

MARICOPA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Bureau of Internal Oversight
Audits and Inspections Unit



Complaint Intake Testing Inspection July 2024

Inspection # BI2024-0104

The Bureau of Internal Oversight's (BIO) Audits and Inspections Unit (AIU) conducts Complaint Intake Test inspections on a monthly basis. The purpose of this inspection is to determine employee compliance with Office Policies GH-2, *Internal Investigations*, GI-1, *Radio and Enforcement Communications Procedures*, and GB-2, *Command Responsibility* as they relate to the civilian complaint intake process. To ensure consistent inspections, the *Complaint Intake Testing Matrix* developed by the AIU is utilized.

To achieve this, the AIU will conduct monthly inspections of the complaint intake tests completed by an outside vendor selected by the MCSO for this purpose. This vendor is responsible for having testers file fictitious complaints either in person at MCSO facilities, by telephone, by mail, by e-mail, or by using MCSO's website to determine if MCSO employees process the intake of complaints in accordance with MCSO policy.

The vendor has been issued open Purchase Orders for the Fiscal Year ending June 30th which allows for random and targeted tests to allow MCSO to assess the complaint intake process. The vendor determines the number of tests it will conduct and when and how it will conduct these tests. Additionally, the vendor has been provided with testing methodologies and testing paperwork which have been approved by the AIU. These methodologies include the requirement to audio and video record all in-person tests and audio record all telephone tests. The testing vendor will adhere to these methodologies when conducting complaint intake testing for the Office.

Compliance Objectives:

- Are employees providing civilians with appropriate and accurate information about the complaint process?
- Are employees promptly notifying the Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) upon the receipt of a complaint?
- Are employees providing the PSB with accurate and complete information?
- Are employees attempting to discourage, interfere with, or delay civilians from registering a complaint?

Criteria:

MCSO Policy GH-2, *Internal Investigations*

MCSO Policy GI-1, *Radio and Enforcement Communications Procedures*

MCSO Policy GB-2, *Command Responsibility*

Conditions:

AIU began conducting the inspection of Complaint Intake Testing in January 2019 for tests performed during the month of December 2018. The following charts illustrate 6-month histories of compliance with Office Policy. "N/A" indicates a particular type of testing was not performed during that month.

There were two Complaint Intake Tests conducted during the month of July 2024; one was an in-person test and the other was an email test. AIU inspected both complaint intake tests. These tests are discussed in further detail under the applicable report sub-sections below.

In-Person Testing

There was one In-Person Complaint Intake Test conducted during the month of July 2024.

TEST #: IP25-01

DISTRICT/DIVISION: District 4

TEST SCENARIO: The tester posed as a white female who witnessed an accident and assault in Sun City. The responding deputy asked the tester to wait in a parking lot and that he would be back to talk to her after talking with the driver of the vehicle who stayed on the scene. She said the deputy talked with the driver and then got in his vehicle and left the scene without talking with her or letting her know if he would be back.

ACTIONS TAKEN: The tester went to District 4's Cave Creek office and was greeted by the administrative assistant. The tester told the assistant she would like to file a complaint and the administrative assistant said an on-duty sergeant was not currently available. The administrative assistant said she would contact the on-duty sergeant and have him come to the office to take the complaint. While the tester was waiting for the sergeant the captain came out to verify the location of the incident to ensure it was not located in the City of Phoenix. An on-duty sergeant came out to join the tester and took her complaint.

The interview was audio and video recorded by the sergeant in accordance with Office Policy. At the conclusion of the interview, the sergeant explained that he would enter the complaint and that the Professional Standards Bureau would be in contact with her.

RESULTS: No deficiencies were noted


TESTER COMMENT: N/A

BIO FOLLOW-UP: None required

It was determined that the MSCO employees' compliance with the applicable Office Policy (GH-2, *Internal Investigations*) was 100%, as illustrated by the table below:

Inspection Element	Not In Compliance	In Compliance	Total	Compliance Rate
Determine if the complaint was accepted.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the complaint was taken in a courteous manner.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the complaint was referred to the on-duty supervisor.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the supervisor offered to meet the complaint in person.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If a supervisor was not available, verify that the employee obtained pertinent information and have a supervisor make contact with the complainant as soon as possible.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Determine if original recordings and documents were attached to BlueTeam or sent via interoffice mail to PSB.	0	1	1	100%
Verify that the complaint was entered into BlueTeam or IAPro.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the employee attempted to discourage, interfere, or delay the complaint.	0	1	1	100%
If the alleged conduct is of a criminal nature, determine that the chain of command was notified, who then notified PSB.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Verify that the complaint was audio and/or video recorded.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the following minimum amount of information was obtained: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complainant's name • Complainant's contact information • Location of the complaint occurrence • Report number and deputy name, if known 	0	1	1	100%
Determine if verbal or written acknowledgment was provided that the complaint was received, documented, forwarded for investigation, and that the complainant would be contacted by a department representative.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the complaint was immediately forwarded to PSB.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the employee reported accurate information in the complaint.	0	1	1	100%
Overall compliance for In-Person testing	0	11	11	100%


Below is a 6-month historical comparison of compliance for In-Person tests:



Testing by U.S. Mail

There were no Complaint Intake Tests conducted by U.S. Mail during the month of July 2024.


