2 (WE#2), was mandated to work overtime and coded .25 hours (fifteen minutes) of overtime for that purpose.³ Facility access logs showed NE#1 did not badge into the building until 11:39 pm, nine minutes after the start of her shift. Her actual start time was unknown, but based on her arrival time at the building was more than three minutes and over the seven-minute threshold to use leave or make up time.

Facility Access Logs

SPD HQ facility access logs showed NE#1 scanned into the Seapark garage at 11:36 pm October 4, 2024. NE#1 scanned in to access the 4th Floor of SPD HQ from the Seapark garage at 11:39 pm on October 4, 2024.

Email Correspondence

OPA reviewed email correspondence. In an October 8, 2024,⁴ email, an SPD employee notified WE#1 that NE#1 called into work on October 4, 2024, at about 11:30 pm to advise they would be about 5-10 minutes late.⁵

On October 9, 2024, WE#1 emailed NE#1 requesting the time they arrived on October 4, the reason for their lateness, and if they stayed late to make up the time. On October 10, 2024, NE#1 responded: “I was late due to construction, I did not stay late. I arrived at 1133 ish.”

Unit Policies and Expectations

OPA reviewed the written policies for NE#1’s unit. Signed and initialed onboarding paperwork showed that NE#1 received all these policies when she started working at SPD in December 2022. The unit has specific written policies noting the expectations for attendance and tardiness. Notably, employees were advised to contact a supervisor in the event of late arrival. Also, employees arriving late are required to notify their supervisor before the start of their shift,

² Although not specifically mentioned in the Blue Team complaint, emails and documentation obtained by OPA showed the relevant day was NE#1’s October 5, 2024, “shift.” Because NE#1 worked overnight, her “shift” for October 5 started at 11:30 pm on October 4, 2024, and carried over into the next day. NE#1’s shift ends at 7:30 am.

³ Timesheet records corroborated both that NE#1 entered a full day of work for her October 5, 2024, shift and that WE#2 entered fifteen minutes of overtime.

⁴ October 8, 2024, was a Tuesday. SPD pays its employees every other week. Time sheets for the preceding two weeks (running Wednesday to Tuesday) need to be approved by supervisors by the Wednesday after the pay period. Here, WE#1 would have needed to approve NE#1’s timesheet for Wednesday, September 25, 2024, through Tuesday, October 8, 2024, no later than Wednesday, October 9, 2024.

⁵ In this email, the SPD employee incorrectly listed the relevant dates as October 5 and October 6. OPA confirmed this was an error. The relevant dates are October 4 and October 5.



including an estimated time of arrival. Afterwards, a late-arriving employee must email their supervisor letting them know if they will be covering the time with paid time off or staying late to make up the time.

Complainant

OPA interviewed the Complainant, a civilian manager of NE#1's unit. Her statement was consistent with her Blue Team complaint. The Complainant elaborated that NE#1 worked for SPD for about two-and-a-half years and had been late before. The Complainant clarified that, in their unit, if an employee is less than fifteen minutes late, they can stay late to make up the time, otherwise use of PTO would need to be approved. The Complainant spoke about the importance of timely arrival for their specific unit, noting that if one employee is late, mandatory minimum staffing requires another employee to work forced overtime and potentially incur additional parking fees. The Complainant noted these mandatory minimums are strictly adhered to due to the impact on other employees and need for their unit to provide validation and confirmation on a full-time, twenty-four/seven basis. The Complainant stated their belief NE#1 violated both professionalism and truthfulness policies, emphasizing that NE#1 was given two opportunities to be truthful and failed to do so.

Witness Employee #1

WE#1 was NE#1's civilian supervisor. Their interview was consistent with the complaint information. WE#1 spoke to observing the discrepancy between NE#1's statement that she was only three minutes later versus WE#2's fifteen-minute overtime request. WE#1 said such discrepancies are not common, noting she was not aware of it occurring before. WE#1 stated she thought NE#1 violated both professionalism and truthfulness policies.

Witness Employee #2

WE#2 is a civilian employee. She stated she volunteered to work the overtime due to NE#1's late arrival because she was already assigned to the same "desk" so would minimize disruption by staying later. She stated NE#1 arrived at the desk at 11:41 pm. WE#2 remembered this because she checked the clock to see if she would still need to complete an overtime sheet. She stated fifteen minutes of overtime is paid for anything between eight to fifteen minutes over.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 — Allegation #1

5.001 — Standards and Duties POL-10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was unprofessional.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 requires that SPD employees "strive to be professional." The policy further instructs that "employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers" whether on or off duty. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10.

This allegation is Sustained. As discussed below at Allegation #2, NE#1's timesheet submission and email to WE#1 contained untruthful and incomplete statements. On their own, these dishonest statements would be sufficient to also violate the professionalism policy. Separately, however, NE#1 also failed to abide by her unit's expectations to provide her supervisor with her actual time of arrival and how she wanted her time covered. Instead, her supervisor



needed to follow up with her after the fact and then resolve a discrepancy between NE#1 and WE#2's timesheets. Finally, NE#1's lateness impacted WE#2, her unit, and required SPD to pay overtime to cover her absence.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 — Allegation #2

5.001 — Standards and Duties 5.001-POL 11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was dishonest.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11 requires Department employees to be truthful and complete in all communications.

This allegation is Sustained. NE#1's timesheet showed she worked a full eight hours, beginning at 11:30 pm and ending at 7:30 am. When asked later, NE#1 emailed WE#1 stating she arrived at "1133 ish." Even accepting her use of "ish" to connote some uncertainty, she also stated she did not stay late and did not attempt to request any paid time off to cover the absence. These statements implied that NE#1's lateness was so slight as to not require her to stay late or use paid time off. But that was obviously not the case. OPA credits WE#2's recollection that NE#1 arrived at her desk at 11:41 pm, eleven minutes late. This fact was important enough to WE#2 to make specific note; NE#1 should have similarly noted her arrival time, entered it accurately in her timesheet, and provided WE#1 with accurate information.

OPA recognizes that, to some, NE#1's eleven-minute tardiness would seem mundane or commonplace. OPA notes that NE#1 had multiple options to manage her late arrival, from requesting to use PTO or making up the time by working beyond her scheduled shift. The issue here was not just her late arrival but her attempt to cover it up. Also important to OPA's findings is the high importance NE#1's unit places on timeliness and accurately reporting arrival and departure times. This is shown in the Complainant and witness statements, the specific written policies on this issue, and operational need for minimum staffing in a unit with twenty-four/seven obligations to a law enforcement agency. In this environment, NE#1 knew the importance of accuracy and candor regarding her time entry. Instead of honoring that commitment, she chose to minimize her late arrival and sought full pay without making up time or using paid time off, as required by policy.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**