

MARICOPA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Bureau of Internal Oversight

Audits and Inspections Unit



Targeted Integrity Inspection: November 2024

Inspection Report # BI2024-0156

The Audits and Inspections Unit (AIU) of the Sheriff's Office Bureau of Internal Oversight (BIO) Conduct a targeted inspection on off-duty jobs which were completed during the month of September 2024 to ensure they were within the guidelines established in office policy EA-18; *Law Enforcement Extra-Duty and Off-Duty Employment*.

Inspection BI2024-0156 will examine off-duty jobs which were completed in September 2024. To accomplish this task, every off-duty job performed in September 2024 was extracted from the OfficeTRAK system and exported into an excel spreadsheet. Excluding one employee due to potential conflict of interest from off-duty jobs, a total of 1,361 jobs were inspected. The information was then filtered, with the use of randomizer.org, to identify one off-duty job from every employee listed, which totaled 161 employees. All 161 off-duty jobs were uniformly inspected utilizing a matrix developed by the Audits and Inspections Unit in accordance with the procedures outlined in policy and the AIU Operations Manual. In the inspection, a "reasonable person" standard will be utilized by inspectors.

Compliance Objectives:

- Determine if the inspected employee successfully completed the required ODM training course through The HUB prior to the off-duty employment.
- Determine if the employee notified communications of required information contained within office policy.
- Determine if the employee utilized the ODM application to clock-in and clock-out for the off-duty employment.
- Determine if the employee had 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period.
- Determine if the employee had overlapping on-duty shifts with extra-duty/off-duty.
- Determine if the employee worked off-duty employment which is prohibited by office policy.
- Determine if the employee activated the Body-Worn Camera (BWC) if law enforcement action was taken or interaction with members of the public occurred.

Criteria:

MCSO Policy EA-18; *Law Enforcement Extra-Duty and Off-Duty Employment*.

MCSO Policy GJ-35; *Body-Worn Camera*

Section 303 of the AIU Operations Manual.

Conditions:

The Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) has identified a pattern of misconduct allegations which have risen from off-duty employment across all ranks and divisions. To ensure compliance with office policy, a targeted test was conducted on off-duty jobs performed in September 2024. During this time, 1,361 jobs were completed by 161 different office employees. Due to the large volume of off-duty jobs, randomizer.org was utilized to identify one job from each employee to be inspected. 161 off-duty jobs were reviewed to identify violations of office policy for evidence of criminal, serious or continual, repetitive, and willful acts of minor misconduct.

Results:

All 161 off-duty jobs uniformly inspected utilizing a matrix developed by the Audits and Inspections Unit in accordance with the procedures outlined in policy and the AIU Operations Manual. The results of the inspection were as follows:

- 130 of the 161 off-duty jobs (or 80.74%) contained no compliance deficiencies.
- 30 of the 161 off-duty jobs (or 18.63%) contained compliance-related deficiencies.
 - 5 of the 30 off-duty jobs, required ODM training which was not completed.
 - 10 of the 30 off-duty jobs did not use OfficeTRAK to clock-in or clock-out.
 - 11 of the 30 off-duty jobs did not notify communications of the assigned job.
 - 9 of the 30 off-duty jobs did not have the required 8 hours off after working 16 hours in a rolling 24 hours.

During the analysis of this targeted integrity test, it was found that 65 employees with 'non-exempt' status do not have a documented work schedule associated with their specific duty assignment. Based on the analysis, it was concluded that these 65 employees were not working their regular hours in conjunction with any off-duty or extra-duty assignments.

It is important to note that this targeted integrity test involved 24 employees who hold the rank of Lieutenant or higher. These employees are classified as 'exempt' under the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office policies, meaning they are not required to use a daily time clock to record the hours worked. As part of this test, no comparisons were made to assess whether their standard work hours overlapped with any off-duty or extra-duty hours.

Conclusion:

The determination by AIU regarding the disposition of this targeted inspection is a **FAIL**. AIU did not observe evidence of criminal, serious or continual, repetitive, and willful acts of minor misconduct; however, AIU believes various employees had deficiencies based on the compiled data obtained for this inspection.