Below is a 6-month historical comparison of compliance for tests conducted by U.S. Mail:



Testing by Telephone

There were no Complaint Intake Tests conducted by Telephone during the month of July 2024.


Below is a 6-month historical comparison of compliance for tests conducted by Telephone:



Testing by Telephone via the Communications Division

There were no Complaint Intake Tests conducted by Telephone via the Communications Division during the month of July 2024.

Below is a 6-month historical comparison of compliance for tests conducted by Telephone via the Communications Division:



Testing by E-Mail

There was one Complaint Intake Test conducted by Email during the month of July 2024.

TEST #: RE25-01

DISTRICT/DIVISION: District 3

TEST SCENARIO: The tester posed as a male who went to a grocery store in Sun City and witnessed an MCSO vehicle parked in one of the handicapped spaces. The tester then entered the store and saw a plain-clothed male at the self-checkout wearing a gun and badge on his belt. The gentleman then went to the MCSO vehicle and left. This was very upsetting to him as his brother utilizes handicapped spaces and they would get a ticket if they did this.

ACTIONS TAKEN: The tester e-mailed PSB directly. The complaint was entered into the blue team as required.

RESULTS: No deficiencies were noted


TESTER COMMENT: N/A

BIO FOLLOW-UP: None required

It was determined that the MSCO employees’ compliance with the applicable Office Policy (GH-2, *Internal Investigations*) was 100%, as illustrated by the table below:

Inspection Element	Not In Compliance	In Compliance	Total	Compliance Rate
Determine if the complaint was accepted.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the complaint was taken in a courteous manner.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Determine If the supervisor offered to meet the complainant in person.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Determine if the complaint was referred to the on-duty supervisor.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
If a supervisor was not available, verify that the employee obtained pertinent information and have a supervisor make contact with the complainant as soon as possible.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Determine if original recordings and documents were attached to BlueTeam or sent via interoffice mail to PSB.	0	1	1	100%
Verify that the complaint was entered into BlueTeam or IAPro.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the employee attempted to discourage, interfere, or delay the complaint.	0	1	1	100%
If the alleged conduct is of a criminal nature, determine that the chain of command was notified, who then notified PSB.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Verify that the complaint was audio and/or video recorded.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Determine if the following minimum amount of information was obtained: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complainant's name • Complainant's contact information • Location of the complaint occurrence • Report number and deputy name, if known 	0	1	1	100%
Determine if verbal or written acknowledgment was provided that the complaint was received, documented, forwarded for investigation, and that the complainant would be contacted by a department representative.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the complaint was immediately forwarded to PSB.	0	1	1	100%
Determine if the employee reported accurate information in the complaint.	0	1	1	100%
Overall compliance for testing by E-mail	0	8	8	100%


Below is a 6-month historical comparison of compliance for tests conducted by E-mail:



Testing Online via MCSO's Website

There were no Complaint Intake Tests conducted online during the month of July 2024 using the Office's website.


Below is a 6-month historical comparison of compliance for filing a complaint Online:



Overall Compliance for July 2024:


Compliance Rate by Method of Testing July 2024	Compliance Rate
Tests conducted In Person	100%
Tests conducted by U.S. Mail	N/A
Tests conducted by Telephone	N/A
Tests conducted via Dispatch	N/A
Tests conducted via E-mail	100%
Tests conducted by filing a complaint Online/Website	N/A
Overall Compliance for all Complaint Intake Tests Inspected – July 2024	100%

Below is a chart illustrating the compliance rate by type of test conducted for the month of July 2024 as compared with the corresponding year-to-date compliance rate:



History of Overall Compliance:

Below is a 6-month historical comparison of compliance for all Complaint Intake Testing:



There were no deficiencies noted during the inspection period.

Action Required:

The compliance rate is **100%** for Inspection BI2024-0104; therefore, **no BIO Action Forms** are requested.

Date Inspection Started: July 16, 2024
 Date Completed: August 01, 2024
 Timeframe Inspected: July 1 - 31, 2024
 Assigned Inspectors: Ronda Jamieson B3178

I have reviewed this inspection report.

Lt. Brian Arthur S1806

Lieutenant T. Brian Arthur S1806
 Commander, Audits and Inspections Unit
 Bureau of Internal Oversight

8/3/2024

Date