The targeted inspection disposition of FAIL is a PROCEDURAL FAIL according to Section 303 of the BIO Operations Manual and the disposition does not require a referral to the Professional Standards Bureau. There were thirty (30) employees with compliance deficiencies identified. A search withing the IA Pro system was conducted to see if there was supervisor intervention, for the identified deficiencies during this targeted integrity test. Both searches resulted in a return of negative results.

Action Required:

AIU will provide the inspection report to the Division via the Bio Action Form Process: **15 BIO Action Forms Required.**

District 1 (2 BIO Action Forms):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
1	09/22/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not complete ODM training in the HUB. (Policy EA-18.4)				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
1	09/09/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not have 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period. (Policy EA-18.9) * A BAF is not required for this deficiency due to policy lacking clarity.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
1	09/09/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A) 2. *No GPS location in ODM clock-in or clock-out times. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
1	09/01/24	Lieutenant	Captain	Captain
Deficiency				
1. No GPS location in ODM clock-in or clock-out times. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
1	09/29/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not have 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period. (Policy EA-18.9) * A BAF is not required for this deficiency due to policy lacking clarity.				

District 2 (1 BIO Action Form):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
2	09/07/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not have 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period. (Policy EA-18.9) * A BAF is not required for this deficiency due to policy lacking clarity.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
2	09/10/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not have 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period. (Policy EA-18.9) * A BAF is not required for this deficiency due to policy lacking clarity.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
2	09/27/24	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
2	09/17/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. *No GPS location in ODM clock-in or clock-out times. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
2	09/12/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. No GPS location in ODM clock-in or clock-out times. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
2	09/14/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not have 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period. (Policy EA-18.9) * A BAF is not required for this deficiency due to policy lacking clarity.				

District 3 (2 BIO Action Forms):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
3	09/01/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not complete ODM training in the HUB. (Policy EA-18.4)				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
3	09/26/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. No GPS location in ODM clock-in or clock-out times. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
3	09/04/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
3	09/15/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. No GPS location in ODM for clock-out time. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

District 4 (4 BIO Action Forms):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
4	09/05/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not complete ODM training in the HUB. (Policy EA-18.4) 2. *Employee did not have 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period. (Policy EA-18.9) * A BAF is not required for this deficiency due to policy lacking clarity.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
4	09/14/24	Captain	Chief	Chief
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
4	09/15/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not complete ODM training in the HUB. (Policy EA-18.4) 2. *Employee did not have 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period. (Policy EA-18.9) * A BAF is not required for this deficiency due to policy lacking clarity.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
4	09/21/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
4	09/19/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. No GPS location in ODM for clock-in time. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

SWAT (2 BIO Action Forms):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
SWAT	09/21/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not have 8 hours of rest after working 16 hours in a rolling 24-hour period. (Policy EA-18.9) * A BAF is not required for this deficiency due to policy lacking clarity.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
SWAT	09/14/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
SWAT	09/06/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

Court Implementation (1 BIO Action Form):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
CID	09/01/24	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

Major Crimes (1 BIO Action Forms):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
MCD	09/26/24	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. No GPS location in ODM for clock-out time. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
MCD	09/22/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

Special Investigations (1 BIO Action Form):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
SID	09/22/24	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain
Deficiency				
1. Employee did not complete ODM training in the HUB. (Policy EA-18.4) 2. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A) 3. *No GPS location in ODM for clock-in or clock-out time. (Policy EA-18.8.B) * A BAF is not required because there is no tracking mechanism in place with ODM to identify employees' start and end times when completed by telephone.				

Training (1 BIO Action Form):

District	Off-Duty Job Date	Employee	Supervisor	Commander
Training	09/22/24	Lieutenant	Captain	Chief
Deficiency				
1. Communications was not notified of the off-duty employment. (Policy EA-18.8.A)				

Note: Two (2) deficiencies are not displayed as a result of ongoing PSB investigations.

Date Inspection Started: October 22nd, 2024
 Date Completed: December 2nd, 2024
 Timeframe Inspected: September 2024
 Assigned Inspector(s): Sgt. R. T. Bierwalter S1263

I have reviewed this inspection report.

Lt Andrew Rankin S1839

01/14/2025

Lt. A. Rankin S1839
 Commander, Audits & Inspections Unit
 Bureau of Internal Oversight

Date